

The global history of Latin America*

Matthew Brown

Department of Hispanic, Portuguese and Latin American Studies, University of Bristol,
15 Woodland Road, Bristol, BS8 1TE, UK
E-mail: matthew.brown@bristol.ac.uk

Abstract

This article explains why historians of Latin America have been disinclined to engage with global history, and how global history has yet to successfully integrate Latin America into its debates. It analyses research patterns and identifies instances of parallel developments in the two fields, which have operated until recently in relative isolation from one another, shrouded and disconnected. It outlines a framework for engagement between Latin American history and global history, focusing particularly on the significant transformations of the understudied nineteenth century. It suggests that both global history and Latin American history will benefit from recognition of the existing work that has pioneered a path between the two, and from enhanced and sustained dialogue.

Keywords commodities, decoloniality, empire, historiography, Latin America

Introduction

Latin America is one star among many in the firmament of global history. Yet it rarely shines brightly, is often overlooked, and has remained on the periphery of a way of writing about history that consciously seeks networks and connections, and aspires to overcome older imperial and colonial exclusionary narratives. The explanation can be found partly in historiography, in Anglophone historians' (lack of) language skills, in the way that historians choose their subject materials, and in the institutionalization of the writing of global and Latin American histories. For these reasons, the spread of the discipline of global history has caused some anxiety among Latin Americanists, who have been fearful both of the loss of culture-specific knowledge and of the potential homogenization of the historical discipline.¹ This article examines the links and

* This article was originally presented as a keynote lecture to the University of Oxford Centre of Global History workshop on Latin America on 12 March 2014. I thank all of the participants for their suggestions for improvement. I acknowledge the insights of the editors and anonymous reviewers of the *Journal of Global History*, and the formational conversations that I have had with Paula Caffarena, Joanna Crow, Paulo Drinot, Andrew Ginger, Nicola Foote, Alan Knight, Su Lin Lewis, Chris Manias, Fernando Padilla Angulo, and Jonathan Saha, which have assisted me in articulating some of these thoughts.

1 See for example the 2013 campaign against the University of Oxford's decision to freeze its Chair in Latin American History, <http://paulodrinot.wordpress.com/2013/02/18/oxford-chair-in-the-history-of-latin-america-copy-of-letter-sent-to-professor-andrew-hamilton-vice-chancellor-university-of-oxford-on-15-february-2013/> (consulted 2 July 2015), signed by many historians of Latin America from around the world. For a rigorous overview, see Matias Middel and Katja Naumann, 'Global history and the spatial turn: from the impact of area studies to the study of critical junctures of globalization', *Journal of Global History*, 5, 1, 2010, pp. 149–70.

divergences between Latin American history and global history. It argues that the geographical and institutional locations occupied by historians, the languages they read and write, and their relationships with their perceived readerships have been crucial factors in shaping disconnections between fields that should be intimately interconnected.²

The first part of this article suggests that, because historians of colonial Latin America operating within Atlantic history and African diaspora frameworks have been more likely to engage with global history than those focusing on the post-1800 period, the disconnections and divergences between Latin American history and global history have been most significant for the nineteenth century, with major interpretative consequences.³ Because of the vacuums created by the historiographical discontinuities, too much global history and too much Latin American history has situated Latin America as marginalized, passive, or a victim. The final part of the article outlines a manifesto for combining global history and Latin American history, identifying the key periods and events which historians need to address in order fully to integrate the history of Latin America into analyses of global processes, and vice versa.

A history of disconnections

In 2012 Oxford University Press published the *Oxford handbook of Latin American history*, edited by José Moya.⁴ The book gives a sense of developments in the fields and diverse historiographies that make up what is still called, with some reservations, ‘Latin American’ history. Moya provides a lucid breakdown of the regional subcategories of Euro-American, Afro-American, and Indo-American histories, which he suggests provide more coherent units of analysis for post-1492 history. He concludes, nevertheless, that ‘Latin America’ remains a convenient and recognizable label. In this he acknowledges the important advances in understanding the construction of ‘the idea of Latin America’, to use Walter Mignolo’s term.⁵ ‘Latin America’, a term never used on either side of the Atlantic before 1840, was an idea invented by a transnational cosmopolitan elite born in Panama, Chile, and Argentina, who were intellectually active in Paris in the mid nineteenth century. What the ‘Latinity’ of parts of America actually meant has been disputed ever since the term was coined. It includes an opposition to ‘Anglo-Saxon’ North America, a shared history of colonialism, Catholicism, and, in the versions attributed to early twentieth-century thinkers such as José Enrique Rodó, a degree of spirituality and aestheticism lacked by rationalist Protestants to the north and in Europe.⁶

In Moya’s volume, eminent scholars trace the contributions in agrarian history, economic history, indigenous history, and so on that have changed the way in which specialist historians have thought about Latin America’s past over the last few decades. There is no chapter on the

2 On historians, their locations, and their readerships, see Jorma Kalela, *Making history: the historian and the uses of the past*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012, pp. 40–55.

3 For examples, see W. H. McNeil, *A world history*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967; Alfred Crosby, *The Columbian exchange: biological and cultural consequences of 1492*, Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1972; Sidney Wilfred Mintz, *Sweetness and power: the place of sugar in modern history*, New York: Penguin, 1986; Felipe Fernández-Armesto, *The world: a brief history*, London: Pearson, 2007.

4 José Moya, ed., *Oxford handbook of Latin American history*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

5 Walter Mignolo, *The idea of Latin America*, Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.

6 *Ibid.*; Matthew Brown, *From frontiers to football: an alternative history of Latin America since 1800*, London: Reaktion, 2014, pp. 87–91.

influence of global or world history on Latin American history. Indeed, there are no references at all to how the writing of Latin American history has been influenced by global history. Those who are not Latin Americanists might be surprised that a major historiographical shift is not mentioned in this comprehensive regional body of analysis, but Moya and his contributors did not miss anything. They are correct that the influence of global history upon the writing of Latin American history has been negligible.

Latin American history is correspondingly underrepresented in world and global history, being an object of study only around certain key moments of conquest, rupture, and revolution. As A. G. Hopkins has observed, the writing of world history faces ‘formidable obstacles’ in which ‘attempts to give the endeavour coherence can easily become proxies, witting or unwitting, for a story that is already well known: the rise of the West – with or without the fall of the rest’.⁷ World history practitioners have become increasingly aware of these absences in their curricula, and have debated how best to overcome them.⁸ The last two decades have witnessed a creative tension between a world history that aspires to comprehensive and comparative accounts of events and processes, and a global history that focuses on networks and connections in the shadow of contemporary globalization.⁹ The marginalization of Latin America within both these approaches remains a mutual weakness requiring consideration, reflection, and remedy.

The disconnect between global or world history and Latin America has long been noted. Patrick Manning commented in 2003 that the region was ‘curiously neglected in most treatments of world history’.¹⁰ Seven years later, Rick Warner attempted to explain the continued breach in institutional terms: ‘I would submit that Latin American historians themselves are poorly represented in the membership and activity [...] of world historical communities ... anecdotally I can probably count on two hands the number of Latin Americanists I have met over the past decade at our conferences.’¹¹

Those calling for better connections have often focused on teaching. In 1997, Lance Grahn proposed that university teachers adopt the themes of economics, politics, and ideas to provide an entry point for Latin America into world history survey courses.¹² Warner’s attempt ‘to energize the connections between Latin American Studies and World History’ was aimed at creating better classroom discussions in world history programmes in the US.¹³ Latin Americanists there taught world history because they had to, and researched

7 A. G. Hopkins, ‘The history of globalization – and the globalization of history?’, in A. G. Hopkins, ed., *Globalization in world history*, London: Pimlico, 2002, p. 14.

8 Patrick Manning, *Navigating world history: historians create a global past*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, esp. pp. 3–15.

9 A. G. Hopkins, ‘The historiography of globalization and the globalization of regionalism’, *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 53, 2010, pp. 19–36.

10 Manning, *Navigating world history*, p. 90.

11 Rick Warner, ‘Introduction: bringing Latin America into world history’, *World History Connected*, 7, 3, 2010, paragraph 3. The 2014 conference of the World History Association was held in Costa Rica: <http://www.thewha.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/WHA-Program-2014-final-1.pdf> (consulted 2 July 2015); one of its themes was ‘Latin America in world history’.

12 Lance Grahn, ‘Integrating Latin America and the Caribbean into global history’, *Journal of General Education*, 46, 2, 1997, pp. 107–28.

13 Warner, ‘Introduction’, paragraph 4. See also Paolo Castaño, ‘Latin America as a unit of analysis for world history: some reflections’, *World History Bulletin*, 20, 2, 2004, pp. 30–6.

Latin American history because they wanted to. World history survey course textbooks, especially those including Latin Americanist authors or editors, have engaged with some key moments in Latin American history, normally related to wars or political violence.¹⁴

Whereas the multi-authored world history comparative approach has secured a place for Latin America in teaching, global history research has not followed suit. Instead, the global history approach that privileges connections and networks has often provided a methodological justification for single authors to concentrate on the regions, empires, and cultures they were initially trained to research.

One explanation as to why Latin Americanists have not embraced global history might be the high profile of the strand of global history represented best by Bruce Mazlish and Akira Iriye in their *Global history reader*. Their approach sets out to understand the processes that have led to the present, globalized world. Historians are encouraged by Mazlish and Iriye and their followers to seek to understand the world they live in. The problem with this approach is that it relegates to the periphery the roads not taken, the processes and events that, while significant to contemporaries and indeed to other historians, did not lead to the world 'we' live in today. The *Global history reader* displayed a clear dichotomy between global history and Latin American history. Of twenty-eight chapters, only two made more than cursory mention of anywhere in Latin America: a study of how US-based environmental activists got involved with, and helped, Brazilian campaigns against environmental degradation, featuring the celebrated martyred campaigner Chico Mendes; and a treatment of human rights abuses in the Southern Cone in the 1970s and 1980s.¹⁵ Latin America thus appeared only as a bit-part actor. Latin Americans themselves are presented as victims rather than as active participants in global history, and the pre-1950 history of the continent is entirely absent.¹⁶

The premise that global history is predicated on a notion of how globalization is experienced today is one that is wholly unsatisfactory for historians of Latin America, who have developed deep-seated historical explanations of contemporary issues. In addition, Latin Americans themselves of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries already had a realization of the global shadows that shaped their lives, just as clearly as do Anglophone global historians writing today.¹⁷ The way in which global processes have been assimilated and incorporated into local histories has been part of the history of Latin America since well before Leslie Bethell's *Cambridge history of Latin America* collections in the 1980s, to say nothing of more recent historical scholarship.¹⁸

14 Robert Tignor et al., *Worlds together, worlds apart: a history of the world, from the beginnings of humankind to the present*, New York: W.W. Norton, 2008; Bonnie G. Smith, Marc Van de Mieroop, Richard von Glahn, and Kris Lane, *Crossroads and cultures: a history of the world's peoples*, London: St Martins, 2008.

15 Bruce Mazlish and Akira Iriye, eds., *The global history reader*, London: Routledge, 2004, featuring Margaret E. Keck and Kathryn Sikkink, 'Environmental activism', pp. 135–45, and Jack Donnelly, 'Human rights as an issue in world politics', pp. 158–68.

16 Another example of how new approaches can repeat the absences and omissions of previous imperial narratives can be found in Emma Rothschild's work on the United Nations and world archives, in which the only engagement with Latin America is a handful of references to the *existence* of archives in Mexico. Emma Rothschild, 'The archives of universal history', *Journal of World History*, 19, 3, 2008, pp. 375–401. Compare this with the work of Latin Americanists, for example Maxine Molyneux and Nikki Craske, 'The local, the regional and the global: transforming the politics of rights', in Nikki Craske and Maxine Molyneux, eds., *Gender and the politics of rights and democracy in Latin America*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002, pp. 5–14.

17 Brown, *From frontiers to football*, pp. 67–112.

18 Leslie Bethell, ed., *The Cambridge history of Latin America*, 10 vols., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985–88.

The global history of Latin America, therefore, is not the history of globalization writ backwards. Yet the historiography of global history has been up to now largely Anglo-centric. As Dominic Sachsenmaier has shown, the ‘environments of global history’ and the places where the discipline is produced have in many ways mirrored the unevenness of the histories being related.¹⁹ The focus of research in global history has been predominantly angled at exploring the shifting power dynamics between South Asia, China, and Europe or ‘the West’. Kenneth Pomeranz’s *Great Divergence* did discuss Latin America, describing it as ‘a new kind of periphery’, as its resources and labour ‘abolished the land restraint’ elsewhere.²⁰ That view – that Latin America was a periphery – is common in global history. The possibility of Latin American agency has been neglected – and sometimes left out of research questions entirely. C. A. Bayly barely engaged with the continent, and the peripheral place that he and others allocated to Latin America has served to buttress claims that place China and South Asia, along with Europe, at the centre of global history.²¹

One explanation for the neglect of Latin America is that global history is to some degree a descendent of British imperial historiography, and thus still focuses primarily on the lands that once were painted red on the map, or where British soldiers fought battles and shed their blood. Assumptions about global agency have deep roots. John Darwin’s *After Tamerlane: the rise and fall of global empires, 1400–2000*, for example, conceded that, despite its title, ‘the problem with which this book is concerned [is] the shifting balance of power and wealth within Eurasia itself in the last half-millennium’.²² A good corrective to Anglophone blindness to Latin America for the nineteenth century is Jürgen Osterhammel, whose monumental *The transformation of the world* takes care to reflect seriously on Latin American events such as independence, revolutions, urbanization, and the extermination of indigenous peoples. Latin America gets much more attention in Osterhammel than in Bayly, certainly. But there is little difference in overall interpretation: Osterhammel brings Latin America back from the margins but leaves it on the periphery of global processes.²³

This is the crux of the matter: the central questions asked by global historians have often been about East–West connections and comparisons. Latin America’s problematic identification with ‘the West’ complicates this binary focus.²⁴ Global historians and Latin American

19 Dominic Sachsenmaier, *Global perspectives on global history*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011, which otherwise does not engage with the questions raised in the present article.

20 Kenneth Pomeranz, *The Great Divergence: China, Europe, and the making of the modern world*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009, p. 265.

21 C. A. Bayly, *The birth of the modern world, 1780–1914: global connections and comparisons*, Oxford: Blackwell, 2004, and the critique in Charles Jones, *American civilization*, London: Institute for the Study of the Americas, 2007, p. 52.

22 John Darwin, *After Tamerlane: the rise and fall of global empires, 1400–2000*, London: Penguin, 2007, p. 490; John Darwin, *The empire project: the rise and fall of the British world system, 1830–1970*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

23 Jürgen Osterhammel, *The transformation of the world: a global history of the nineteenth century*, trans. Patrick Camiller, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2014. The author relies heavily on narrative overviews of Latin American history and is prone to mistakes: of fact, as in the independence of Brazil (p. 100), and of interpretation, as in the attribution of the term ‘Latin America’ to French strategists behind the invasion of Mexico in the 1860s (p. 82), rather than to Latin Americans themselves in the 1840s, as discussed in Mignolo, *Idea of Latin America*.

24 Marcello Carmagnani, *The other west: Latin America from invasion to globalization*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2011.

historians have not always been asking similar questions – or speaking the same language. This is not to advocate the ‘rediscovery’ of Latin America by global historians, but rather an argument for engagement with the region’s histories as a constituent part of global processes, systems, and networks rather than as a constantly peripheral victim.²⁵

Explaining isolation

The disconnections between interpretations of Latin American history and global history, outlined above, rest on the ambiguous place that the writing of Latin American history occupies in the fields of world and global history. The following analysis of articles published in the two major journals, the *Journal of World History* (founded 1991, henceforth *JWH*) and the *Journal of Global History* (founded 2006, henceforth *JGH*) illustrates the origins of this ambiguity and explains how it persists.

JWH is the longest-established journal focusing on global history, and its publishing patterns show a strong focus on the Pacific World (it is based at the University of Hawai‘i). The founding and long-time editor was Jerry Bentley, who worked on cultural encounters in the pre-modern world, and the current editor is Fabio López Lázaro, a world historian who works on colonial Spanish America.²⁶ A review of the articles published in *JWH* demonstrates some clear patterns relating to the type of history of Latin America that it has attracted and preferred. Out of 304 articles published between 1991 and 2015, 20.5 have a focus on Latin America (where articles are explicitly comparative between somewhere in Latin America and somewhere else, I have allocated 0.3 or 0.5, according to the depth of the comparison – this is a rough and ready form of calculation and the results should be treated accordingly). This number equates to 6.7% of the total dealing in any detail with Latin American history. Those articles that engage with Latin American history are overwhelmingly focused on the colonial period (fifteenth to eighteenth centuries), while the nineteenth and twentieth centuries appear very infrequently. The most likely explanation for this is the preference among world history researchers for themes relating to the conquest and colonization of Spanish America, over modern or republican Latin America. A relative paucity of studies of Latin America in the journal from 1991 to 2004 was followed by a rise in the number of articles in the mid 2000s, followed by a falling off recently. This pattern might be explained by the temporary rise in the popularity of Atlantic history in the mid 2000s among historians of the post-1750 period.²⁷

JGH is the younger of the two journals addressed here. Like *JWH*, it has also published a small minority of articles dealing with Latin America. In comparison to *JWH*, nevertheless, *JGH* has taken Latin America rather more seriously as a participant in global networks and processes. Its more modern/contemporary focus seems the most likely explanation here. Some patterns can be usefully traced. Of the 174 articles published, 16.5 have looked in depth at

25 This call follows the trajectory established by Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra and Erik R. Seeman, eds., *The Atlantic in global history 1500–2000*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, 2007.

26 See, for example, Fabio López Lázaro, *The misfortunes of Alonso Ramírez: the true adventures of a Spanish American with 17th-century pirates*, Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2011.

27 For a discussion of this historiographical trend, see Matthew Brown and Gabriel B. Paquette, ‘Between the age of Atlantic Revolutions and the Axial Age’, in Matthew Brown and Gabriel B. Paquette, eds., *Connections after colonialism: Europe and Latin America in the 1820s*, Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 2013, pp. 6–10.

Latin America: that is approximately 9.5% of the total. A review of the subject material of those articles provides us with a useful overview of the types of Latin American history which *have* engaged with global history. There is no clear pattern, but rather a variety of specialized research projects and divergent historiographies: the histories of labour, nationalism, the Cold War, economics, gender, Ernesto ‘Che’ Guevara, human rights, and commodities. The lack of pattern is reflective of the weak integration of the concerns of Latin American history and global history, but this diversity is also one of the great strengths of global history, engaging cultural, political, economic, and material history, and bringing the experience of understudied regions into dialogue with places elsewhere. The recent issue of *JGH* on sport, edited by Matthew Taylor, clearly shows the benefits of a global history approach for Latin Americanists. Paul Dietschy’s article on the global football body FIFA demonstrates the way in which its governance and politics were shaped after the First World War by non-Europeans and especially Latin Americans.²⁸ The apparent overrepresentation of Latin American national teams in FIFA world cups, and their apparent overachievement in those competitions, compared to size of population, territory, and economic wealth, was previously explained in cultural terms (namely, that Latin Americans are intrinsically ‘good at’ football). Dietschy explains this, however, through practical, economic, and geopolitical factors rooted in the 1920s and 1930s. The origins of football and other modern sports in Latin America were resolutely global, linked to cultural and commercial networks encompassing the whole world, rather than national or imperial as has been suggested in the past.²⁹ The absence of Latin America’s agency in these processes can be explained by the ongoing disconnect between scholarly production of world history narratives, sports history, and Latin American studies.

In summary, the *JWH* has published 6.7% of articles on Latin America, and *JGH* 9%. These figures do not seem unreasonable, though it is clear that Latin America is still underrepresented on some scales. In terms of land mass, Latin America is usually held to occupy around 13% of the world’s land-surface area. In 2013 the population of the lands conventionally understood to be part of Latin America (the republics of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela) represented around 8% of the global population (603 million out of 7.1 billion). Latin American history is therefore a little underrepresented but by no means absent, at least in terms of publications in the major journals as measured against the size of the territory.³⁰ Were migrant and Latino/a communities taken into account, the underrepresentation would be even starker.

The point remains to explain why Latin American history has not yet made the transition from a subject of research by global historians to full integration into the explanatory models of global history. The historiographical and institutional parts of the answer relate to regional differences in the development and conditions of the professionalization of the historical discipline in the twentieth century. Historians of Latin America working in

28 Paul Dietschy, ‘Making football global? FIFA, Europe and the non-European football world, 1912–1974’, *Journal of Global History*, 8, 2, 2013, pp. 279–98.

29 See Matthew Brown, ‘British informal empire and the origins of Association football in South America’, *Soccer and Society*, 15, 2–3, 2015, pp. 167–82.

30 A similar observation might also be made for *Itinerario*, the *International Journal on the History of European Expansion and Global Interaction*, which focuses on 1500–1950.

non-English/Spanish/Portuguese-speaking Europe seem to have found it easiest to engage with global history, without having to disengage messily from imperial historiographies that have left Latin America on the periphery. Spain has followed the British model, with its own ‘imperial’ history divorced from ‘Latin American’ history (with the exception of the work of pioneers such as Josep Fradera and Chris Schmidt-Nowara).³¹ Some Spanish historians, such as Carlos Barros, have hoped that global history would revitalize their ‘moribund’ national historiography.³²

French historians of Latin America have taken the lead here, perhaps indirectly influenced by the universal history advocated by Fernand Braudel and others. The journal *Annales*, which ‘has always sought to transcend its prestigious heritage by continually presenting the most innovative research in the field of history’, has published numerous works of global history.³³ These have included writings on Caribbean and Latin American history and ‘colonized memories’, global paradigms beyond the Atlantic, diaspora, and global representations of the tropics during the Enlightenment.³⁴ The separate development of *histoire croisée* is another factor. The influence of François-Xavier Guerra and Annick Lempérière in Paris, supervisors of numerous Latin American doctoral students, encouraged comparative and transnational histories of Latin America.³⁵ A similar trend can be noted in work coming out of the Latin American History Centre in Berlin: the theme of the 2014 conference of the Association of Historians of Latin America in Europe (AHILA), held in Berlin, was precisely the challenges for Latin American history within its global context.³⁶

In the United States, Latin American history has been taught as part of world history courses and therefore integrated into major syntheses and textbooks. The focus, as for *JWH* articles, tends to be on the pre-colonial and colonial periods. One factor explaining the reluctance of US-based Latin Americanists to engage with global history might be the influence of subaltern studies among their number (peaking in the 1990s). This movement encouraged scholars to push down into the ‘local’ to capture non-elite agency, at the expense of the themes of global history. Latin American subaltern studies was principally a cultural and literary studies phenomenon, but it did heavily influence the kinds of projects devised by historians. As Gustavo Verdesio observed, subaltern studies became ‘one of the most influential endeavours in the fields of Latin American literary and cultural studies in the United States’

31 For example, Josep Fradera, *Colonias para después de un imperio*, Barcelona: Bellaterra, 2005; Alfred W. McCoy, Josep M. Fradera, and Stephen Jacobson, eds., *Endless empire: Spain's retreat, Europe's eclipse, America's decline*, Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2012; Josep Fradera and Christopher Schmidt-Nowara, eds., *Slavery and antislavery in Spain's Atlantic empire*, New York: Berghahn Books, 2013.

32 Carlos Barros, ‘La historia que viene’, *Revista Historia e Espacio*, 18, 2002, p. 207.

33 *Annales* mission statement, <http://anales.ehess.fr> (consulted accessed 15 July 2014).

34 For example, the special sections on ‘The West Indies and Europe in the eighteenth century’ and ‘Colonised memories’, *Annales*, 68, 1, 2013; Cécile Vidal, ‘Pour une histoire globale du monde atlantique ou des histoires connectés dans et au-delà du monde atlantique?’, *Annales*, 67, 2, 2012, pp. 391–413; Paul-André Rosental, ‘Migration, sovereignty and social rights: protecting and expelling foreigners in Europe from the early 19th century to the present’, *Annales*, 66, 2, 2011, pp. 335–73; Neil Safier, ‘Transforming the torrid zone: Enlightenment catalogues of nature in the tropics’, *Annales*, 66, 1, 2011, pp. 143–72.

35 A good example here is Clément Thibaud, Gabriel Entin, Alejandro Gómez, and Federica Morelli, eds., *L'Atlantique révolutionnaire: une perspective ibéro-américaine*, Rennes: Les Perséides, 2013; also Daniel Gutierrez Ardila, *El reconocimiento de Colombia: diplomacia y propaganda en la coyuntura de las restauraciones (1819–1831)*, Bogotá: Universidad Externado de Colombia, 2012.

36 For example, Stefan Rinke and Christina Peters, eds., *Global play: football between region, nation, and the world in Latin American, African, and European history*, Stuttgart: Heinz, 2014. The full AHILA programme is available at <http://www.lai.fu-berlin.de/es/ahila2014> (consulted 2 July 2015).

and, through area studies conferences such as the Latin American Studies Association, had a direct effect on historians too.³⁷ Some of those historians affiliated with these area studies organizations were members of the Latin American Subaltern Studies group, or were taught by them. While originally inspired by the South Asia Subaltern Studies group, and regional and globally comparative in approach, the strongest legacy of subaltern studies for historians of Latin America has been in its followers' commitment to local and micro-history, usually involving the study of indigenous or Afro-American communities.

The concern with (and debates over) 'giving voice' to subaltern peoples, through either oral history or ground-breaking archival work with legal records or municipal collections, has found a comfortable home within Latin American studies. Ulrike Strasser and Heide Tinsman observe that 'Latin American history anticipated the concern of both world history and transnational cultural studies with international dynamics of domination, dependency, and difference'.³⁸ Historians who have related their local subjects explicitly to global processes within this tradition, such as James Sanders and Karin Roseblatt, have been relatively rare.³⁹ This partially explains why non-historians have come to be the ones who have theorized about the scope and range of Latin American history in the *longue durée*. Away from subaltern studies, pioneers in integrating Latin American history with global history, such as Jeremy Adelman, Lauren Benton, and Micol Seigel, have drawn fruitfully on Atlantic, Pacific, and transnational historiographies.⁴⁰

Latin American history as practised in the UK, as in the US, emerged in the 1960s, 'animated by a deep and fruitful commitment to challenging universal claims', as was gender history and other new approaches to the discipline.⁴¹ Historians of Latin America working in the UK on what from other perspectives are seen as global history topics such as liberalism, modernity, or the Columbian exchange, have seldom published in global history journals or edited books, preferring instead 'universal' history or 'area studies' journals.⁴² That generation

37 Gustavo Verdesio, 'Latin American subaltern studies revisited: is there life after the demise of the group?', *Disposition*, 52, 2005, p. 4. This was a special issue on the legacy of subaltern studies for Latin America, with many interesting contributions. It is worth noting that Verdesio's introduction uses the word 'history' only once, and that in reference to the history of the Latin American Subaltern Studies group, not the history of Latin America. On the disconnect between world history and area studies in the US, explained by methodological and disciplinary approaches, see Manning, *Navigating world history*, pp. 146–55.

38 Ulrike Strasser and Heidi Tinsman, 'It's a man's world? World history meets the history of masculinity, in Latin American studies, for instance', *Journal of World History*, 21, 1, 2010, pp. 75–96, esp. pp. 76–82.

39 James E. Sanders, 'Atlantic republicanism in nineteenth-century Colombia: Spanish America's challenge to the contours of Atlantic history', *Journal of World History*, 20, 1, 2009, pp. 131–50; Karin Roseblatt, Nancy Appelbaum, and Sarah Chambers, eds., *Race and nation in modern Latin America*, Durham, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2003.

40 See the special issue of *Hispanic American Historical Review*, 84, 3, 2004, including Jeremy Adelman, 'Latin America and world histories: old and new approaches to the pluribus and the unum', pp. 399–411; Lauren Benton, 'No longer odd region out: repositioning Latin America in world history', pp. 423–30; Micol Seigel, 'World history's narrative problem', pp. 431–6.

41 Strasser and Tinsman, 'It's a man's world?', p. 78.

42 This statement is based on a review of the publication lists of Keith Brewster, Rebecca Earle, Will Fowler, Nicola Miller, and Patience Schell, whom we might characterize as the second generation of historians of Latin America in the UK. An exception is Alejandra Irigoin, who has published in both *JGH* and *JWH*: Regina Grafe and Maria Alejandra Irigoin, 'The Spanish empire and its legacy: fiscal redistribution and political conflict in colonial and post-colonial Spanish America', *Journal of Global History*, 1, 2006, pp. 241–67, and Alejandra Irigoin, 'The end of a silver era: the consequences of the breakdown of the Spanish peso standard in China and the United States, 1780s–1850s', *Journal of World History*, 20, 2, 2009, pp. 207–44.

of historians of Latin America was trained under what we might broadly characterize as the ‘founding fathers’ generation of UK-Latin American History at the post-Parry Report Centres for Latin American Studies, none of whom published a work of global history themselves. I would argue that these historians have practised global history with a focus on Latin America, while identifying themselves, their publications, and their careers as being in the field of Latin American history. This generation’s professional commitment to area studies probably explains their reluctance or delay in responding to global history in the 1990s and 2000s. Some historians working in the UK have thought outside these boxes, bringing them a little closer to global history. Francisco Bethencourt’s work on race, noting the disjuncture between historical conceptions of ‘Iberian’ as against ‘Latin American’, is one good example.⁴³

Within Latin America itself, most history departments remain overwhelmingly national in their research agendas and teaching curricula. Funding streams, likewise, highlight national concerns, which shape research projects and publications. Where external forces are studied it is in the effect of the global on the local. The long-standing distinction in Latin American history teaching between *historia nacional* and *historia universal* is worth noting. In 1897, Ecuador’s first lay school was created, the Instituto Nacional Mejía, in Quito. Its history programme was separated into *historia del Ecuador* and *historia universal*. The latter ranged from pre-colonial South American history to Greek and Roman history. No connections were suggested between the two, creating an apparent separation, which persists to this day in bookshops, library classifications, and teaching curricula.⁴⁴ Though teaching has moved towards regional and thematic teaching, the distinction between *historia nacional* and *historia universal* can still be found in journal mission statements and undergraduate programmes.⁴⁵ One example of a historian of Latin America who fully situated his studies (on Brazil) within global contexts was Gilberto Freyre (who died in 1987), whose research on race, slavery, migration, and Brazilian culture had global transcendence and left a strong legacy. However, Freyre was not a professional historian but rather a sociologist who wrote some history.⁴⁶

Historians in Latin America are marked by their professional loyalties, their training, and their institutional homes. This partly explains the tensions with global history that are identified here. The slow disengagement from the ‘national’ might be seen as symptomatic of the inability of the historical discipline there to deal with the pressures and challenges of a globalizing world, or of the resilience of the national paradigm many years after this was deemed obsolete elsewhere. Language also remains a significant explanatory factor. The past fifty years have seen an increased attention to language skills among US and European graduate students, and in-country immersion through long periods of archival research. Historians of Latin America from elsewhere have developed language and cultural skills in Spanish and Portuguese as part of their tools as professional historians, and those from Latin America have been slower to access sources in other languages. Together these trends perhaps

43 Francisco Bethencourt, *Racisms: from the crusades to the twentieth century*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2014.

44 *Programa del Instituto Nacional Mejía correspondiente al año escolar de 1900–1*, Quito: Tipografía de la Escuela de Artes y Oficios, 1901, pp. 15–18.

45 One example comes from the Universidad de Chile, according to <http://www.filosofia.uchile.cl/ciencias-historicas> (consulted 2 July 2015).

46 On Freyre’s global influence see Maria Lucia G. Pallares-Burke and Peter Burke, *Gilberto Freyre: social theory in the tropics*, Oxford: Peter Lang, 2008.

unconsciously contributed to making the field more parochial than it needed to be as academia itself was globalizing.

In the last two decades, however, historians working in Latin America itself have taken significant steps towards breaching the strong national historiographical paradigms that have shaped much research funding and publication across the region. Historical journals throughout Latin America now regularly publish articles dealing with neighbouring countries, and engage with historiographical innovations regardless of origin or language.⁴⁷ Global history is still barely being written in Spanish or Portuguese, but in the last ten years it has started to find some adherents looking to overcome the ‘great institutional obstacles’ facing it within Latin America. Their historiographical surveys and criticisms may lead to a flowering of publications in future years. One example is Hugo Fazio, in Colombia, who has written several good historiographical reviews that interpret and annotate the English-language literature on global history.⁴⁸ He is a historian of the contemporary period, and a follower of the school of global history seen in the *Global history reader*, writing that ‘global history needs to be thought of as the environment where the history of the present day takes place’. He concludes that: ‘The global historian needs the ability to learn different languages, to be submerged in different historical-cultural contexts, and to be open to understanding other points of view about the past. The global historian, in this sense, is not a simple translator of the past but the translator of other cultures.’⁴⁹

Wherever it is written, some strands of Latin American history correlate closely with global history without identifying themselves as such. These strands diverge from Pamela Kyle Crossley’s assertion that global historians tend to use secondary sources and so are distinguished from those doing regional or national history ‘more by their methods than by their facts’.⁵⁰ Like many global historians, some Latin Americanists attempt to ‘tell a story that aspires to explain global-scale changes over time’, but disagree that this means relinquishing the obligation to locate and analyse primary sources and resort instead to sifting secondary sources alone.⁵¹ Retaining a focus on archival work rather than synthesis, some Latin Americanists have adopted the methodologies of transnational history, through the study of travellers and travel writing, economic exchange, and the networks of material culture. The results of these studies have been Atlantic, and sometimes global, as Latin Americanists have followed their research questions across continents and oceans. In this they have been motivated by the relative failure of Atlantic history to decentre narratives from their northern cores, and by new geopolitical concerns of the twenty-first century, such as the rise of the

47 See, for example, the tables of contents of *Historia y Sociedad*, published in Medellín, Colombia: <http://www.revistas.unal.edu.co/index.php/hisysoc/issue/archive> (consulted 2 July 2015). Issue 27 (2014) contains articles on the histories of Colombia, Argentina, Germany, and Chile, though none of these could be thought of as ‘global histories’.

48 Hugo Fazio Vengoa, *Cambio de paradigma: de la globalización a la historia global*, Bogotá: CESO–Uniandes, 2007; Hugo Fazio Vengoa, ‘La historia global y su conveniencia para el estudio del pasado y del presente’, *Historia Crítica*, 33, 2009, pp. 300–19.

49 Fazio Vengoa, ‘Historia global’, pp. 313–15. See also Diana Marcela Rojas, ‘La historia y las relaciones internacionales: de la historia internacional a la historia global’, *Historia Crítica*, 27, 2004, pp. 153–68; Sean Purdy, ‘A historia comparada e o desafio de a transnacionalidade’, *Revista de História Comparada*, 6, 1, 2012, pp. 64–84; Carlos Marichal, *Nueva historia de las grandes crisis financieras: una perspectiva global, 1873–2008*, Mexico City: DEBATE, 2010.

50 Pamela Kyle Crossley, *What is global history?*, London: Polity, 2008, p. 3.

51 *Ibid.*, p. 103.

Global South. A good example of these newer trends is the work of Micol Seigel on the construction of racial identities in Brazil. Through the study of musical cultures and the travels of Brazilian musicians between the First and Second World Wars, Seigel explores ‘the global in the local’ and succeeds in ‘eroding assumptions of the passivity, ignorance, and impotence of marginalised people’.⁵²

This more global and transnational research has not necessarily been noticed by global historians, however. A perfect example of this is the work of Catherine Legrand on the United Fruit Company enclaves in Colombia in the first half of the twentieth century, published in 1998. She begins with these research questions, which might come from any introduction to a work of self-declared global history:

How did local people respond to the arrival of the foreign company? How did they react to the possibilities that connection to the world economy offered? What was it like to live in such a region transformed by foreign investment, and how did people make sense of what they were living? In such places of transnational intersection, how do people define their identities? What does community mean? And how does the foreign presence (and the boom–bust experience, so typical of enclaves) shape expressions of regionalism and nationalism?⁵³

Legrand is a widely respected scholar within Latin American history, well known in Colombia, North America, and Europe. Using Google Scholar (admittedly not a very reliable citations index) we see that nearly every historian of Latin America writing in English in the last decade has cited this work, which has been universally recognized as insightful, original, and bringing new understanding to the way in which Colombia was incorporated into the global economy, and its effects, during the early twentieth century ‘banana boom’. But there is not a single work of global history that cites Legrand, and her work has had very limited impact in publications outside the field of Latin American studies.⁵⁴ The reasons for this unfortunate absence lie both in the institutional orientation of this work within area studies and also in its chronological focus: as a study of the long nineteenth century Legrand’s work falls well after the conquest and colonial period in which world history generally discusses Latin America, but before the contemporary lens of some global history has started paying attention.

A manifesto for a global history with Latin America: periodization

The first two parts of this article have outlined the disconnections between interpretations of Latin American and global history, and have proposed some explanations as to how these

52 Micol Seigel, *Uneven encounters: making race and nation in Brazil and the United States*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009, p. xvi.

53 Catherine Legrand, ‘Living in Macondo: economy and culture in a United Fruit Company banana enclave in Colombia’, in Gilbert Joseph, Catherine Legrand, and Ricardo Salvatore, eds., *Close encounters of empire: writing the cultural history of U.S.–Latin American relations*, Chapel Hill, NC: Duke University Press, 1998, p. 335.

54 Google Scholar Citation search on ‘Catherine LeGrand living in Macondo’ (consulted 14 July 2014). A possible exception is Jana Lipman, *Guantanamo: working-class history between empire and revolution*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2008, which might be considered global history at a push.

might have emerged. This part identifies the principal periods and processes which should form the basis of engagement between global history and Latin American history, outlining a potentially rich and fruitful research agenda for both sides of this ‘geohistoriographical’ divide.⁵⁵ It is intended as a contribution to ‘what might optimistically be considered to be a dialogue’ between the two sides.⁵⁶

The first key period in which Latin America influenced and shaped global history is the well-known Columbian exchange from around 1500. Ever since the residents of the islands of the Caribbean observed the arrival of Christopher Columbus’ ships in 1492, Latin America has participated in global crises and international commercial, political, and social networks. Columbus’ arrival began the exchange of products, peoples, and practices that created the conditions for the ascendance of empires ruled nominally from Madrid, London, Paris, and Lisbon, and a degree of transculturation, syncretism, and hybridity between cultures and religions. Merchants exported tobacco, tomatoes and chillies, while dietary innovations caused settlers in the New World to contemplate what it meant to be European, Indian, or human.⁵⁷ Excellent comparative advances have been made here within Atlantic paradigms, by J. H. Elliott and Jeremy Adelman, which draw major conclusions as to the legacies of Spanish and Portuguese colonialisms long after their control of the American continent was undone by the independence movements of the early nineteenth century.⁵⁸

The second period is the establishment of slave plantation complexes in the Americas during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, especially in the USA, Haiti, Cuba, and Brazil, which has been recognized by Pomeranz as a crucial input *into* global history, with labour working in Latin America and materials produced in Latin America catalysing significant change in Eurasia.⁵⁹ Histories of slavery and slave trades by scholars on the north and south Atlantic have shown how the slave economies of St Domingue (Haiti from 1804), Brazil, and Cuba were central to the development of the global economy and to ideas about freedom, labour, and democracy worldwide. Long-term study of migration to the Americas – forced and voluntary – complicates Eurasian-centred periodization of ‘proto’ and ‘modern’ globalization.⁶⁰

Third, and less well known, is the period around 1820. The independence of most of Latin America from the Spanish and Portuguese empires in the 1820s came about through anti-colonial movements but they were also ‘liberal’ in the sense that sovereignty came to reside in the people, and legitimacy became grounded in the consent (rather than just the domination)

55 Robert J. Mayhew, ‘Geohistoriography, the forgotten Braudel and the place of nominalism’, *Progress in Human Geography*, 35, 3, 2011, pp. 409–21.

56 Manning, *Navigating world history*, p. 105.

57 The literature on this subject is large and well known. A recent addition is Rebecca Earle, *The body of the conquistador: food, race and the colonial experience in Spanish America*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012, especially pp. 146–9.

58 Jeremy Adelman, *Sovereignty and revolution in the Iberian Atlantic*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006; J. H. Elliott, *Empires of the Atlantic world: Britain and Spain in the Americas 1492–1830*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006.

59 See the excellent account in Pomeranz, *Great Divergence*, pp. 265–97.

60 Nicola Foote, ‘Writing Latin American nations from their borders: bringing nationalism and immigration histories into dialogue’, in Nicola Foote and Michael Goebel, eds., *Immigration and national identities in Latin America*, Miami, FL: University of Florida Press, 2014, pp. 281–304. Tellingly, Richard Drayton’s chapter on slavery and labour is the only contribution to Hopkins’ pioneering *Globalization in world history* that deals with Latin America in any detail: Richard Drayton, ‘The collaboration of labour: slaves, empires, and globalization in the Atlantic world’, in Hopkins, *Globalization*, pp. 98–114.

of the governed. The French Revolution of 1789 may have initiated this period in *European* history, but events and ideas in Latin America often overtook Europe and provided a huge swathe of republics, some liberal, some not so, that Europeans and North Americans looked to for inspiration – and often with some anxiety – during the rest of the nineteenth century.⁶¹ Latin Americans' participation in global processes in the Age of Revolutions is often ignored.⁶² The independence of Latin America gave rise to a series of brand new nation-states and republics, entities that characterized this continent much more, and much earlier, than any other region of the world. Such an occurrence is often dismissed, but mistakenly. In the long term, Latin American faith in the nation-state has contributed significantly to the global persistence of this form, and to the successes of multinational organizations in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.⁶³

Fourthly, the years around 1850 have been identified by James Dunkerley as the key period when transport and communication revolutions connected global currents with Latin American lives with greater depth and rapidity than ever before.⁶⁴ Historians could spend more energy investigating the influence that Latin America has had upon the rest of the world in the mid nineteenth century, a research area that remains understudied in key works, despite some important advances by Latin Americanists. These include Patience Schell, who has shown that Charles Darwin's Chilean friends were crucial to his travels, investigations, and publications; Paula Caffarena on scientific knowledge about the smallpox vaccine in Chile; and Irina Podgorny on fossil collection in Argentina. All have shown how Latin Americans shaped scientific knowledge as it became global.⁶⁵

It was not just people and commodities that circulated between Latin America and the rest of the world. As Helen Cowie has shown, Latin American animals were an intrinsic part of the global networks of collection and display of exotic animals centred initially on Paris and London, in the mid 1800s. These turtles, llamas, alpacas, alligators, and others became highlights of zoological gardens and travelling menageries, and enabled spectators to reflect upon their own places in the world. In 1836 London Zoo proudly displayed and restrained an Andean condor, which for visiting journalists symbolized the global dimensions of the collecting networks, encompassing Latin America.⁶⁶ The global dimensions of the lives and

61 Brown and Paquette, *Connections after colonialism*, pp. 1–28; see also Matthew Brown, *The struggle for power in post-independence Colombia and Venezuela*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

62 Some exceptions are Ines Quintero, *El hijo de la panadera*, Caracas: Alfa, 2014; Karen Racine, *Francisco de Miranda: a transatlantic life in the age of revolution*, Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 2002; Jeremy Adelman, 'Iberian passages: continuity and change in the South Atlantic', in David Armitage and Sanjay Subrahmanyam, eds., *The age of revolutions in global context, c.1760–1840*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, pp. 59–82.

63 Moya, 'Introduction', p. 10. A view of the period that persists in placing Latin America on the periphery is John E. Wills Jr, 'What's new? Studies of revolutions and divergences 1770–1840', *Journal of World History*, 25, 1, 2014, pp. 127–86.

64 James Dunkerley, *Americana: the Americas in the world around 1850 (or, 'seeing the elephant' as the theme for an imaginary western)*, New York: Verso, 2000.

65 Patience Schell, *The sociable sciences: Darwin and his contemporaries in Chile*, New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013; Paula Caffarena, 'La historia global de la viruela y la vacuna en Chile, 1780–1830', PhD thesis, Universidad Católica de Chile, 2015; Irina Podgorny, 'Fossil dealers, the practices of comparative anatomy and British diplomacy in Latin America, 1820–1840', *British Journal for the History of Science*, 46, 4, 2013, pp. 647–74.

66 Helen Cowie, *Exhibiting animals in nineteenth-century Britain: empathy, education, entertainment*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

histories of Latin American animals were more than symbolic. Peccaries sent from Valparaiso, turtles from the Galapagos Islands, alligators from Tampico: those that survived the arduous Atlantic crossing were studied and marvelled at by Britons.⁶⁷ Cowie shows how hunters and collectors always relied upon local guides and often upon indigenous knowledge. The global networks that resulted reflected the inspiration and improvisation of these agents, rather than any clear imperial agenda to collect and dominate.⁶⁸ Nor were the networks unidirectional: while condors were taken to London, many Old World animals travelled in the opposite direction to Latin America, beginning with the conquistadores' horses and donkeys, and continuing through cows, sheep, and pigs. The global movement of animals was the result of idiosyncratic as well as broader commercial motives.

Drawing on Schell, Cowie, and Dunkerley, we might see the mid nineteenth century as the moment when Latin America embraced and was embraced by the global, in culture as well as commerce. This was the period when sport expanded worldwide and coffee and rubber colonized much of the world from the fertile soil of Latin America. But it was also 'the birth of the modern world', when the central motors of global history as traced by Bayly, Pomeranz, Osterhammel, and Darwin shifted east from Europe, not west. The overlap between economics, modernity, empires, and nationhood is the critical issue at the crux of the intersection between global history and that of Latin America in this period.⁶⁹ The work of Chris Evans and Olivia Saunders on the 'world of copper' that evolved between 1830 and 1870 around networks embracing Wales, Chile, Cuba, and Australia suggests ways to proceed with a research agenda on this era.⁷⁰

Fifthly, the late nineteenth century, between 1870 and 1920, is perhaps *the* crucial period for these questions, whose global contours have begun to be examined. Alejandro Mejías-López has shown how the Latin American *modernismo* movement of the 1880s predated Anglophone modernism, and has used this to argue that 'the Hispanic Atlantic, as an integral part of "the West", can help expose the biased and skewed ways in which "Western" history has been written'.⁷¹ Another example comes from Ecuador's position as the world's principal cacao producer at the start of the twentieth century. As landowners there came to understand and exploit the global networks through which their cacao was traded, principally through the British ships that took their products to French consumers, they adapted the ways in which they contracted labour. Struggles over the geographical movement of the Ecuadorian workforce became a principal factor in that country's political and military conflicts of the early twentieth century. These conflicts were understood in Ecuador at the time – and since – as primarily national, and the global networks which triggered them, shaped them, and provided a continuing dynamic, were made peripheral to the national interpretation favoured by

67 *Ibid.*, p. 91. Another excellent example is Nicola Foote and Charles W. Gunnels 'Exploring early human-animal encounters in the Galápagos Islands using a historical zoology approach' in Susan Nance, ed., *The historical animal*, Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2015, pp. 203–20.

68 Cowie, *Exhibiting animals*, pp. 77–100, esp. p. 86.

69 On this see the interesting reflections of Jeremy Adelman, 'Mimesis and rivalry: European empires and global regimes', *Journal of Global History*, 10, 1, 2015, pp. 77–98.

70 Chris Evans and Olivia Saunders, 'A world of copper: globalizing the Industrial Revolution, 1830–70', *Journal of Global History*, 10, 1, 2015, pp. 3–36.

71 Alejandro Mejías-López, *The inverted conquest: the myth of modernity and the transatlantic onset of modernism*, Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 2009, p. 11.

politicians and subsequent historians.⁷² But Latin American and Pacific producers of cacao shaped European and global tastes, and market demand catalysed infrastructure development and investment in some but not all producing areas, as William Clarence-Smith has shown.⁷³

The late nineteenth century was a significant point of transition in environmental global history set against a *longue durée* framework. Gregory Cushman's work on guano (bird droppings) begins with the indigenous, pre-Columbian stories about the origins of guano and about the seabirds that excrete it.⁷⁴ Using sources produced and located across the world, Cushman demonstrates how the actions of Peruvians and others interested in capitalizing guano had environmental, colonial, and economic consequences that spilled out across the Pacific to other nitrate-producing islands, and stimulated other nations with colonial designs to control neighbouring islands and rock formations. Fluctuating populations of seals, chinchillas, and vicuñas were part of this history, as were the mass migrations of Asian workers to shovel the guano and the dreams of British and Peruvian engineers to re-engineer the Pacific coastline to maximize profit and make the guano trade sustainable. Writing the global history of Latin America like this can allow the detection of causation and effect outside national or regional paradigms, and open horizons in a way that area studies approaches, almost by definition, cannot.⁷⁵

At the end of the nineteenth century migration patterns carried hundreds of thousands of people from Europe to Latin America, echoing the journeys of the millions of enslaved Africans up to the abolition of slavery in Brazil in 1888. Latin America was one of the most important receiving destinations for migrants in the nineteenth century, but is typically overlooked by historians and theorists of immigration.⁷⁶ Ideas followed these unprecedented movements of peoples. Benedict Anderson has produced a remarkable study of the global histories of anarchism and anti-colonialism in the 1890s, circulating between Europe, the Americas, and the Philippines.⁷⁷ Also at the end of the century, Latin American products flooded onto world markets. Economic historians, in particular, have shown that Latin America was never simply the impotent provider of raw materials – gold, silver, sugar, coffee, rubber, oil – that some of the literature which casts the continent as a peripheral victim might have us believe. The work of Steven Topik, Arnold Bauer, and others has shown how economic and material cultures from Latin America came to be embedded globally and how non-Latin Americans came to be

72 Enrique Ayala Mora, *Historia de la Revolución Liberal Ecuatoriana*, 2nd edn, Quito: Corporación Editora Nacional, 2002, pp. 63–9.

73 William Gervase Clarence-Smith, *Cocoa and chocolate, 1765–1914*, London: Routledge, 2000; Manuel Chiriboga, *Jornaleros y gran propietarios en 135 años de exportación cacaotera, 1790–1925*, Quito: Consejo Provincial de Pichincha, 1980.

74 Gregory Cushman, *Guano and the opening of the Pacific world*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

75 *Ibid.*, p. 341. Another good example is Paul Gootenberg, *Andean cocaine: the making of a global drug*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2009.

76 A good example is Wang Gungwu, ed., *Global history and migrations*, Boulder, CO: Westview, 1997. See the critique advanced in Michael Goebel, 'Reconceptualizing diasporas and national identities in Latin America and the Caribbean, 1850–1950', in Foote and Goebel, *Immigration*, pp. 1–30, and the attempt by James Belich to incorporate settler colonization in late nineteenth-century Brazil and Argentina into his account of 'the rise of the Anglo-world' in *Replenishing the earth: the settler revolution and the rise of the Anglo-world, 1783–1939*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009, pp. 520–40.

77 Benedict Anderson, *Under three flags: anarchism and the anti-colonial imagination*, London: Verso, 2006; see also the suggestive work of Daniel Laqua, 'Transnational intellectual cooperation, the League of Nations, and the problem of order', *Journal of Global History*, 6, 2, pp. 223–47.

unknowingly addicted to its exports, such as silver, indigo, cochineal dye, tobacco, coffee, sugar, cacao, bananas, guano, nitrates, rubber, henequen, and cocaine.⁷⁸ Research on commodity chains has shown ‘that Latin American producers were much more than simple marionettes set to dance by overseas commands and demands’.⁷⁹ As Topik and Mario Samper have it, for example, in the late nineteenth century, by virtue of the continuing use of slave labour in Brazil and its international trading connections, ‘Latin America turned much of the Western world into coffee drinkers’.⁸⁰ Topik, Marichal, and Frank conclude that ‘frequently Latin Americans have been the price-makers and developed the cutting-edge production technology’ which has been adopted elsewhere, rather than slavishly following outside models.⁸¹

It is worth noting that, in the field of economics, Latin Americanists have been major contributors to discussions of globalization, and have generated much of the theory on which others have drawn.⁸² The explanation might simply be that these Latin American economists had better English-language skills early on, which drew them into global debates, than their monolingual counterparts in history, who were therefore ‘naturally’ drawn into national or regional discussions limited by common language. This is certainly the case for Brazil, whose historiography is written largely in Portuguese, in contrast to economics, where Brazilian economists publishing in English have made major global contributions.⁸³

Future historians will decide whether, as Oscar Guardiola-Rivera suggests, the years around 2010 saw another key shift in the relationship between South and North, whence Latin America may come to ‘rule the world’.⁸⁴ Anthropologists have begun to map the changes of late twentieth-century globalization in Latin America, inspired by pioneers for other regions such as Donald Wright.⁸⁵ Wendy Call traced them across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec in Mexico over several decades.⁸⁶ Joy Logan’s study of the mountainous peak of Aconcagua, the highest summit in the Americas and now an international adventure tourism destination, is

78 Arnold Bauer, *Goods, power, history: Latin America’s material culture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

79 See the essays collected in Steven Topik, Carlos Marichal, and Zephyr Frank, eds., *From silver to cocaine: Latin American commodity chains and the building of the world economy, 1500–2000*, Chapel Hill, NC: Duke University Press, 2006 (quote from p. 3 of the editors’ introduction); Steven Topik and Allen Wells, *Global markets transformed, 1870–1945*, Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2012.

80 Steven Topik and Mario Samper, ‘The Latin American coffee commodity chain: Brazil and Costa Rica’, in Topik, Marichal, and Frank, *From silver to cocaine*, p. 129.

81 Steven Topik, Carlos Marichal, and Zephyr Frank, ‘Introduction’, in Topik, Marichal, and Franks, *From silver to cocaine*, p. 15.

82 Mario Sáenz, ed., *Latin American perspectives on globalization: ethics, politics, and alternative visions*, London: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002; Hank Johnston and Paul Almeida, eds., *Latin American social movements*, London: Rowman and Littlefield, 2006; José Antonio Ocampo and Juan Martín, eds., *Globalization and development*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003.

83 On Fernando Henrique Cardoso, the dependency theorist-turned-president of Brazil, see his *Charting a new course: the politics of globalization and social transformation*, London: Rowman and Littlefield, 2001.

84 Oscar Guardiola-Rivera, *What if Latin America ruled the world? How the South will take the North into the 22nd century*, London: Verso, 2011.

85 Donald Wright, *The world and a very small place in Africa: a history of globalization in Niimi, the Gambia*, 3rd edn, London: M.E. Sharpe, 2010.

86 Wendy Call, *No word for welcome: the Mexican village faces the global economy*, Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2011, pp. 291–3.

another insightful example of changes in the world's relations with Latin America.⁸⁷ Regardless of whether the contemporary period marks continuity or change in the nature of Latin America's relationship with the world, it has been argued here that accurate periodization is crucial to the incorporation of Latin America within global history. Such an incorporation of Latin American experience might necessitate reimagining exactly what global history considers itself to be.

The universal global history of Latin America

The years around 1820, 1850, 1870, and 1920 form key stages in the transformation of the nineteenth-century world when global histories must not avoid the history of Latin America. An alternative approach to that outlined above, which eschews such close attention to periodization, attempts to fit these and other moments of Latin American history into a new, radical universal history. These narratives have come from writers inspired by the dependency and world-systems approaches of the 1970s and 1980s. There is a crucial caveat here, however: the scholars seeking to redefine and rewrite Latin American history from a global perspective in this way are not historians. Latin Americanists working in social sciences and cultural studies have used the language of coloniality/decoloniality to propose new ways of understanding Latin America's historical and contemporary relationships with the rest of the world. Scholars such as Walter Mignolo, Aníbal Quijano, Enrique Dussel, Ileana Rodríguez, and Arturo Escobar warn Latin Americanists against following global trends and encourage autochthonous responses to the academic challenges of globalization. Like Jean-Frédéric Schaub, they argue that the move to global histories carries the danger of flattening out the inequalities that locally focused colonial and imperial histories have identified.⁸⁸

The coloniality/decoloniality version of history contains much observation of colonial and imperial parallels and networks across global empires, and focuses on the resistance and exploitation of indigenous peoples in the Americas.⁸⁹ Mignolo draws on Immanuel Kant's 'The idea of universal history from a cosmopolitan point of view' (1784) to construct compelling links between ideas of progress, race, civilization, and colonialism.⁹⁰ A universal history with Latin America written back in, as proposed by Mignolo and others, emphasizes victimhood as well as moments of revolutionary and transcendental humanity. There is interesting overlap here with the way that Susan Buck-Morss, in her widely cited *Hegel, Haiti, and universal history*, asked: 'how are we to make sense out of the temporal unfolding of collective, human life?'⁹¹ Buck-Morss argued that 'The need to rethink this question today in a

87 Joy Logan, *Aconcagua: the invention of mountaineering on America's highest peak*, Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 2011.

88 Jean-Frédéric Schaub, 'Notes on some discontents in the historical narrative', in Maxine Berg, ed., *Writing the history of the global: challenges for the 21st century*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013, pp. 48–65.

89 An overview of this interpretation is in Eduardo Galeano, *Children of the days: a calendar of human history*, New York: Nation Books, 2013.

90 Walter Mignolo, *The darker side of western modernity: global futures, decolonial options*, Chapel Hill, NC: Duke University Press, 2011, p. 163. A universal history without Latin America written back in can be found in Craig Benjamin, "'But from this time forth history becomes a connected whole": state expansion and the origins of universal history', *Journal of Global History*, 9, 3, 2014, pp. 357–78.

91 Susan Buck-Morss, *Hegel, Haiti, and universal history*, Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009. Note that this work does not cite the coloniality/decoloniality authors.

global context, that is, as *universal* history, has not been felt so strongly for centuries – perhaps not since Hegel, Haiti, and the Age of Revolution.’ She followed global historians in stating that ‘because the central question of history’s meaning cannot be asked outside of time but only in the thick of human action, the way the question is posed, the methods of the inquiry, and the criteria of what counts as a legitimate answer all have political implications’.⁹²

This approach to universalizing Latin American history – emphasizing its radical significance alongside other versions of history – sets itself as a counterweight to global histories that tell the stories of those who won globalization. Buck-Morss concludes: ‘The definition of universal history that begins to emerge here is this: rather than giving multiple, distinct cultures equal due, whereby people are recognized as part of humanity indirectly through the mediation of collective cultural identities, human universality emerges in the historical event at the point of rupture.’⁹³ By this she means seeing ‘raw’ humanity emerging in subaltern ruptures with established orders: the Haitian Revolution of 1791 is the starting point. Other examples of universal moments of human emancipation in this interpretation would include the Cuban Revolution of 1959, the Sandinistas, Hugo Chávez, and the new Bolivian Constitution of 2009, ‘the second founding of Bolivia’.⁹⁴

Crucial to this project of universalizing Latin American history is the integration of Caribbean history alongside continental Latin American history. It makes particular use of events and people from the history of Haiti, which is presented as the classic case of an authentic, popular revolutionary uprising suppressed by imperial/external powers. Laurent Dubois’s work on the Haitian Revolution has tied French, Haitian, and global history together.⁹⁵ Historians of the Caribbean have embraced global approaches as well as Atlantic paradigms, which can be seen in John McNeill’s *Mosquito empires* and David Geggus’ publications on the global wars of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries fought out in the Caribbean basin.

In its present state, however, the attempt to write a universal history of radicalism is not so different from old-style universal history, or history of civilizations: it picks what it sees as the ‘best’ bits of history and displays them together as *the* narrative. History of civilizations retains a considerable legacy in the public consumption of history, as well as in some university syllabuses. It is still visible in Europe’s major museums as a legacy of its highpoint in the early twentieth century. Universal history put the Elgin Marbles in the British Museum and the Persian Reliefs on display in Berlin’s Pergamon Museum, leaving the artefacts collected from Latin American civilizations in cupboards and basement annexes, or as part of colonial collections in Madrid or Lisbon. In his *A history of civilizations*, Fernand Braudel was part of this marginalizing of Latin America, despite the three years that he spent at the University of São Paulo between 1935 and 1938. Although he was very conscious that Latin American history had been absolutely linked to global currents from 1492

92 *Ibid.*, p. 109, emphasis in original.

93 *Ibid.*, p. 133.

94 Galeano, *Children*, p. 28.

95 In addition to the works cited above, see John McNeill, *Mosquito empires: ecology and war in the greater Caribbean*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010; David Gaspar and David Geggus, eds., *A turbulent time: the French revolution and the Greater Caribbean*, Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press, 1997; Laurent Dubois, *The avengers of the New World: the story of the Haitian revolution*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005; and, more recently, Carrie Gibson, *Empire’s crossroads: a history of the Caribbean from Columbus to the present day*, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2014.

to 1963, when he wrote the book he did not have much time for the indigenous civilizations of the Americas.⁹⁶

The global connections of South American archaeology and their collections were substantial, and have recently come to be better understood by historians.⁹⁷ Indeed, recent global exhibitions on gold or Inca and Aztec societies suggest that curators and historians of the global are keen to incorporate Latin American stories and move beyond what Stefanie Gänger identifies as the ‘systemic hierarchies and the chasms of global modern intellectual culture’ that shape their collections.⁹⁸ It remains unclear how these have been integrated into global visions, however, or whether old interpretations of periphery, exoticism, and victimhood are being perpetuated. New, radical, universal history is admirable in bringing the indigenous knowledge out of the cupboard and placing it as an exhibit in support of an alternative interpretation. But if global history is going to test and challenge its practitioners and its students, and provide a useful framework for understanding the worlds we live in, then it will have to do rather more than that. In this case, following Braudel’s lead, we need to study the past comparatively as well as focusing on networks and their power relations.

New universal history is informed by a narrative of Latin American victimhood within world history shaped by dependency theory and world-systems analysis.⁹⁹ Narratives of radical universal history as proposed by Buck-Morss, featuring occasional moments of revolution, great works of literature, or charismatic Latin American leaders tragically overthrown, draw heavily on this school. Raw materials are central to the histories of Oscar Guardiola-Rivera and Eduardo Galeano, which offer redemption in the future against the background of victimhood in the past.¹⁰⁰ From the opposite end of the spectrum, other grand narratives of world history invoke Latin American ‘failure’ to demonstrate and justify the ‘success’ of other places. A good example is Niall Ferguson, who omitted the region from *Empire*, and then used Latin America with scant regard for its history in *Civilization* as an example of where Western ideals and practices had failed.¹⁰¹

If we reflect on the global geopolitical, financial, and commercial shifts that have been shaped by Latin American events, migrants, and innovations, discussed above, we see that Latin America’s history can be judged neither as a forgotten continent of hope and dreams nor as the pitiable victim

96 Fernand Braudel, *A history of civilizations*, trans. Richard Mayne, London: Penguin, 1993 (first published Paris, 1963).

97 Clara Isabel Botero, *El descubrimiento del pasado prehispánico de Colombia: viajeros, arqueólogos y coleccionistas, 1820–1945*, Bogotá: Instituto Colombiano de Antropología e Historia, 2006; Stefanie Gänger, ‘Disjunctive circles: modern intellectual culture in Cuzco and the journeys of Incan antiquities, c.1877–1921’, *Modern Intellectual History*, 10, 2, 2013, pp. 399–414.

98 Exhibition at the National Geographic Museum in Washington, DC; the British Museum 2013 exhibition on Colombian gold, loaned from the Museo de Oro in Bogotá; also the Museo de Oro in Lima, Peru; Gänger, ‘Disjunctive circles’, p. 400.

99 See Immanuel Wallerstein’s reflections on this legacy in *World-systems analysis: an introduction*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005.

100 A view of history expressed most influentially in Eduardo Galeano, *Open veins of Latin America: five centuries of the pillage of a continent*, London: Siglo XXI, 1973, and Guardiola-Rivera, *What if Latin America ruled the world?* See the critique by Oscar Sanchez-Sibony, ‘The rise and fall of the dependency movement: does it inform underdevelopment today?’, *Estudios Interdisciplinarios de América Latina*, 14, 2, 2003, pp. 32–50.

101 Niall Ferguson, *Empire: how Britain made the modern world*, London: Penguin, 2004; Niall Ferguson, *Civilization: the six killer apps of Western power*, London: Penguin, 2011.

of the machinations of evil empires. In Mignolo's interpretation, 'coloniality' in Latin America was produced by Enlightenment and colonialism emanating from Europe. Long-term analysis is crucial, but that does not mean selecting favourite events and stringing them together to tell a supposedly universal tale. Latin America has sometimes been a victim of empire, sometimes an agent of globalization, and has also been made peripheral to some global processes. As Mejías-López has argued, 'cultural theories of transculturation, dependency, hybridity, and parody, while undoubtedly seeking to empower Latin American cultural production through difference, have ultimately perpetuated, in one way or another, the imperial sameness of the metropolitan centre under critique'.¹⁰² Historians have shown that such stark dichotomies between victim and victor on opposing sides of the ocean do not fit with the surviving evidence. As noted above, periodization is key: Latin America's relationship with the world changed qualitatively around 1500, again around 1800, and once more around 1880, and perhaps again around 2000. At all of these junctures, imperial and decolonizing processes emanated from Latin America, with significant effects globally.

So instead of dismissing Mignolo and others for their sometimes crude ahistoricism, it is worth considering whether their interdisciplinary insights might be usefully applied to the global history of Latin America by historians. Mignolo reflects on 'global histories' from the perspective of a cultural critic who wants to 'decolonize' knowledge. He suggests that a decolonized global history would not have only one narrative of the history of Latin America but rather many voices relating parallel and interrelated histories. Later in the same work, he observes that the writing of history has been linked too closely with coloniality. He suggests that 'undoing the colonial difference means to accept and act on the fact that History is the flat narrative of imperial dominium that pretends to capture the flow of reality, while histories, ancestralities, memories are local, marginal, insignificant narratives from the perspective of History'.¹⁰³

Few practising historians, in Latin America or elsewhere, would recognize themselves or their profession in Mignolo's brash caricature of History versus histories. Historical research as a method and set of approaches allows us to go beyond the 'flat narrative'. Indeed, it is the questions raised by global history about causations and connections that must force historians of Latin America to continue to go beyond the 'flat narrative' and to open up sources, regions, and histories to comparative analytical critique.

Concluding thoughts: writing Latin American global history

Global history has been slow to see Latin America as one of its centres of gravity, which instead were believed to lie in Eurasia. Furthermore, well-publicized present-focused strands of global history emanating from the US have been particularly unattractive for historians of Latin America, as they presented an image of the continent as peripheral or victim – if not, indeed, entirely absent. Institutional factors and the dynamics of funding have presented a further obstacle to Latin Americanist engagement with global factors, encouraging national paradigms or, at best, area studies frameworks. Within these circumstances, over the past two decades a younger generation of historians of Latin America has emerged who continue to

102 Mejías-López, *The inverted conquest*, p. 5.

103 Mignolo, *Darker side*, pp. xxvi, 175.

define themselves as such, yet for whom global processes and exchanges are at the centre of their research agendas. It is the contention of this article that they should see themselves both as historians of Latin America *and* as global historians.

It should be taken as a given that all historians, global or otherwise, should be reading *JGH* on a regular basis, and that institutional reciprocal arrangements should be set up for *JGH* and *JWH* (and other historical journals with aspirations to global coverage) to be translated into and published in Spanish and Portuguese (and Quechua, Aymara, and Guarani) for monolingual readers in Latin America. If we want debates about global history to be truly global, then we cannot allow English to be the sole language of discussion. At the very least, works of global history should be required to engage with the historiography of the places under analysis, either directly or in translation.¹⁰⁴

A. G. Hopkins observed in 2002 that debates around globalization had remained ‘almost exclusively Western in conception and indeed in orientation too’.¹⁰⁵ Latin Americanists must therefore engage with global history on an equal footing with South Asianists, Europeanists, North Americanists, and so on, arguing strongly that Latin American connections and experiences are just as significant to the development of global processes as those of places elsewhere, especially where these have been understudied, as for the nineteenth century. This article has argued for a reinvigorated research agenda shared across these disciplines which examines key periods of Latin America’s nineteenth century that have hitherto been relatively neglected by global historians. New political, social, intellectual, and economic formations arose in Latin America in the nineteenth century, whose global dimensions remain lamentably poorly understood. The major contribution of global history in the last two decades has been to demonstrate that some places are *not* more important than other places, only that they have appeared to historians to be of less significance with regard to particular questions.

Historians of Latin America should continue to decolonize their discipline and to address the big questions of global history from their own unique standpoints. This means having the confidence to step over the line into debates that might seem unfamiliar, unnecessary, or shrouded in difficult language. Historians of Latin America have relished frontier-crossing actors and have produced studies of hybridity, borders, and contact zones. It is time for them to step further into this new territory themselves and to apply themselves to global history. With full consideration of nineteenth-century Latin American histories of migration, trade, war, sport, ideologies, products, and practices, global history itself will look very different, as it should.

Matthew Brown is Reader in Latin American Studies at the University of Bristol. He has edited volumes on British informal empire (2008) and on European connections with Latin America in the 1820s (2013). He has published monographs on British and Irish mercenaries in Colombia and Venezuela (2006) and on the battle of El Santuario (2012) and has translated the writings of Simón Bolívar (2009). His most recent book is From frontiers to football: an alternative history of Latin America since 1800 (Reaktion, 2014). He is an editor of the Bulletin of Latin American Research and of Historia y Sociedad.

104 Manning, *Navigating world history*, pp. 154–5. These conclusions echo Manning’s call for historians to ‘go out to encounter the world they worry about’ (p. 162).

105 Hopkins, ‘History of globalization’, p. 19.