

Panel Assignment Table

Panels	Presenters	Discussant/Moderator
Medicine & indigeneity (6/20, 10-noon)	Projit Mukharji, Helen Tilley, Li Shang-jen	Yi-tze Lee, Mårten Söderblom Saarela (moderator)
Climate & environment (6/20, 1:30-3:30)	Fa-ti Fan, Scott Gabriel Knowles, Kuang-Chi Hung	Albert Wu, Xin-Zhe Xie (moderator)
Knowledge, race, & religion (6/21, 9-11)	Shellen Wu, Elise Burton, Jongtae Lim, Jaehwan Hyun	Kevin Chang
Multispecies histories (6/21, 2-4)	Prakash Kumar, Michael Hathaway, Brendan Galipeau, Christine Luk	Wendy Fu
Keynote (6/20, 3:45-5:30)	Evelynn Hammonds	Wendy Fu (introduction)
Journal (6/21, 11:10-12:30)	Projit Mukharji (book editor, <i>Isis</i>), Hsin-Hsing Chen (associate editor, <i>EASTS</i>), Taro Mimura (editor, <i>Historia Scientiarum</i>)	Daiwie Fu

Keynote Lecture

Dr. Evelyn Hammonds, Harvard University

“One history of science or Many? Reckoning with the many historie(s) of the science(s)”

Abstract:

In this talk I will reflect on my education in the history of science. I begin with a review of the marginalization of race, gender and sexuality in history of science curricula as taught in the United States and the impact of this marginalization on the field. I will offer these reflections using the case of current debates in genetics/genomics.

Titles & Abstracts

<i>Panel 1 : Medicine & Indigeneity</i>	
Projit Mukharji	Four Modes of Transregionalism: Clearing Space for a Critical Transregionalism
Hellen Tilley	How to Erase Indigeneity and Misconstrue Medicine: African History, Racial Origin Stories, and the History of Science
Shang-jen Li	After Covid-19: Comparative History of Epidemic Disease and Transregionalism
<i>Panel 2 : Climate & environment</i>	
Fa-ti Fan	Spaces and Movements: Globilities, Regions, and Transregionalism in the History of Science
Scott Gabriel Knowles	Jeju: A Slow Disaster Approach
Kuang-chi Hung	El Niño, La Niña and the Spanish Lady: Nature, State, and Capital in the Territorialization of Tayal Territories, 1915-1935
<i>Panel 3 : Knowledge, race, & religion</i>	
Shellen Wu	Thinking about History in the History of Science
Elise Burton	The Non-Region of the Middle East and the Imperative for Transregional History of Science
Jongtae Lim	Bilateralism in Korea's Foreign Scientific Exchanges and the Prospect of a Regional Approach in the History of Science in East Asia: Some Thoughts Based on the History of Pre-modern Korean Science
Jaehwan Hyun	When Asia Comes to Korean Genetics: A Transregional Reflection on the History of Genetics and Race in South Korea
<i>Panel 4 : Multispecies Histories</i>	
Prakash Kumar	South Asian Historiography and Species History
Michael Hathaway	Thinking About and With Mushrooms: Explorations into Fungal Agency
Christine Luk	Studying Variegated Stuff from the Sea: Jellyfish in the Haicuo Genre and "Species-in-Common" in Practice
Brendan A. Galipeau	Locating Plants Transregionally through History

<i>Medicine & Indigeneity</i>	
Projit Mukharji	<p>“Four Modes of Transregionalism: Clearing Space for a Critical Transregionalism”</p> <p>In order to develop transregionalism as a critical practice that articulates a set of analytically robust, intellectually creative, and politically productive possibilities, we must begin by carefully delineating the existing forms of transregionalism embedded in a variety of institutional spaces. Drawing on my experience and training in South Asian history and with a particular focus on South Asian perspectives on our Asian neighbors, I will describe four existing modes of transregionalism, viz. the civilizational, the geopolitical, the diasporic, and the subaltern. In each case I will also describe how each of these modes of transregionalism mobilize histories of medicine. Finally, I will propose a set of orientation points for developing a critical transregionalism.</p>

[[Home](#)]

Helen Tilley	<p>“How to Erase Indigeneity and Misconstrue Medicine: African History, Origin Stories, and the History of Science”</p> <p>On the 22nd of April 1892, a delegation of Yorùbá leaders from Lagos arrived in Ìjẹ̀bú-Ode, the capital of the Ijebu kingdom, on a last-ditch effort to save the region from British occupation. Over a thousand people assembled for the discussion, including the <i>Awujale</i> (King) himself and his judiciary, the <i>Òsùgbó</i> council. Collectively, the Ìjẹ̀bú leaders oversaw all matters relating to their sovereign realm, including life and death, health and wealth, and land and labor. At a key point in the proceedings, the <i>Asipa Ilu</i> (prime minister) insisted on offering a history lesson. “We and the whiteman have no quarrel, our own race and tribe and their own together had their origin from the same place at <i>Ile Ife</i>, the cradle of mankind. Whitemen emigrated beyond the sea, . . . and we to the river side.” Recently, he continued, white people had returned and the British governor – known to them by the moniker “one who burns bush” (<i>Jógbójógbó</i>) for his scorched earth tactics – seemed to have forgotten their shared ancestry. Now, the “Whiteman is the viper” and “we [are] under the impression that the Governor [has] held our hands together for the snake to bite us.” He was not wrong. Just weeks later, machine-gun wielding soldiers, acting on the governor’s orders, burned their way through the kingdom, gunning down hundreds of Ìjẹ̀bú men, disbanding the <i>Òsùgbó</i> council, and destroying sites for healing and worship. Their first public act, two days after so much murder and mayhem, was to celebrate Queen Victoria’s birthday “with imposing military ceremonies.” A few years later, a Yorùbá carver commemorated the jubilee, depicting the Queen as <i>Èṣù</i>, a deity healers invoked when offering diagnoses, prognoses, and treatment. (The carving lived for a few decades at the Wellcome Museum in London.)</p> <p>This essay uses this pivotal moment from Nigeria’s past to explore three questions: what does it mean to be indigenous or aboriginal in the “trans-region” of Africa? Why have subaltern forms of sovereignty and systems of justice produced such different definitions of medicine and ancestry? And how have imperial institutions and print cultures influenced these dynamics over time? The prime minister of Ìjẹ̀bú-Ode believed fervently that all people could trace their origins to his region of the world. The British disagreed, at least in 1892. He and his compatriots also believed that ancestors and invisible powers (<i>àṣẹ</i>) held the key to their collective and personal well-being (<i>àlàáfìà</i>). Indeed, to give them a sense of unified purpose, one of the <i>Òsùgbó</i> leaders, who spoke after the prime minister, began by reciting a Yorùbá text about the leaf of one of their sacred plants. “May it not count you among the victims of mass dead [<i>ikú àjókú</i>] . . . May it not count you among the victims of mass disease [<i>àrùn àjorún</i>]. Rather, may it count you worthy of riches [<i>owó</i>], children [<i>omọ</i>], and good health [<i>àlàáfìà</i>], which is the peak of wealth.” Needless to say, the British occupiers – plus the many historians of science who followed in their wake – dismissed these words and their effects. This essay explains the legacies of their decisions.</p>
--------------	---

Li Shang-jen	<p>“After Covid-19: Comparative History of Epidemic Disease and Transregionalism”</p> <p>After COVID-19 emerged from Wuhan and progressed into a pandemic, countries responded to the risk of massive numbers of sick and deceased in very different ways. On one hand, countries such as Taiwan, Korea, Singapore, and New Zealand were praised for their prompt responses of implementing measures such as quarantine, boarder control, facemask wearing, aggressive contact tracing and isolation in the early phase of the pandemic which helped them successfully flatten the curve and reduce morbidity and mortality; on the other, countries led by right-wing populist leaders, including the United Kingdom, Brazil and the United States, were reluctant to implement restrictive measures to slow the spread of the virus. Historians of medicine have long noticed that when facing the threats of epidemic diseases, different countries often adopt dissimilar preventive strategies despite their shared, to some extent, common medical knowledge of the disease. Erwin Ackerknecht, Peter Baldwin and Michael Worboys have all presented explanatory frameworks to understand such divergence. Drawing on but also revising their works, I tentatively analyze the very different responses of the governments of Taiwan and the UK (and to a lesser extent China) to COVID-19, reflecting on the significance of comparative studies for the transregional history of science and medicine.</p>
--------------	---

[[Home](#)]

<i>Climate & environment</i>	
Fa-ti Fan	<p>“Spaces and Movements: Globilities, Regions, and Transregionalism in the History of Science”</p> <p>In this talk, I will discuss the main perspectives and approaches of transregionalism (and related concepts) in the history and historiography of science. My purpose is to show the ambitions and limitations of “transregionalism” as invoked and practiced in the field of history of science today. I will use specific historical examples to highlight my critiques of these approaches.</p>
Scott Gabriel Knowles	<p>“Jeju: A Slow Disaster Approach”</p> <p>In the Jeju National Museum, the history of this island off the coast of the South Korean mainland begins with a disaster: the explosion of a volcano and the land-making that followed. Beautiful artifactual exhibits of shell tools and iron hooks and basalt dol hareubang sculptures lead visitors from room to room, inexorably towards maps drafted by European explorers and finally the documents of Japanese imperial control. The permanent exhibit ends ominously, just before the 20th century unfolds. Stopping time in Jeju is an important exercise of historical recreation, allowing the land, its people, and its ecosystem to exist on its own before it was ruthlessly transformed. The history that followed was violent: Jeju became a Korean colonial outpost, then a Japanese military last-stand encampment, a civil war zone before and throughout the Korean War, a way-station for US cold war geopolitics, and a tourism destination-renewable energy hotspot. Jeju’s transregional identity was in flux so often over the last century that scholars working different analytical channels have always seen it as peripheral to some different and competing regional history. A slow disaster approach allows us to track the accumulation of harms—geology and climate, state violence and war, rapid environmental degradation—that bring Jeju right into the center of an expansive region of disaster. This essay develops a slow disaster methodology for the case of Jeju, speaking back to transregional maps that don’t account for harm as a space and identity-making analytic.</p>

Kuang-Chi Hung	<p>“El Niño, La Niña and the Spanish Lady: Nature, State, and Capital in the Territorialization of Tayal Territories, 1915-1935”</p> <p>In light of the “Anthropocene” becoming a key concept in the humanities and social sciences, COVID-19’s recent tremendous impact on human society globally has urged many researchers to consider how to endow actors at multiple scales---such as climate and viruses---with an agency in human history. Situating within the context of Anthropocene humanities research, this study attempts to re-explore a classic issue in the literature of Taiwan history research: What made the transition to capitalism of Taiwan’s aboriginal land possible during the Japanese rule? This article attempts to prove that in order to contribute to this research tradition that has lasted for nearly a century and highlight the significance of Taiwan history research in the context of contemporary Anthropocene research, researchers need to go beyond the analytical frameworks centered on colonial states or capitalism dominant in the past and allow three actors to take the stage: El Niño, La Niña, and the Spanish lady. El Niño and La Niña are two types of manifestations of the "El Niño-Southern Oscillation" (ENSO). El Niño is when the ocean temperature in the eastern Pacific rises and the sea level pressure in the western Pacific strengthens, while anti-El Niño is when the ocean temperature in the eastern Pacific decreases and the sea level pressure in the western Pacific weakens. The “Spanish Lady” in this article denotes the flu that claimed 25 million lives worldwide in 1918. Combining climatology, historical GIS perspectives and analytical tools, and historical materials related to forestry, pacification of aborigines, and meteorological observation data, this article points out that the anti-El Niño phenomenon from 1917 to 1918 brought Taiwan its coldest winter since temperature records began. This article contends that this extreme climate coupled with the ensuing Spanish flu put the Atayal people who had just been attacked by the colonial government in a severe survival crisis. This study endeavors to contribute to Anthropocene humanities and social science research by rethinking the causes and consequences of policies of demarcating aboriginal reserves, establishing a modern forest administration system in aboriginal areas, promoting forest conservation, and relocating aborigines, while considering the environment more than the mere background, object, raw material, or condition as common in environmental history research.</p> <p>Keywords: Anthropocene, capitalism, governance, climate, scale, Atayal people</p>
----------------	---

[[Home](#)]

<i>Knowledge, race, & religion</i>	
Shellen Wu	<p>“Thinking about History in the History of Science”</p> <p>Recent years have seen growing interest in the spatial turn in history, aided by the rise of digital humanities and projects such as Stanford University’s Spatial History Lab, Story Maps and other forms of digital storytelling that are accessible without an in-depth knowledge of GIS. Whether of the American West or Roman archaeology, the spatial turn has transformed how we understand these regions and the significance of spatial understanding to these fields. Yet, many questions remain. What are the limitations of technology for the spatial turn? What is the significance of the spatial turn for histories of parts of the world such as East Asia with its own historical and geographical traditions that long predates the arrival of Western spatial conceptions? In other words, how do we address the temporal dimensions of spatial categories largely constructed in the nineteenth century?</p>

[[Home](#)]

Elise Burton	<p>“The Non-Region of the Middle East and the Imperative for Transregional History of Science”</p> <p>All regional boundaries are arbitrary, but some are more arbitrary than others. A significant challenge for researching the region often called the “Middle East” is that its boundaries are completely defined by North Atlantic geopolitical interests. Yet alternative geographic concepts dividing the region into component parts, such as West Asia, North Africa, or the littorals of the Mediterranean Sea or Persian Gulf, are also not fully satisfactory for historical studies of scientific knowledge and practice, as scholars and their works frequently traversed these sub-regions within their lifetimes. Meanwhile, many of the rationales offered for treating the Middle East as a single regional entity based on shared cultural heritage, social practices, and knowledge traditions actually signal the imperative to study across regions. As scholars of the premodern period know well, religious and linguistic frameworks such as the Islamicate, Persianate, or Arabophone worlds link the Middle East region to large swathes of Asia and Africa. Early modern imperial formations ruled by the Ottomans and Persian dynasties included parts of Europe and South Asia, defying the current borders of the region imposed by North American area studies. However, the effects of European economic imperialism, the subsequent creation of nation-states in the 20th century, and the attendant rise of nationalist historiographies has obscured many possibilities for understanding the modern Middle East as a center for the development of science. (Scholars of the premodern period, too, must often contend with the back-projection of modern racial or national identities onto premodern historical figures.) Existing scholarship of the modern period has long fixated on scientific translations from Europe and North America to the Middle East, at the expense of exploring other transregional connections. Only recently have intra-regional circuits of scientific education and professionalization been substantially analyzed, as opposed to single-country studies of institution building. I review how recent histories of medicine and racial science offer new approaches for conceptualizing the Middle East as a region in itself and as a center of transregional knowledge exchanges with other parts of Asia and Africa.</p>
--------------	--

[[Home](#)]

Jongtae Lim	<p>“Bilateralism in Korea’s Foreign Scientific Exchanges and the Prospect of a Regional Approach in the History of Science in East Asia: Some Thoughts Based on the History of Pre-modern Korean Science”</p> <p>This paper aims to contribute to the workshop theme by examining the lack of regional thinking among Korean historians of science. Throughout the past century, these historians have primarily focused on documenting the emergence of modern national science in Korea through its vertical relationship with a single dominant source of modern Western science (initially Japan and later the US), while disregarding the importance of horizontal interaction with other neighboring countries. This paper traces this historiographical blind spot to a longer-term historical factor—the “bilateral” perspective adopted by premodern Koreans in their foreign cultural exchanges. This perspective compelled premodern Korean elites to position themselves on the periphery of the successive dynasties in the Chinese mainland and to set their cultural agenda solely in relation to this dominant cultural superpower, neglecting their relations with other, more equal neighbors. This perspective has persisted into modern times, as historians draw parallels between premodern and modern times, with the only change being the replacement of China with Western powers as the powerful metropolis. This enduring blind spot indicates, this paper finally suggests, the inherent geopolitical difficulty that has hindered Koreans from thinking regionally. The stark disparity of power and cultural resources among countries in East Asia has framed the cultural exchange in the region in a manner that prevents weaker actors from gaining a complete picture of it.</p>
-------------	---

[[Home](#)]

Jaehwan Hyun	<p>“When Asia Comes to Korean Genetics: A Transregional Reflection on the History of Genetics and Race in South Korea”</p> <p>In South Korea, only in the mid-2000s did geneticists begin framing their work on Korean genetics within the broader context of Asia. Now the large genome sequencing company Macrogen, Inc. and the university-based research institute UNIST Korean Genomics Center are competing to sequence the “Asian genome” while engaging with regional genomic research projects, such as the Genome Asia 100K Project. It is quite a big contrast to the past, which since the 1950s had shown a total lack of the regional idea of Asia in their research (and group classification) and in their collective memory of international activities. Indeed, when it comes to international collaboration, the official historical narratives produced by Korean geneticists themselves often mention only their interactions with US funding agencies and scientists. As a first step in integrating a trans-regional perspective into the Korean history of genetics and race, in this paper, I reflect on a collection of my previous studies following Warwick Anderson’s suggestion of using “Asia as method”—or reimagining Asia as a cognitive platform for historical analysis. In integrating the trans-regional approach, this paper has three parts: first, it examines how South Korean geneticists placed (or erased) Asia in their research and memory of their international experience; second, it shows that trans-Asian involvements of South Korean geneticists had often been mediated by their Japanese colleagues until the mid-1990s and later were carried out by themselves; and third, it reflects the influence of the colonial past and new colonial relations on those trans-Asian activities. Related to the third part, I will also make some critical reflection on the limits of a recent “global history” synthesis</p>
--------------	---

[[Home](#)]

<i>Multispecies Histories</i>	
Prakash Kumar	<p>“South Asian Historiography and Species History”</p> <p>What does species history look like, when seen from the vantage point of South Asian history? How does this scholarship engage with species history in other national and international contexts? South Asianists have mostly arrived at the sub-field from their roots in animal history and environmental history. The social scientists, the anthropologists particularly, have done seminal work. But what does doing history with a “more than human” logic require? How can this project be made more radical? Is the frame of justice for the non-human a sufficiently comprehensive one and how do we get even close to it?</p>
Michael Hathaway	<p>“Thinking About and With Mushrooms: Explorations into Fungal Agency”</p> <p>How might we write about and think about the role of the more-than-human in shaping larger histories? Especially for those of us who step out of human-only worlds, where we are interested in questions of environmental transformation, how might we consider the actions of other beings in creating and transforming worlds? My work in China on the worlds generated by the presence of the matsutake mushroom pointed to the actions of the mushroom itself, alongside the relationships it negotiates with trees, insects and many others. Transregional connections to Japan (the destination of the vast majority of the mature matsutake picked by humans) were absolutely foundational to the human economy, and yet were certainly not the whole story when we want to know what is happening in more-than-human worlds. My paper explores the tensions between reconciling a fascination with the more than human in relation to building more human-focused accounts of transregional change.</p>

Christine Luk	<p>“Studying Variegated Stuff from the Sea: Jellyfish in the Haicuo Genre and “Species-in-Common” in Practice”</p> <p>How does one historicize the vast array of marine life beneath the sea without essentializing knowledge systems of ordering nature? Historians and practicing scientists who were interested in the history of marine species across time and space tend to privilege the thoughts and works of Western naturalists as the guiding principles. From Aristotle to Linnaeus and Darwin, these canonical thinkers become the typical, if not the only available rank of historical actors from which the history of natural history was written and disseminated. However, by no means is the European style <i>Systema Natura</i> a universal or transnational schema for approaching natural history, as they carry with them a teleological matrix for determining the self-fulfilling progress of European regions and excluding the non-European or extra-European regions of the world. Yet European attempts at naming, classifying, collecting, displaying, and experimenting with marine living organisms have become hugely impactful models globally, particularly since the maritime age of the late fifteenth century. An example that speaks to the fundamental differences in conceptualizing the history of multiple <i>species</i> in different regions of the world comes from Chinese categories of species (<i>zhong</i>) and genera (<i>lei</i>), which is the opposite to that specified in the Linnean taxonomy.</p> <p>In this position paper, I do not set out to reach a solution for approaching multi-species histories, nor do I aim at propagating which style of taxonomy or nomenclature is the “true” representation of nature. Rather, I recognize the heuristic usefulness of categories and systems of classification as one cannot engage with the multi-hued, multi-form, multi-layered history of species without referencing names and frames. But it doesn’t mean one should essentialize historical systems of naming and framing nature. To cast reflection upon different culture-bound framings of nature, I offer examples from the Chinese knowledge tradition of “variegated stuff from the sea” (<i>haicuo</i>) and argue for using the <i>haicuo</i> texts to study marine “species-in-common.” Echoing Gluck’s notion of modernity-in-common and Mittler’s history-in-common,^[1] with “species-in-common”, I argue for a plural, shared-but-sometimes-conflicted terminologies that contains a rich variety of possible meanings assigned to multispecies. It allows us to take a closer look at vocabularies and lexicons other than the Latin-based European languages. To speak of “species-in-common” was to think of “the world beneath”^[2]—to borrow the title of Richard Smith’s recent book—transeotionally, transculturally, and transtemporally.</p> <p>^[1] “All Things Transregional?” in conversation with Barbara Mittler: https://trafo.hypotheses.org/3146, accessed on January 23, 2023. ^[2] Richard Smith, <i>The World Beneath: The Life and Times of Unknown Sea Creatures and Coral Reefs</i> (Apollo Publishers, 2019)</p>
---------------	---

Brendan Galipeau	<p>“Locating Plants Transregionally through History”</p> <p>What can thinking with transregionalism teach us about species assumed to be of one origin or home but in fact tied up on much wider networks of exchange or migration? This paper examines how I have thought about wine grapevines in Tibetan Southwest China for many years that assumed to be of primarily recent introduction from the West are in fact tied up in much longer continuous patterns of exchange and back and forth movement since European colonialism in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. For example, grape varieties assumed to be extinct in Europe were discovered to be thriving in the churchyard of a small Catholic Tibetan village after being abandoned by missionaries over fifty years prior. Now this plant only exists in Southwest China. By studying these plants as an ethnographer of Tibetan Southwest China, I was then transported to Europe for archival research to understand more. I would not have undertaken this regional leap through were it not for possessing an interest in the identity and transregional history of these vines.</p> <p>Rather than merely directly discussing this research though, this paper seeks to extrapolate and muse upon how using transregional history to tell the story of relations between a certain set of agricultural plants and different communities and wider cross border communities of humans can create new spaces and spheres of analysis. Through the transregional and cross-cultural identity that I have afforded to grapevines as a non-human species and actor across time and space, grapevines and wine become a common thread that connects disparate communities in Switzerland, France, China, and Tibet. Transregional analysis of agricultural plants thus creates new forms meaning and breaks down borders in that research assumed to be about for instance China is no longer bounded or regionally specific according to national borders or identities. That is, examining identities afforded to agricultural plants across space and time can allow ethnographers and historians to jump beyond the bounds of being identified based upon their locale and place of research but instead linking themselves with larger networks and conversations outside of area and region-based approaches.</p>
------------------	--

[[Home](#)]