

## Week6 World History

1. While discussing technological breakthroughs that contributed to the Industrial Revolution, Pomeranz contrasts Margaret Jacob's "scientific culture" – influence of Newtonian science, scientific societies, and entrepreneurship - with "geographical accidents" – location of coal mines and their distance from skilled people – and argues that the latter was what mattered most. My question is: Can those two factors be compared in a fair way? In other words, do they exist on the same historiographical layer? The former is one that is discovered by a microscopic analysis, while the latter is a macroscopic term. I think they are just complementary to each other. The recognition of the latter forms the background of the analysis of the former.

2. Interestingly, Pomeranz finds it problematic that recent historians have discovered more continuity and gradualness where former generations saw revolutions and discontinuity in European history. Many historians now think that the medieval age was not dark at all; that the Scientific Revolution can be understood as a culmination of the previously accumulated changes; and that the Industrial Revolution and even the French Revolution were not so revolutionary. Many of these new interpretations are regarded as a desirable revision of the simple, straightforward narrative. To Pomeranz, however, this recent historiography is, at least in economic history, misleading since it consolidates the European exceptionalism and prevents one from looking at wider contexts. How can we reconcile this conflict in historiographical trends?

3. Is this a book that falls into the category of global/world history? Or is it just a comparative history? It seems to me that the main aim of this book is to offer a better understanding of European economic history by making comparison with Chinese case. (Note that this book belongs to the series "The Princeton Economic History of the Western World.") This book places European economy in the context of the bigger world, which gives us a lot of insight. But the focus is still on European industrialization, although the subtitle says "the Modern World Economy." If one can still insist this is a world/global history book, is there more persuasive justification for world/global history

than that it offers a broader context for local/national history?

4. One more very short question. Does this book support Jack Goldstone's coining of the term "Advanced Organic Society" and give us any fresh insight to the periodization issue? It was interesting to see Goldstone's name in the Acknowledgement of this book.