



# ISHA NEWSLETTER

International Social History Association

## CONTENTS

1. **Report on the International Conference “Slavery and Forced Labour in 16<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> Century Spain and Hispanic America”** by *Victoria López Barahona* and *Álvaro París Martín* >>>
2. **Grupo Taller de Historia Social – Social History Working Group (Madrid) – A collective interview with the members of the group** >>>
3. **Zapruder World – A new project and on-line journal** >>>
4. **Social History Worldwide – Panels at the next ICHS Congress, Jinan, August 2015** >>>
5. **Call for papers** >>>

## **Report on the International Conference “Slavery and Forced Labour in 16<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> Century Spain and Hispanic America”**

by  
*Victoria López Barahona* and *Álvaro París Martín*



The conference “Slavery and Forced Labour in 16<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> Century Spain and Hispanic America” was held on 26 May 2014 at the *Universidad Autónoma de Madrid* (Spain). The event was organized by the *Grupo Taller de Historia Social* and the “Free and unfree labour” working group of the European Labour History Network. Following a discussion of the Network’s aims, the conference attracted specialists from several countries in order to share a broad and long-term perspective.

Bernard Vincent, a prominent specialist in early-modern Spanish slavery, opened the conference with an overview of the subject, placing labour at the core of the debate. He discussed the limits and definitions of slavery and outlined the different geographical origins of Spanish slaves. Next, Aurelia Martín Casares focused on the enslavement of women in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spain, thereby raising an interesting hypothesis. She argued that the higher prices for women in the slave market could not be explained by their “reproductive capacity” or their “sexual value”, but rather by the sexual division of labour. Women slaves’ work was more flexible, labour-intensive and productive compared to that of men and ranged from artisanal and agricultural work to reproduction and domestic labour.

The second session focused on forced labour in the eighteenth century. Manuel Martínez analyzed the work of convicts consigned to galleys and prisons in the Spanish Navy. He de-

scribed the living conditions of the prisoners, paying especial attention to Gypsies who were convicted without due trial as part of the State's ethnic cleansing agenda. Christian G. De Vito addressed this issue from a global perspective, examining the circulation of convicts throughout the Spanish Empire. Convicted workers were assigned to several prison settlements scattered on both sides of the Atlantic, where both forced and "free" labour coexisted.

The third session was devoted to slavery and forced labour in eighteenth-century Madrid. José Miguel López García emphasized the often-neglected economic relevance of slavery in the city, as well as the role of Charles III as the chief owner of slaves in the Hispanic Monarchy. He analyzed the role of forced labour in public works construction and how the dividing lines of both forms of "restrained labour" became blurred and also overlapped. Jesús Agua de la Roza focused on child labour in Madrid's hospices. Through *Hospicio* records and other sources – such as the petitions submitted by the children's families – he estimated the number of minors who were sentenced and examined their living conditions inside the institutions, together with their methods of resistance against punitive forced labour.

In the final session, Eduardo Soler Fierrez presented a synopsis of his recent book, namely, a biography of Juan Latino. Juan Latino was a rarity: a slave who attained higher education, translated Latin and Greek classical texts and published his own poems. Following this, Cecilia Tarruell addressed the issues of slavery and captivity from a different viewpoint: namely the capture of Christians by Berbers and Ottomans after the 1574 military defeat. She discussed the thin dividing line between war prisoners, captives and slaves, highlighting the complexity of these indistinct and blurred concepts.

The conference outcomes reveal the usefulness of a comparative approach, grounded on an international network, for social history. Slavery and forced labour were understood from a global perspective, whereby each localised or regional system was embedded in a wider pattern or form and based on the international circulation of labour. The boundaries between slaves, conscripts, captives and "free" workers were often distorted, although these categories of workers lived in the same workplace. Furthermore, the early modern penal systems provided a steady supply of forced labour, and played an essential role in the processes of colonization, internal economic transformation and capitalist development. Slavery, forced labour and wage labour were closely related categories and the interactions between them help explain the rise of modern capitalism.

In conclusion, the conference was a fruitful one and allowed those present to share new historiographical perspectives, thus paving the way to future "Free and unfree labour" working group activities. From the Spanish to the Ottoman Empire, from local to global approaches, from biographies to group studies, all the contributions guide us to reconsider definitions and relationships concerning concepts such as "slave", "captive", "prisoner" and "worker". We look forward to carrying on this collective reflection through building and strengthening the European Labour History Network.

## **Grupo Taller de Historia Social – Social History Working Group (Madrid)**

A collective interview with the members of the group



**The *Grupo Taller de Historia Social* is a research team specializing in the social history of Spain during the early modern age (16th- to early 19th centuries). The Group comprises the following members: José Antolín Nieto Sánchez, Santos Madrazo Madrazo, José Miguel López García, Victoria López Barahona, Álvaro París Martín, Fernando M. Sánchez Escobar, Juan Carlos Zofío Llorente, Jesús Agua de la Roza, Manuel Martín Polo.**

For further information on the Group, see <http://www.historiasocial.org>

### **How was the group formed?**

The *Grupo Taller de Historia Social* continues a tradition of collective research in the Social History of Madrid at the *Universidad Autónoma de Madrid*, previously incorporated in the *Equipo Madrid de Estudios Históricos*. In 1996, following the publication of *El trabajo en la encrucijada* (a collection of definitive papers about European artisans that were translated into Spanish), a group of social historians who had graduated from the University of Madrid decided to come together in order to challenge their unstable economic and working situation. We can say that this led to the birth of Grupo Taller. Later, these historians gained the support of some of their colleagues from the University and participated they in several research projects. The early stages of the group were very difficult due to financial problems, but nevertheless, the group managed to publish several books and even launched the first version of the group's website. Since 2009, the Grupo Taller has made further progress with the addition of new members, a broadening of the research agenda and organization of public events. From that time on, our activities expanded steadily through academic seminars, conferences and in-house workshops. We consolidated ourselves into a stable group that had shared interests, a common research agenda and a strong presence at the *Universidad Autónoma de Madrid*.

### **What do you see as the main purpose of Social History?**

From our perspective, Social History is the history of common working people, their employment relations, living conditions, experiences and struggles, as well as their ways of organizing, socializing and dissenting. Our approach to these subjects relies upon the “history from below” methodology, so wisely put in practice by British social historians.

### **How do you carry out your aims?**

In our opinion, focusing on *how* we construct social history is just as important as the act of construction. In other words, we believe that one can write Social History only if one develops a social way to put it in practice and acts in order to disseminate this. Thus, our research group is based on collaboration, a horizontal organization and openness towards the non-academic community. We make our decisions as an egalitarian assembly of scholars, where a senior professor has the same rights as a doctoral candidate.

For us, Social History loses its direction if it is confined solely within the walls of academia. We believe that our task as social historians is also to work outside the university confines, on the streets and in cooperation with social movements. We are strongly opposed to a hierar-

chical, corporate and stratified University. We believe in a public education system, (which is currently under attack due to budget cuts and privatization). In the context of a class offensive, history has been marginalized because it is not regarded as interesting, especially from a profit-based perspective. Thus, we continue to make or construct Social History through our ongoing interactions and within our social milieu.

As regards our research interests and methodology, our group was established by researchers who were brought together through the study of Madrid and Castile during the Early Modern period. We analyze labor from a wide perspective: from domestic units to survival strategies; from the viewpoint of popular culture to social conflicts or banditry. In order to study this broad range of issues, we have discovered new sources for Social History, which have rarely been used before. For example, we use poverty declarations (*declaraciones de pobreza*, documents including the last wills and testaments of poor people) to study their popular consumption patterns, living conditions as well as the attire of the lower classes. Through exam letters and *escrituras de aprendizaje* (contract influenced documents in which the working conditions for apprentices were established), we analyze how artisans obtained access to businesses and their long-term development. We study popular opinion and politics through secret police reports, while digging into lower class discourses through petitions addressed to the Council of Castile. Formal trial records take us from banditry to “popular unlawful acts”, and from slave sale contracts to a study of manpower. This vast scope of subjects and sources –within a specific location and chronological context– allows us to study the nature of society in Early Modern Madrid and Castile from a wide range of perspectives.

### **How do you see the relationship between other sub-disciplines and disciplines?**

Social History is not any commonplace discipline. It has to remain in permanent contact with many other fields, and this is why we rely on researchers in the disciplines of Anthropology and Economic History in our group. We strongly appreciate the exchange between Social History and Sociology, or even Anthropology, as stated before. However, we would not make them the focus of our social conflict explanations in History. We are prepared to ask for help in order to have a better understanding of certain issues, but this cannot mean any degree of dependency or submission to them. The basis is History itself, which includes the entire social frame; any other discipline plays an important role in a better understanding of that frame. This is why we consider History as an autonomous discipline, free of any subjection to any other area of knowledge. History should create its own toolbox, its own methods and processes. Quite often, we are invited, as social Historians, to depart from the so-called old-fashioned technical jargon. We are told that those words are no longer valid to analyze the past and that we must replace them with new words, which are not better, but simply newer. For instance, we are told to forget about using words such as *social class*, *bourgeoisie*, *feudal*, *capitalist*, *class struggle*, *social relationships of production...* and to replace them with some other words, such as *status*, *collective*, *professional segment*, *traditional*, *pre-industrial*, *patronizing*, *modernization...* We are told that the first terms are unspecific and that they are loaded with ideology. Nevertheless, the second set of terms is at least as imprecise, and they hold their own distinct ideological burden. The first terms have been forged within real or actual conflicts among people and they evince a dynamic of struggle, whereas the second terms appeal to a self-regulated social order, created by Sociology as a discipline, and acclaimed by the mainstream ideology. Given the choice, we stay committed to the old terminology because, at the least, it has the advantage of not having been created by Sociologists or Historians, since the words have been retrieved from the daily life of past times. Those words were used to express the people's perceptions and conflicts, and, because of that, they have a real historical value.

### **What academic (and non-academic) traditions inspire you most?**

Our group identifies with a series of academic traditions such as heterodox Marxism of Gramsci, the works of Edward P. Thompson and the organizational experience of Raphael Samuel. We absolutely support the retrieval of the History of those without history, developed nowadays by Linebaugh and Rediker (which had been introduced in Spain under the sponsorship of Joseph Fontana). We feel very close to the recovery of the line research on the guilds, which is being done by relevant Historians such as Hugo Soly or Jan Lucassen. We have developed a long career in those topics, and in women's labor as well. Of course we have fed on the debate about the transition between feudalism and capitalism and *proto-industrialization*, and we are acutely aware of the studies about commons that is currently taking place. Taking into account the strong bonds between Spanish and French historiographies, we are indebted to the French post-Annales Hispanists. Jacques Soubeyroux and his studies on poverty have been our bedside books. Similarly, Pierre Vilar's masterworks have served a similar purpose. We would not be fair-minded if we didn't acknowledge the influence of Polanyi, Foucault and Bordieu's teachings.

### **In what ways do your research interests deal with non-Spanish social history, and eventually connect social history in Spain and in other countries?**

Nowadays, Social History in Spain is not in its best times. There are only a few guiding lights we can rely upon. That is why our motivation owes so much to the European and Latin American theoretical and methodological research. Of course, we don't study Madrid for the sake of Madrid itself. In many of our works we try to set a comparative analysis towards the European panorama.

### **What do you see as a potential agenda for social history in the next decade?**

Our agenda for the next decade ought to mainly focus on the development of the core concepts we have started to deal with in our research projects throughout the last decade. This period has allowed us to advance relative knowledge about some formal aspects of the world of labor, such as urban work social organization. However, the better our knowledge of the guilds, the more questions arise about everything around them. That is why our agenda, at least in the area of labor, will gain more depth in all those facets which have remained in the dark throughout the last decades. From the corporate work of masters and skilled workers, we will inevitably transition to women's labor, to child labor, and to *unpaid-domestic-hidden-invisible-forced-precarious* labor. In a natural way, we will connect aspects of past labor with today's reality and with today's social movements. In conclusion, we will study the entire vast social frame, which did not work *in* the guilds, but *for* the guilds.

Together with the world of work, there are other topics that concern the group as a whole. We have started a parallel line of study about popular culture and politics. This issue is relatively new in Spain and we believe that we are obliged not only to dismantle the well-praised topics, but also the unknown, enlightened policies. A first critical approach to this matter has been showed by José Miguel López García in his book *El motín contra Esquilache. Crisis y protesta popular en el Madrid del siglo XVIII*. This book maintains that the common people of Madrid caused 1766 mutiny and it proposes explanatory key ideas that go in depth into its culture, its political organization and its mobilization skills from an absolutely original perspective. We believe that extensive research should be done in this field so that a better understanding of the popular identity and the creation of its own speech can be achieved. This topic is frequently linked to modest neighborhoods, but more than that, to a social working class.

According to our last statement, we strongly believe that Social History, as the direct expression of the testimonies of the exploited people's resistance, could be seen as a tool for a social, political and ideological change; a tool at the service of a more fair and free organiza-

tional frame; that is to say, a world with more peace, more solidarity, better human conditions, and even regarding ecology, cleaner. History, and especially Social History, more than a discipline, is a way of thinking, always looking for a global understanding of human conflicts throughout time. It is a perfect and vast tool for documentation, organization and for factual analysis. In History, the debate about concepts, methods or starting points must always be kept open, so that historians can be prepared before they start working and such that the debate is kept open parallel with their research. History should be used to help explain the real world, and thus, to make it a better place. There is a lot at stake: nothing less than a theoretical frame to explain reality in which we could build a specific political praxis. In summary, we understand that Social History is an instrument to build social and political alternative options.

**Thank you.**

**Interviewed by *Christian G. De Vito***

---

## **Zapruder World**

A new project and on-line journal



**In June 2014 the Zapruder World project and on-line peer-reviewed journal was launched ([www.zapruderworld.org](http://www.zapruderworld.org)). In the next two sections we reproduce, respectively, the presentation of the project and the Editorial introduction to the first issue of the journal. For further contacts: [info@zapruderworld.org](mailto:info@zapruderworld.org)**

Abraham Zapruder was a 58-year-old Russian migrant tailor who filmed (captured on camera) the assassination of John Fitzgerald Kennedy in Dallas on 22 November 1963. He made history, armed with an 8 mm camera. From below.

Since 2002 *Zapruder* is also a journal dealing with the history of social conflict and is published in Italy and in Italian. Together with the association *Storie in movimento* (SIM – *Histories in movement*), it was founded by historians and social activists who participated in the protest movement in Genoa (July 2001), and had roots in the local social forums which emerged from the international demonstrations and meetings of Seattle, Göteborg and Porto Alegre. Their social activism fed their research curiosity, broadened their intellectual interests, and drove them to explore new methodological and theoretical perspectives. History – they felt during those months of continuous and inspiring mass movements and debates – was no longer (just) a series of words on a page, nor was it a sequence of institutional meetings and events. It was performed by persons and written in acts of protest, resistance, and rebellion of ordinary people against hegemonic and oppressive structures of power anywhere and at any time.

Since their inception, both the journal and the association have mirrored these experiences. Members have been meeting in locations for academic and non-academic scholars, spaces of inclusive and anti-authoritative cultural creation, and *laboratories* based on egalitarian and democratic participation. For example, the topics of the journal are chosen via public assemblies and the members of the association elect the Editorial Board and the Coordinating Committee.

Through a network of local groups, annual symposia and the journal *Zapruder*, SIM's members have sought to develop critical perspectives beyond the sterile conceptual straight-jackets of liberal progressivism, epistemological Euro centrism, and methodological national-

ism, as well as the alternative to the celebratory approach of much of the historiography on the institutional organization of the labour movement. Sustained exploration of new topics in radical historiography has been combined with experimentation in research and communicative methods appropriate for dismantling monopolistic attitudes towards access to sources; the individualistic and solitary nature of historical work; the tendency to limit research to the academic market; and the hyper-fragmentation of knowledge. For all their originality, however, the experiences of SIM and *Zapruder* have not taken place in a vacuum. They have been rooted in the changing global geography and paradigm of history and relate to the (re-) emergence of global movements.

New associations of historians have appeared in the last ten to fifteen years and much research has been done all over the world: from Western and Eastern Europe to Brazil, South Africa, the USA and Canada, Turkey and Southeast Asia, just to mention the principal sites of production. These associations, journals, and the studies they have initiated, have addressed the interactions between different regions of the world throughout the modern era, providing new perspectives on global socio-economic history and suggesting new ways of understanding social movements.

Moreover, as new forms of workers' protest, grassroots social movements and a growing collective consciousness relating to the diffusion of contemporary globalization have emerged all over the world, this new type of historiography has incorporated the histories of national and local insurgent movements and social conflicts in more global, comparative, intertwined and trans-local perspectives. Similarities, mutual influences and linkages among populations in different nation states and land-empires have been explored. National boundaries have been transcended, networks within and beyond the national level investigated and a series of collective actions, forms of resistance and insurgent movements researched in the context of their interconnections and interdependency within the political and social changes arising inside other world societies.

It is time that this wealth of interconnected and socialized knowledge be used to establish a method to circulate these connections globally, against the backdrop of contemporary digital technology, and assist scholars from the Global South and Global North to build bridges of collaborations and mutual inspiration as has already happened on the plazas of Cairo, New York, Istanbul, Rio de Janeiro and Rome. Our call for the creation of *Zapruder World (ZW)* is both a call for bringing together researchers from all over the world into a network of scholars and social activists who want to exchange and diffuse their knowledge and knowledge practices, and to realize together a digital tool for the construction and maintenance of this network, namely, *An International Journal for the History of Social Conflict*.

We envisage *Zapruder World* to be an online journal *and* a network of historians and social activists dispersed in different places, countries and continents, and who will explore the many forms of social conflict and reconsider the notion of social conflict itself. In doing this, our aim is to simultaneously transform the way we look at history, the way historical research is organized, and the way historical knowledge is transmitted from one generation to another.

We understand/comprehend "social conflicts" in the broadest sense of the word, and without spatial or chronological limits. We target the *movement of conflicts* – rather than the resolutions arrived at – and compare forms of conflict across time and space in order to connect our knowledge with current transnational cycles of protests. We consider "social conflict" as a useful interpretative category to address the structural and mutual relations between classes, genders, cultures and races, as well as technologies, the formation of identities, and nature. We explore social conflicts by both producers as well as consumers, and stress the agency of historical actors, their memories, discourses, beliefs, and hopes. We seek to expand and redefine the meaning of insurgent practices beyond the privileged locus of the workplace, e.g. by looking at public ceremonies, celebrations, street theatre and bodily practices as ways to express complaints, demands and eventually ignite rebellion. We look at

wage and “subsistence” workers, men, women and children, slaves and serfs, unemployed and *lumpenproletarians* and our goal is to question the traditional separation between “free” and “unfree” labour.

Social conflict is explored through an interdisciplinary perspective; it is tackled at any scale and examined through constant *jeux d'échelles*. We use concepts and methodologies derived from history, ethnography, economy, geography, anthropology, and the humanities at large, to explore the complex interactions between the “local” and “global”. We all practise “global history”, that is broadly defined as “spatially”-aware historiography, but intentionally leave its actual definition, contents and methods open for discussion.

Finally, we seek to integrate empirical research, theoretical insight and methodological self-reflexivity. In this way we explicitly aim to overcome the tendencies in social conflict studies towards fragmentation and thematic hyper-specialization that keep these three elements apart. Briefly, we conceive *ZW* as a laboratory for new forms of historiographical discourse aimed at matching our thematic focus on the *movement of conflict* with narrative forms that recapture the openness of outcomes, and the potentialities of conflict before resolution.

As researchers we realize that addressing all these issues is a huge challenge. We are also conscious of the existence of other networks and journals that have been created to accomplish the same tasks we have envisioned for our needs. Yet, as social activists, we know that social movements necessitate the proliferation of sites of knowledge production, dissemination, and resistance to hegemonic discourses. Our research activities are therefore located in the very historical context in which we work. By focusing on social conflict, we aim to consciously contrast the normalization and dominance of “liberal thought”, which consistently downplays the tenor and causes of social conflicts, and is impotent in contrasting the spread of the Neoconservative world view. We see history as, essentially, an arena of conflicts that overtly challenge liberal-conciliatory descriptions of the past.

Apart from seeking answers to old and new research questions, and exploring new methodological perspectives, we ought to also address the material conditions in which we perform our tasks. We know the present situation of research only too well: national and international “reforms” aimed at the commercialization of research and education; reductions on public investments, and the growing role of private actors; daily difficulties for independent organizations; strengthening of authoritarian nepotism; and a project-centred approach in funding, mainly driven by short term, market-related goals. The outcomes of these trends are also visible: the contraction of research and educational opportunities; the sustained instability of contracts extending to research and the lives of the researchers; and the drastic restrictions on independent research.

In opposition to this situation, *Zapruder World* intends to be a pluralistic open forum for social activists and academic and independent scholars from all related disciplines. With its origins in the wider project *Storie in Movimento*, our initiative departs firstly from the desire to expand our own horizons beyond the national confines of Italian history. At the same time, it intends to valorize some key aspects of *SIM*'s experience, namely, its horizontal relationships, direct participation and self-funding principles; its provision of a network for the exchange of critical knowledge; its coupling of individual study and collective discussion. From the original *Zapruder* we have taken its very successful “thematic” approach, which has allowed it to gather and present to its readers perspectives on a specific form of social conflict originating from different disciplines, and involving researchers studying the approach in geographical periods and chronological times very different from the others.

*ZW* does not aim however to be an international extension of either *SIM* or *Zapruder*, but is intended to be a new collective agent. In keeping with this goal, our first aim is to build a transnational network of activist researchers, grounded in skills and methodological ap-



proaches in tune with the project, and open to exchange in a growing transnational perspective. We envision this process as delivering or providing to an ever-expanding Advisory Community working in horizontal ways with the Editorial Board. It will consist of scholars and activists willing to contribute to the peer reviewing process, co-edit issues of the journal, submit and solicit contributions, and participate actively in the building up of the journal itself.

The Advisory Community is not elective and we intend to ask for a small fee to be part of the committee. This payment is not intended to create an income for us, but rather to sustain the association *Storie in movimento* and the *Zapruder World* project. The entire activity for the project is voluntary – excepting some parts of the copy-editing process – and each item for funding will be regularly reported on, it will be open to scrutiny and circulated to all members in the Annual Financial Report of the Association.

The Editorial Board of the journal is elective. At the moment its members are the founders of the project but our aim is to enlarge and review the process over the next several months as willing candidates emerge from the Advisory Community.

Elections to the Editorial Board will take place annually during SIM's General Assembly that will usually be held in Italy in November/December. Given the difficulty for most international members to be present physically at the assembly, both the election of members to the Editorial Board and the presentation of/voting on proposals for new issues of *ZW* will be conducted online through our website in the days preceding the Assembly. The Editorial Board will form the core of *Zapruder World*, in close collaboration with editors and authors, and in dialogue with the Advisory Community. In particular, the potential of the online media will give successive Editorial Boards an opportunity to develop and give new directions to our website in keeping with the goals discussed here but also in response to the demands of the present moment.

## **Zapruder World, Issue 1 – Editorial Introduction**

*The Whole World is Our Homeland:  
Italian Anarchist Networks in Global Context 1870-1939*

This inaugural issue of *Zapruder World* highlights one of the principal aims of the journal: to investigate and reflect upon methodological approaches that enable scholars to break off from the Western- and nation-centric cage, and the self-referential perspective that often accompanies the concept of "local". We see a relationship of continuity rather than polarization between "local", "national" and "global" scales, as well as between the "micro" and the "macro", and also between flows, exchanges, connections, and diasporas, on the one hand, and individual and collective identities, on the other. Yet, rather than addressing these methodological and theoretical issues in abstract terms, we do it through a series of empirical studies around a monographic theme: the Italian contribution to the transnational anarchist movement.

While surely appropriate to the scope of our journal, the choice of this opening theme was neither a foregone conclusion, nor was it devoid of reflection. Why launch a new journal on conflict, aimed at widening the definition of "conflict" itself, by focusing on a seemingly "traditional" form of conflict such as anarchism? And, why place the emphasis on Italian anarchists, since the goal is the exploration of new methodological perspectives and issues capable of challenging the centrality of the "national" perspective?

The logic of our choice is in our willingness to lay the groundwork for a broad dialogue, rather than imposing a predetermined point of view. Our goal is to encourage the widest possible discussion around the methodological issues mentioned above. We wish to contribute new insights, and nurture the visions of those who are already convinced of the need to over-

come methodological nationalism and Eurocentrism; at the same time we wish to provide concrete examples of the possibility of an alternative way of doing history to those who are more or less consciously linked to those interpretations.

The theme selected for this inaugural issue seems to us as appropriate for our goals, since late 19<sup>th</sup>- and early 20<sup>th</sup>-century anarchism is not only a “traditional” topic in the history of social conflict, but also one that has been radically renewed in the last two decades. The new theoretical and methodological perspectives of global history, and ongoing debates in migration studies, for instance, are manifest. Important contributions have stemmed from this process, some of which have focused on Italian migration networks (whether anarchist or otherwise), as evident in the case of Donna Gabaccia’s work including her afterword to this issue. More generally, the study of Italian anarchists – remarkable because of their number, their symbolic impact and their influence on the international literature – represents a concrete example of a renewed research field rather than a static and exclusive field.

An article by David Turcato, originally published in the *International Review of Social History* (2007), and reprinted here, has synthesized the new trends in this research field. Turcato convincingly showed that the study of Italian anarchism, if conducted from a transnational perspective, makes continuity and organizational patterns visible, whereas the traditional national approach maintains the discontinuities and organizational shortcomings of the Italian anarchist movement. The reason for re-printing this article stems also from the fact that it represents a key moment in the evolution of the field. Thus Turcato embraced a transnational perspective at the time when this approach was repeatedly interrogated by other scholars (Wimmer and Schiller 2002; Bayly, Beckert et alia 2006).

Starting from Turcato’s review of the field we have sought to focus on the rich field of methodological debates identified in that article, thus providing a wide range of contributions stemming from various approaches, from trans-locality and Diaspora studies to micro-history and network analysis. Contributors were asked to be self-reflexive in their approach and to explain what it informed and what it surpassed. They were also asked to reflect on the impact their approach had on the selection and use of sources. The reader will judge how far this course has been followed and whether it has proved to be successful. As far as we are concerned, we wish to point to the fact that the contributions provide multiple, and arguably conflicting, theoretical and methodological insights, and that the very order by which we decided to present them in the issue is aimed at highlighting this feature. Thus, Maria Miguelañez’ essay most closely resembles the transnational methodological approach proposed by Davide Turcato in the (reprinted) article that precedes it, as it accurately leads us across the borders of four nations, namely Italy, Argentina, Uruguay and Spain. Andrew Hoyt also explicitly refers to Turcato’s suggestions as a starting point for his exploration of a single anarchist pamphlet, although one gets the feeling that his focus on material culture opens up additional perspectives for research in this field, and is more closely related to network analysis. Kirwin Shaffer makes a convincing case for the need to address both circulation (the “lines”) and specific contexts (the “dots”), as a means to deal with the continuous dialectics between differences and analogies – an argument that reaches the very foundations of global history, far beyond the field of anarchist studies. Ilkay Yilmaz’ contribution points to the same local-global connection, but somehow reverses the point of observation, by focusing on State-sponsored anti-anarchist networks (and control policies) rather than on those created by anarchists themselves.

This issue also points to the need for a spatial expansion of the research field. Whereas Hoyt’s essay relates to the North Atlantic – definitely the most researched area in the field – two contributions are made here on Italian anarchists’ activism in Latin America (Shaffer and Miguelañez) and in the Ottoman Empire (Yilmaz). Spatial expansion is accompanied by a focus on the temporal dimension; especially in as far as the different generations of Italian anarchists in the period 1870-1939 are concerned. Miguelañez’ focus on the period between

the two world wars also stands as an example of the potential to go beyond the “traditional” late 19<sup>th</sup> to early 20<sup>th</sup> century focus in anarchist studies.

Finally, starting from the perspectives of the most recent literature, and in keeping with the goals of this journal, further research issues are highlighted by all the contributors and, in particular by Donna Gabaccia in her afterword. These include the relationship between Italian anarchists and anarchists from other geographical areas; the connections between “political” migration and “economic” migration; the gender dimension in migration networks and diasporas and the anarchist movement. The relationship between “national” identity and the Italian anarchists’ internationalism is also addressed, together with the (individual and collective) perceptions of the “national” and the “international”, that was shared by the men and women who play a central role in this issue.

## NEWS

### Social History Worldwide

Panels at the next ICHS Congress, Jinan, August 2015



*The 22nd Congress of the International Committee of Historical Sciences (ICHS/CISH) will be held in Jinan, China, 23-29 August, 2015. As an affiliated organization of the ICHS, the International Social History Association will organize two half-day panels at the Congress, from Thursday 27 afternoon until Friday 28 morning. The panels equally wish to take stock of the present situation of social history from a global perspective. The first panel covers recent trends in social history by addressing the achievements of social historians in specific regions and continents, while the second session explores the new themes and methods of social historians worldwide.*

The preliminary programme is as follows:

#### **Social History Worldwide: Decline and Revival**

##### **A. Regional trends and comparative issues (August 27, 2015, Afternoon session)**

Chair: Marcel van der Linden (International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam, and University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

1. China (Shuo Wang, California State University, Stanislaus, USA)
2. South Asia (Janaki Nair, Jawaharlal Nehru University, Delhi, India)
3. Africa (Toyin Falola, University of Texas, Austin, USA)
4. Latin America (Larissa Corêa, FAPESP, São Paulo, Brazil, Paulo Fontes, Fundação Getulio Vargas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, and Mirta Zaida Lobato, University of Buenos Aires, Argentina)
5. Europe (Béla Tomka, University of Szeged, Hungary)
6. Social history: A global perspective (Peter Stearns, George Mason University, Fairfax, USA)

*B. Themes and methods: trends and innovations* (August 28, 2015, Morning session)  
Chair: Dirk Hoerder (Arizona State University, Tempe, USA, and Salzburg, Austria)

7. Time in social history (Christian De Vito, University of Leicester, UK)
8. The 'globalization' of social history (Amarjit Kaur, University of New England, Armidale, Australia)
9. e-Humanities and social history (Karin Hofmeester, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, and University of Antwerp, Belgium)
10. New themes in social history (Marcel van der Linden, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam, The Netherlands)
11. Comparative social history: A status quaestionis (Hartmut Kaelble, Humboldt University, Berlin, Germany)
12. Social History: Substantive and methodological prospects (Jürgen Kocka, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin, Germany)

---

## Call for papers

### **Call for sessions and papers on Labour and Working Class History for the European Social Science History Conference (ESSHC), Valencia, 30 March-2 April 2016**

From 30 March-2 April 2016 the 11<sup>th</sup> European Social Science History Conference will take place in Valencia (Spain). The ESSHC brings together scholars interested in explaining historical phenomena using the methods of the social sciences. The conference is characterized by a lively exchange in many small groups, rather than by formal plenary sessions. It is organized in a large number of networks that cover specific fields of interest.

One of the largest networks is Labour. We think that progress in Labour History is being made by analysing global developments in labour relations and labour struggle, including the influence of these global developments on local cases. It also remains essential to take into account besides class other constituent elements of working class identities, like gender, ethnicity, religion, age and nationality.

At the previous network meeting (Vienna 2014), some participants suggested that there was a need to take stock of the current state of the art. Therefore, we aim to organize four 'Special Sessions' entitled 'Labour History: where do we stand?'. If you wish to propose a (historiographical, methodological, or other) session for this series of sessions, please use 'Special Session' as a subtitle to your sessions. If your panel will not be selected for the 'Special Session', we will of course take it into consideration for our regular sessions.

Apart from the abovementioned 'Special Sessions', the Labour History Network welcomes any other session or paper proposal dealing with all topics and periods in labour and working class history. During the selection of proposals, the coherence of sessions will be an important criterion. Therefore, propositions of **full sessions** with three to five papers will be easier to accommodate in the conference programme than single papers. Most sessions choose the panel format, but other types of sessions are encouraged. We have a preference for sessions with a **comparative** character, geographically and/or chronologically. Also, we advise you to seek alliances with other ESSHC-networks and propose joint sessions. We heartily encourage young scholars, such as PhD and master students, to involve in organizing sessions within the Labour Network. To encourage this, the Jan Lucassen Prize for the best

paper at the ESSHC of a junior scholar (first awarded in Vienna in 2014) will be awarded (see <http://esshc.socialhistory.org/award>).

Proposing sessions or paper only works by pre-registering on our website. To propose a panel session (2 hour timeslot): panel organizers need to pre-register for 3 to 5 participants. Add full names and addresses of all paper authors, and of a chair and/or commentator. To propose an individual paper: pre-register through the conference website, indicating 'Labour' as your network of preference. See for full details: <http://esshc.socialhistory.org/guidelines>. The deadline for proposing abstracts is **1 May 2015**.

Further information on the ESSHC is available from the conference website at <http://esshc.socialhistory.org/>. For specific questions about the Labour History Network, please contact the chairs: Christian G. De Vito ([christian.devito@gmail.com](mailto:christian.devito@gmail.com)), and Elise van Nederveen Meerkerk ([elise.vannederveenmeerkerk@wur.nl](mailto:elise.vannederveenmeerkerk@wur.nl)).

### **ISHA Newsletter**

The Newsletter is the publication of the International Social History Association

#### **Editorial board:**

Amarjit Kaur, University of New England, Armidale NSW  
Marcel van der Linden, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam  
Christian De Vito, University of Leicester, Leicester

#### **Editor:**

Béla Tomka, University of Szeged, Szeged  
E-mail: [tomka@hist.u-szeged.hu](mailto:tomka@hist.u-szeged.hu)

**Submissions** are welcome including brief notes, such as reports on conferences; personal accounts related to ISHA issues; announcements of forthcoming conferences and meetings on issues related to ISHA; readers' comments sharing your reactions to and thoughts about materials published in the Newsletter. All documents need to be formatted using Microsoft Word (.doc). Please send all manuscripts as an e-mail attachment to the editor.

**Subscribe or unsubscribe:** Send a mail with the subject "subscribe" to [tomka@hist.u-szeged.hu](mailto:tomka@hist.u-szeged.hu) to be added to the list. To be removed from the list send a mail with the subject "unsubscribe" to the same address.

**ISHA President:** Marcel van der Linden, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam, Cruquiusweg 31, Amsterdam 1019 AT, Netherlands, Phone: 00-31-20-6685866 Fax: 00-31-20-6654181 E-mail: [mvl@iisg.nl](mailto:mvl@iisg.nl)