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Preface

The ten essays reprinted here reflect my manifold interests in teaching and research. They were written in the years from 1996 to the present. The course of my life determined the themes on which I have worked. I studied history and philosophy at the universities of Marburg and Munich in Germany from 1953 to 1956. I then went to the United States on a scholarship which took me to the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia where I did my Ph.D. in 1959 with a thesis on American history. I then went to India on a grant of the German Research Council. I thus became a "global" historian at an early stage. From 1968 to 2001 I taught South Asian history at Heidelberg University. In this period I also spent much time in India.

The history of European expansion grew upon me when I became a member of the „Network“ dedicated to this subject by the European Science Foundation. From 1992 to 1998 I coordinated a research programme of the German Research Council on the reactions of Non-European nations to the challenges of European expansion. This was a very successful programme, many of its members later on became professors at various universities. I learned a great deal by interacting with them.

The motivation for writing about global history I owe to my friend and colleague Peter Feldbauer, Professor of History at Vienna University. He often invited me for lectures. I also belonged for some time to the group of editors of the series „Weltregionen“ (Regions of the World) published in Vienna. Indian colleagues attracted my attention to Indian economic history and the history of Asian maritime trade. I can only mention a few of them: Binay B. Chaudhuri, Ashin Dasgupta, Ravinder Kumar and Om Prakash. My bibliography at the end of this volume indicates my work in all those fields. As a member of the staff of the interdisciplinary South Asia Institute of Heidelberg University I benefited from interacting with my colleagues and my students. This also ap-
plies to the many authors who contributed to the journal *PERIPLUS. Jahrbuch für außereuropäische Geschichte* which I edited from 1991 to 2001.

Parallel to this volume I publish a collection of German essays. These are not translations of the English essays presented here but an independent publication of different essays entitled *Historische Horizonte: Indien, Europa und die Welt*. Dr. Sandra Frey of NOMOS Publishers suggested that I should produce these two volumes and I wish to thank her for this.

Dossenheim/Heidelberg, Dietmar Rothermund
September 2015
Global historiography benefits from contrasting comparison. Rulers who faced similar problems in different contexts at about the same time are suitable subjects for such a study in contrast. Akbar and Philip both began their reign in 1556 and continued it for more than four decades. They had inherited large realms and expanded and consolidated them with great determination. Since their realms were far apart, they interacted only indirectly. Philip spent the silver mined in his American colonies in his continuous wars and much of it found its way to India where it helped to monetize the land revenue which was the mainstay of Akbar’s power. After taking over Portugal whose throne he had inherited in 1580, Philip also became the head of the Portuguese Estado da India. Akbar was obviously interested in being on good terms with him. In 1582 he dispatched a letter to Philip in which he described his interest in different religions and also asked for copies of the Christian scriptures in Persian and Arabic. He sent the letter with a learned nobleman, Sayyid Muzaffar, who was supposed to explain Akbar’s views to Philip personally. But Sayyid Muzaffar did not agree with Akbar’s syncretistic views and fled to the Deccan before he could embark for Spain. If Philip had received the letter, he would probably have sent a diplomatic reply so as to please Akbar who welcomed the Portuguese as traders. They brought silver to India and also protected Mughal ships taking Muslim pilgrims to Arabia. However, this study of Akbar and Philip is not concerned with their interactions or their awareness of each other, but with their respective strategies of imperial consolidation. The most

2 Ibid., p. 47
obvious contrast in these strategies was in their approach to religion. Akbar’s religious tolerance was in striking contrast with Philip’s reliance on the Spanish Inquisition which became proverbial for the worst type of intolerance and persecution.

Tolerance versus Intolerance: Sulh kul and the Spanish Inquisition

Both Akbar and Philip were faced with the enormous heterogeneity of their subjects. Akbar accepted that the majority of his subjects were Hindus who could not be easily converted. He respected the valour of his chief Hindu adversaries, the Rajputs, and decided to befriend them. He married a Rajput princess and did not force her to embrace Islam and he abolished the poll tax which Muslim rulers imposed on “infidels”. His own religious feelings, influenced by Sufi mysticism, led him to a policy of tolerance, but this also made good sense as far as imperial consolidation was concerned. Sulh kul (universal peace) was his formula for tolerance and it also served as an appropriate ideology for keeping peace within his realm.3 While Akbar’s Hindu subjects appreciated his tolerance very much, the orthodox Muslim ulama criticized him for deviating from the principles of Islam. He certainly did not relish this criticism, but he also tolerated it.

Philip had inherited an even more heterogeneous realm from his father, Emperor Charles V., who had waged four wars against France to defend his scattered dominions. Charles was born in Ghent in what is now Belgium and was imbued with his Burgundian heritage. Burgundy had been one of the wealthiest states of Europe. Charles’ inheritance also included the Dutch Netherlands whose population was the most urbanized in Europe. The Netherlands were studded with many rich and well fortified towns with proud citizens.4 As emperor, Charles controlled most of Germany and Austria as well as parts of Italy (Milano and Naples). His father had married a Spanish princess and thus Charles inherited the

kingdom of Castile. He had faced the armed resistance of many strong Spanish municipalities. After this resistance was crushed, his son Philip who was born and brought up in Spain inherited the Spanish throne. When he was still a young prince, he ruled this big country and its overseas colonies as a regent whenever his father was absent. Charles abdicated in 1555 and withdrew to a Spanish monastery. It served Philip well, that Charles bequeathed the empire (Germany and Austria) to his brother Ferdinand, Philip’s uncle, leaving Spain, the Netherlands and the Italian possessions to Philip. Actually at the beginning of his reign, Philip also had strong links with England as he had married Mary Tudor, „the Catholic“, in 1554. The marriage contract stipulated that he had no right to rule England. But nevertheless this marriage alliance could have been of great importance for the future course of European history. However, Mary’s death in 1558 deprived Philip of this alliance.

Philip was not an aggressive conqueror like Akbar. In fact, he only once participated in a battle – once more against the French – at St. Quentin in the Netherlands in 1557. Otherwise all his wars were conducted by his generals. He was a cautious diplomat, but the defence of his vast realm forced him to wage wars almost incessantly. Throughout his long reign which ended with his death in 1598 he only experienced six months of peace in 1577. His chief enemies were the Ottomans in the Mediterranean, the Protestants in the Netherlands and – in league with them – England under Queen Elizabeth.

Philip was a devout Catholic and being faced with Muslims and Protestants as his chief enemies, he stressed Catholicism as the leading principle of his realm with a vengeance. Organizing the inquisition not only in Spain, but also in the Netherlands and in Latin America was not just a matter of faith, it also served as an instrument of political consolidation. The Catholic clergy thus became

6 Parker, Grand Strategy, p. 147
7 Ibid., p. 2
an arm of Philip’s state – and a very strong arm at that. But his reliance on the clergy and the inquisition caused problems even in Spain. This was shown by the rebellion of the Moriscos in 1568. These people were the offspring of the subjects of the Sultan of Granada whose realm had been conquered by the Spanish in 1492. Those who had stayed on in Spain had been assured of the toleration of their faith. But this was changed in 1508 when many of them were compulsorily converted. They remained nominal Christians and continued speaking Arabic and wearing their traditional gowns. The local Spanish lord tolerated this as they were good taxpayers. „Moorish silk“ was their most important product and this industry continued to flourish. Fighting the Ottomans in the Mediterranean, Philip suspected the Moriscos of being a fifth column of his enemies. In 1561 a very harsh new tax was imposed on Moorish silk. A new Archbishop of Granada was appointed who tightened the discipline of the church. In 1568 the government introduced „reforms“, i.e. the enforcement of the ban of Arabic etc. The local lord who had tolerated the practices of the Moriscos was superseded when a zealous clergyman was made the chief of the civil administration of Granada. This man was an old rival of the local lord. He tried to make a mark with his stern measures and thus triggered off the rebellion. The Morisco swept down on Granada and destroyed Christian churches. A cruel war ensued which took about two years and was conducted by Philip’s young half-brother, Don Juan de Austria. The Moriscos were crushed and Philip forcibly resettled 80,000 survivors in other provinces of Spain. Their silk industry was obliterated in this way. The last remnants of Arabic scholarship for which Spain had once been famous were also destroyed at that time.

With all this emphasis on Catholicism, one should have expected that Philip was an obedient servant of the pope, but this was not so. With most popes who held office during his long reign he had serious political conflicts. But these conflicts concerned only temporal affairs, not the dogma of the church. In matters of faith, he

8 Bernecker/Pietschmann, Geschichte Spaniens, p. 101
9 Ibid., p. 80 f.
was very dogmatic. He also spent hours in intense prayer. His Catholic subjects worshipped him. They called him „the prudent king“ and compared him to King Solomon, a comparison which Philip cherished. In this respect he was not unlike Akbar who also had a high opinion of himself. However, while Akbar did not interfere with the belief of others, Philip felt called upon to fight heretics. When his Dutch subjects converted to Protestantism, he sent his army against them. To some extent he was successful in purely military terms, but in the long run he could not crush their resistance which flared up again and again.

The intolerant king then directed his wrath against Protestant England which supported the Dutch rebels. When English ships also boldly attacked Spanish ports, he resolved to invade England and to reclaim it for Catholicism. Philip then equipped a mighty Armada which carried troops for the invasion. Additional troops stationed in the Netherlands were supposed to join them in this venture. Philip had carefully planned this, but it did not work. The English ships were better armed and were designed so as to outmanoeuvre the cumbersome Spanish ships. They badly mauled the Armada in 1588. The failure of this risky venture was a blow to Philip from which he never recovered. He restored the Armada which later on won some maritime battles against the English navy, but all this at an enormous cost. Even his Spanish subjects then lost faith in their „prudent king“.

Organizing the Early Modern State
Both Akbar and Philip had to solve the problem of organizing an early modern state, depending on expensive armament like the artillery and a large standing army. For this there had to be a reliable tax base and an efficient territorial administration. In this Akbar was also more successful than Philip although the „prudent king“ was a hardworking bureaucrat, devoting attention to every

10 Ibid., p. 97
11 Ibid., p. 117 ff.
12 Ibid., p. 251 ff.
detail of his administration. Akbar was saved from getting bogged
down in bureaucratic detail by being an analphabet. He got to the
heart of the matter by discussing it with his ministers and taking
bold decisions. One of these bold decisions resulted in the compi-
lation of the Dassalnama, a land revenue survey of his realm con-
ducted for a period of ten years in which all emoluments paid from
revenue assignments were paid directly through his treasury. The
survey permitted the calculation of an average jama (revenue as-
seessment) on which subsequent assignments could be based. It also
absolved Akbar from making an annual decision on the revenue
rate, taking into consideration the vagaries of the monsoon. Traditi-
onally this decision had been left to the ruler, because it was
bound to be arbitrary and only the ruler could bear the responsibili-
ity for it. Akbar’s realm was too large for this type of decision
which could not reflect regional variations. Akbar’s method of rev-
ue assessment fitted in very well with his system of granting
mansabs (i.e. graded revenue assignments) according to the rank
of the respective officer in his army or at his court. Each mansab-
dar was graded in terms of two amounts, one referring to the num-
ber of troops which he had to maintain and one stipulating his per-
sonal salary. In this way both military officers and „civil serv-
ants“ could be included in this scale. The mansab-system estab-
lished a rational hierarchy.\textsuperscript{13} Appointments and supervision were
left to Akbar, but he did not interfere with the normal work of his
mansabdars. While the mansab was a hierarchically ordered rank,
it did not necessarily reflect the hierarchy of command in a mili-
tary campaign. Akbar could nominate the commander as he
pleased, he could also select the governor of a province according
to his judgement and even appoint a commander of a fortress in
that province who was equal in rank to the governor as a mansab-
dar. With this flexible system Akbar could organize his state very
well, reserving only essential decision for himself and refraining
from „micromanagement“.