

Luigi Cajani
Università La Sapienza
Rome
Italy

Teaching World History in Secondary Schools: The Present Debate

(draft paper for the World History Association Annual Conference,
George Mason University, Fairfax, VA, June 17-20, 2004)

*The concept of an educational project must be cosmopolitical
(Immanuel Kant)*

*The times they are a-changin'
(Bob Dylan)*

1. History teaching in an age of transition

Since the early 1990s the teaching of history has been passing through a crisis: in many countries the didactic model centered on national identity that was created at the half of the 19th century in Europe to serve as an *instrumentum regni* and later spread worldwide is giving way to a new model based on the overall history of humankind and aimed at fostering a critical knowledge of scientific procedures.

Although facing strong opposition, the new model is slowly gaining ground and it has already won some important battles.

There are three basic reasons for this shift: the first has to do with society; the second with culture and didactics; and the third with scientific research.

At the social level, in several European countries the growing flood of immigrants from outside Europe has raised the issue of the development of school teaching in an inter-cultural direction, and world history is expected to play a decisive role in this perspective. An increase in the knowledge of the history of non-European cultures is regarded as a very effective means of overcoming prejudice against these cultures, of improving mutual understanding and of integrating immigrants into the host countries.

From a cultural and didactic point of view, the mass media have certainly made public opinion more aware of the world dimension of political, economic, social and environmental problems. More and more people are therefore willing to investigate the past on a worldwide scale. Thus, the school system must respond to a new demand for historical knowledge.

There is finally a third but most important reason. Over the past thirty years, historical research has made steady progress at an international level both in the study of the world system and in the analysis of the general worldwide context of local phenomena. The research focus is slowly but gradually leaving the national context.

An encouragement to go beyond self-centered models of history teaching has also recently come from UNESCO, particularly from the Report on Education in the XXI century, prepared in 1996 by Jacques Delors. In this report, one may read:

Education should ... seek to make individuals aware of their roots so as to give them points of reference that enable them to determine their place in the world, but it should also teach them the respect for other cultures. Some subjects are of crucial importance in this regard. History, for instance, has often served to bolster a sense of national identity by highlighting differences and extolling a sense of superiority, essentially because history teaching was based on a non-scientific outlook ... Knowledge of other cultures leads, then, to an awareness of the uniqueness of one's own culture but also an awareness of a heritage common to all humanity.

Understanding others thus make possible a better knowledge of oneself: any form of identity is complex, for individuals are defined in relation to other people – both individually and collectively – and the various groups to which they owe allegiance, in a constantly shifting pattern. The realization that there are many such allegiances, over and above such relatively restricted group as the family, the local community or even the national community, informs the search for common values that can serve as the foundation for the 'intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind' proclaimed in UNESCO's Constitution"¹.

Now - I think - the transition is mature.

2. Teaching world history: a debate

This Copernican revolution in history teaching started in the US in the mid-1990s with the introduction of the National Standards for World History. This reform met with some strong opposition but was substantially successful, especially in a long term perspective: this is shown, for instance, by the development of the Advanced Placement for World History. A few years later, in 2001, a similar project was undertaken in Italy in the context of the general reform of the school

¹ JACQUES DELORS, *Learning: The Treasure Within*, UNESCO Publishing, 1996, pp. 49-50.

system put forward by a left-wing government, under Ministers of Education Berlinguer and De Mauro. Under De Mauro, a commission prepared a world history curriculum to replace the traditional Euro-centric model of history teaching². This attempt failed, partly for political, partly for cultural reasons. At the political level, the 2001 general elections were won by the right-wing parties led by Berlusconi, who managed to abrogate the law on school reform and replaced it with another one, in which the history curriculum is centered on the building up of Italian national identity and is inspired by Euro-centric and Christian values. At the cultural level, many Italian historians refused to accept world history, not only for political reasons (left-wing and right-wing historians were united in this opposition), but also and much more for cultural reasons. The vast majority of Italian historians are plunged in an old Italo-centric, or at best Euro-centric, model of historical research, as was admitted by Giuseppe Recuperati³, and are ill at ease when they have to face discussion at an international level, for example in the meetings of the International Committee of Historical Sciences. This is also shown by recent statements by Paolo Prodi, the president of Italian historians⁴. Not only are Italian scholars restrained by their traditionalist approach to historical research; they are also influenced by new political and cultural trends. Over the past ten years a new wave of patriotism has affected both the Right and the reformist Left in the common search for national identity. This new trend developed in the context of the

² LUIGI CAJANI, *A World History curriculum for the Italian school*, in "World History Bulletin", vol. XVIII, n. 2, Fall 2002, pp. 26-32.

³ GIUSEPPE RICUPERATI, *A proposito di «Whose History?», e di uso pubblico della storia. Lo scontro sui piani di studio negli Stati Uniti (e in Italia)*, in "Rivista storica italiana" CXV (2003), pp. 771 s.

crisis of the political and ideological system of the so-called First Republic and is also connected with the crisis of the anti-fascist model. In this perspective, many historians see history teaching above all as a means of building up national identity, as was shown by the statement made by the left-wing historian Rosario Villari during the discussion about the world history curriculum prepared under Minister De Mauro:

“The study of history coincides with the need to understand deeply the identity of one’s culture, of one’s nation, and of the civil community to which one belongs”⁵.

Ethnocentric, nationalist and traditionalist attitudes combine to produce opposition to world history. The debate that has taken place in the US on the National Standards for World History has shown how important are the first two attitudes, which we also find in other national contexts, for example in India or in many Balkan countries, and are often linked to religious fundamentalism. Yet again, the teaching of history is a political matter.

More generally speaking, in the background of this discussion there are two different conceptions of the individual, of his/her relationship with society and of the role that history teaching must play in building up this relationship: on one side we have the idea of an independent individual, member of humankind and citizen of the world, who is free to define and redefine, over his/her entire life, the political and social arenas where he/she wants to act or belong; on the

⁴ PAOLO PRODI, *Eclissi della storia? Prospettive della ricerca storica in Italia*, in “Passato e Presente”, n. 61, gennaio-aprile 2004, p. 92.

other side we find the idea of an individual who is born and has to remain member of a community well-rooted in the past and of history teaching as a means for creating a sense of belonging to this community. In other words, cosmopolitanism against communitarianism.

Germany perhaps represents a different case from the troubled experiences in Italy and in the US. In 2002 the Georg-Eckert-Institut launched a project for the introduction of a world dimension in history teaching in the various *Länder*⁶. The aim of the project is to gradually overcome the ethnocentric attitude by the introduction of cross-cultural topics, such as the political and economic relationships between Europe and the rest of the world after the 15th century; these topics should also be studied from viewpoints different from those of the European peoples. This is a gradual, reformist approach to the transformation of history teaching, quite different from that followed in Italy, which I would define as “revolutionary” in so far as it abolishes all particular viewpoints and adopts from the very start a continuous global viewpoint. At a political and cultural level the strategy followed in Germany is apparently successful, as it can override opposition stemming from the passionate defense of an ethnocentric viewpoint: the latter is not denied, but it is regarded in a relative manner. Indeed, the proposal made by the Georg-Eckert-Institut has been accepted by the Verband der Geschichtslehrer Deutschlands [Association of German History Teachers], which will

⁵ PAOLO CONTI, *Villari: caro ministro, ecco perché la tua riforma è sbagliata*, in “Corriere della sera”, February, 13th 2001, quoted by CAJANI, *A World History curriculum...*, p. 28.

⁶ MATTHIAS MIDDEL, SUSANNE POPP, HANNA SCHISLER, *Weltgeschichte in deutschen Geschichtsunterricht. Argumente und Thesen*, in “Internationale Schulbuchforschung – International Textbook Research”, XXV (2003), nn.1-2, pp. 149-154.

discuss it at the next Deutscher Historikertag (Kiel, 14-17 September 2004). Nonetheless, I fear that the absence of a clear conceptual world history framework may cause this gradualist approach to halt half way through. What may happen is that the study of the relationships between Europe and the rest of the world might simply produce an enlargement of the limited traditional Euro-centric viewpoint and a better knowledge of non-European culture; this would respond to the need for intercultural didactics, but would preserve the ethnocentric viewpoint on history as the main one. Thus, we would have a quantitative but not a qualitative change: we would still be talking about the rest of the world only when, and in so far as, it comes into contact with Europe. If we want to avoid the danger represented by this slightly corrected ethnocentrism, we must adopt world history as a general framework from the very start and then fit the histories of particular countries or macro-regions into this framework. Otherwise we run the risk of writing a “world history of Europeanness”, that was for example the goal of Ernst Troeltsch, who was convinced that “humankind as a single historical agent does not exist” and that “outside Europe the historical consciousness and the critical knowledge of the past is absent, because only the European spirit has felt the need for them”⁷.

⁷ ERNST TROELTSCH, *Lo storicismo e i suoi problemi*, III, Napoli, Guida editori, 1993, pp. 26, 24 e 27 (ed. or. *Der Historismus und seine Probleme*, Tübingen, Mohr, 1922).

3. Teaching world history: a challenge

The international situation of history teaching resembles that of a tribal fragmentation, in which each State or group of States tells history from the viewpoint of its navel, without a common language. This situation was brought about by a way of practicing historical research that was basically linked to the nation states. Nowadays, international historical research is freeing itself from this subjection and is looking for a common language to describe our world. Thus we face the following challenge: is it possible to overcome the different ethnocentric viewpoints not only in historical research but also in history teaching? This challenge cannot be avoided, because the teaching of any subject must be in tune with the results of scientific research.

While nowadays historical research can usually escape political control, this is not true of history teaching, because the latter — and the school system as a whole — is firmly in the hands of State, and some time regional, political authorities. However, independent intellectuals may in many ways influence politicians, by mobilizing public opinion. This is shown by the campaigns for rewriting history textbooks that were launched before the end of the First World War by pacifist associations, by the International Bureau of Education, by the International Institute for Intellectual Co-operation of the Society of Nations, by the Georg-Eckert-Institut and many others.

It is my opinion that the time has come for opening up a debate among historians and educators all over the world about a basic world history curriculum; the latter ought to provide a common language

which would enable us to co-ordinate history teaching in different States, with due respect for the special educational needs of each country.

The difficulty lies in finding a balance between this common language and differences in interpretation. Every taught history has a political and social agent that accepts it by defining a map of relevant historical events. This operation of acceptance develops through a debate among historians, politicians and other subjects, and its outcome — the history curriculum — is more or less univocal or pluralistic according to the more or less authoritarian or democratic nature of the political system in which the debate takes place. The goal of a democratic — and, in this case, cosmopolitical — system must be that of building up a curriculum that allows the largest possible number of interpretations within a commonly accepted pattern of relevant events — let's say a "canon". This balance is certainly difficult to strike but it is not impossible. It is generally agreed that the rise of the medieval city states, Spanish domination and the Risorgimento are relevant events in Italian history; the same goes for Viking migrations, the Reformation and the Thirty Years' War in European history; in a similar manner we must establish a pattern of relevant events in world history.

It is precisely this pattern that I have tried to work out in order to provide a basis for discussion.

4. Proposal for a cross-cultural world history curriculum

A cross-cultural world history curriculum should be planned on two levels in order to insure both unity and flexibility in relation to different school contexts.

The first level, the core curriculum, should be the same for all schools and should be made up of a conceptually homogeneous history of humankind from its very beginning, embracing all parts of the world and upheld by conceptual categories valid for all times and places.

This level will provide a general frame, giving sense and consistency to more in-depth studies that will make up the second level of the curriculum: these will be chosen according to the didactic and cultural needs of every single school.

Let's first examine the core curriculum. In order to respond to its didactic functions, the core curriculum must be consistent and continuous on three levels: intellectual, temporal, and geographical.

The intellectual framework is centered on two themes: the evolution of human societies — regarded as the main agents of historical development — and their reciprocal interaction. All societies may be analyzed and compared by looking at the following four inter-relating factors, upon which all societies — from the Paleolithic to the advanced industrial age — have been based:

1. the relationship with the natural environment, out of which men draw the resources they need (food, raw materials, energy);

2. the political and social organization, by which society is shaped thanks to the division of labor, power and gender relationships;

3. culture, including mentalities, religion, the arts, literature and music;

4. geopolitical dynamics, that is the peaceful or violent interactions, through either trade or warfare, among different societies struggling to gain control of environmental resources.

From the latter point comes the second theme of world history, that is the dynamic interaction among different societies, which through a progressive, though by no means continuous, development of economic and cultural relationships has led to the contemporary phenomenon of globalization.

The general framework must also be continuous at the temporal level. In order to achieve this, societies and their reciprocal interactions must be studied in chronological order, from past to present, since chronology itself is one of the key elements of historical knowledge.

Finally, there must be consistency at the geographical level. This means that no part of the world should appear, in any of the key moments of world history, as a blank area, lacking the essential pieces of information about what is happening there.

Beside being continuous at the intellectual, temporal and geographical level, the core curriculum is marked by a periodization into broad historical periods. When we come to determine the main ages of world history, we face the problems caused by the fact that many different regions of our planet have been isolated from one another for long periods of time. I chose to determine, in the first

place, the main turning points in the relationship between man and the natural environment on a worldwide scale: the Neolithic and the industrial revolution, which split the history of humankind into three main ages:

1. the age of hunting and gathering, when human beings drew on the alimentary resources already available in the natural environment;

2. the Neolithic age, when human beings began to build up alimentary resources by intervening in natural biological processes: human beings gained control of the reproductive cycles of plants (through agriculture) and of animals (through breeding), at the same time, beginning to develop their technology through the production of pottery, metals, machines and energy;

3. the industrial age, in which human beings accelerated the development of technology, mainly by increasing the amount of non-biological energy at their disposal, and by accomplishing a giant step forward in production — including food production — that has radically changed their relationship with the natural environment.

This division into three main historical ages, in contrast to one inspired by the *histoire événementielle*, cannot be based on precise dates. However, the beginning of both the Neolithic and the industrial revolution, though taking place in limited areas, may be regarded as turning points in world history because these revolutions soon affected the whole planet.

Upon this first chronological framework I build up a second and finer one, mainly based on the interactions between different societies. This second framework is thus centered on geopolitics and on the

development of patterns of economic and cultural relations. It is divided into nine eras, from the origin of human societies to the present (see *Table 1*). To these, I added a tenth era, representing the near future. This may be regarded as the conclusion of our analysis of the past and the present and is consistent with a diffused representation of historical consciousness as a synthesis of the perception of the three temporal dimensions (past, present and future).

These eras represent the first large intellectual framework by which students must learn to find their way through history.

Let us look at them more closely.

The first era (*The hominization process and the Paleolithic age*) embraces two differing phenomena that took place over very long periods of time: the hominization process and the long-lasting Paleolithic adventure of *Homo sapiens neandertalensis* and *Homo sapiens sapiens*, marked by the introduction of fire as a technological instrument. I chose to put them together for two reasons: firstly, in order to show the close chronological and geographical relationships between these two phenomena, and secondly because in this phase all different species of hominids entertained the same kind of relationship with the natural environment, in so far as they did not produce but rather drew out food by hunting and gathering. This first era is also important because it includes the first really global phenomenon, the spreading of *Homo sapiens sapiens* all over the Earth, made possible by the intercontinental bridges that emerged during the last Ice Age. The end of this Ice Age, from which resulted the isolation of America from other lands, marks the end of the first era. We should point out here

that the passage from this phase of the history of humankind to the next, represented by the Neolithic revolution, was due to a change in climate on a worldwide scale. The history of climate is indeed a very important aspect of world history, for it is a key element in the relationship between human beings and nature. Another important subject related to this phase is the genetic evolution of different populations of *Homo sapiens sapiens*, which is also a very relevant theme in the history of languages.

The second era is named after the Neolithic revolution: I prefer the term “revolution” to possible alternatives, such as “transition” or “process”, because I think that, although this phenomenon spans a long period of time (its initial phase lasting about two thousand years in different parts of our planet), we must underline that it represented a real breakthrough in the relationship between man and the natural environment. I included in this era the period from the 9th to the 4th millennium BCE in order to underline the different moments in which the Neolithic revolution started and developed in different parts of the world, being based either on agriculture, dry or irrigated (in Mesopotamia, the Nile Valley, the Indus Valley, the Yellow River Valley, south-eastern Asia, Mesoamerica and the Andean region) or on nomadic shepherds’ societies (in the steppes of Central Asia and Arabia).

These first two eras are usually neglected in the teaching of history: they are regarded as a prologue — significantly defined as “pre-history” — on which history teachers will dwell briefly before moving on to the study of “real” history, starting with the introduction of writing. This is a very serious intellectual mistake, stemming from

19th century prejudices about barbarity and civilization, and about peoples having a history behind them and peoples “without history”. On the contrary, these two eras must be treated with great care in a history curriculum, because they give us the opportunity to foster, from the very start, those fundamental ideas about societies and about the relationships among them that will constantly be used in the study of later periods and upon which a general view of humankind, embracing all times and places, may be founded.

In the third era (*From cities to empires*) the main emphasis is put on one of the consequences of the Neolithic revolution: the development of more and more complex patterns of sedentary society, from villages to cities, paving the way for the building up of states and empires. It goes without saying that this particular perspective should not lead us to forget the nomads of Eurasia and their relationship with sedentary societies. The third era is substantially homogeneous with the fourth (*Crisis and restructuring of empires*), which also focuses on the internal and external developments of State structures as its main feature. From this point of view the two eras could be regarded as one single era, ending with the geographical discoveries made by the peoples of Europe in the 15th century that paved the way to a new phase in the development of interconnections among different areas of our planet. I chose to regard the 5th century as a turning point for several reasons. Firstly, in Eurasia and Northern Africa there was a general crisis of the empires that had developed during the former period; this crisis also represents one of the most important struggles between nomadic and sedentary societies. Secondly, if we look at Sub-Saharan Africa and at America, we find that, in this same period, there

was a development of large State structures. Indeed, in Mesoamerica, the 4th century is marked by the beginning of the classical age of Maya civilization. In the Andean region, the beginning of the Middle Horizon period, characterized by the development of the large State structures of Huari and Tiahuanaco, dates back to the 7th century. In western Africa larger and larger settlements, such as Jenne-Jeno, began to develop from the 5th century onwards, leading up to the formation of States such as that of Ghana, which flourished between the 8th and the 11th centuries. In other words, in these areas the consequences of the Neolithic revolution developed more slowly than in the first area. This is one of the fundamental historical questions to discuss, in order to understand the economic, technological and demographic differences existing between the various regions of our planet at the time when European expansion violently set them one against the other.

The title assigned to the fifth era (*The world-wide expansion of Europe*) underlines the effects of Columbus' discovery of America, which I regard as the crucial event in the expansion of Europe. The discovery of America by the Europeans gave rise to new contacts and exchanges between the two main blocks of inhabitable land that had been split apart at the end of the last Ice Age, paving the way for the coming and going of human beings, plants, animals and germs across the Atlantic. Thus was set in motion the great transformation of economics and geopolitics that has given rise to the world we live in.

This huge worldwide change in the interconnections between human societies was followed by another one concerning the relationships between human beings and the natural environment: the

industrial revolution, after which I named the sixth era. In this context, three more interlinked revolutions will also be dealt: the demographic, the agricultural and the political revolution, the latter bringing the European *Ancien Régime* to an end, as well as the previous political structure outside Europe under the impact of colonialism. Their combined effects had a profound worldwide impact and completely and definitively altered the previous world order.

The two following eras have been defined on the basis of geopolitical features. The seventh period (*From the age of Imperialism to the world wars*) covers the rise of European States and their attempt to gain control of the whole planet through colonialism and the two world wars. The latter represent the climax and the end of the struggle for supremacy among European States; they also witness Japan's attempt to dominate the Far East. The failure of both these struggles for hegemony led to the rise of the United States of America and of the Soviet Union as world powers. The new bipolar order is indeed the key feature of the eighth era (*The world split up in two blocks*) ending with the fall of the Berlin wall.

The ninth era deals with the history of the present time, starting from the events of 1989, which represented the biggest geopolitical change after the end of the Second World War and marked the beginning of the (unstable) unipolarism of the US. The last era is the near future, that is the developments that may possibly take place in the various fields that have been constantly studied throughout the curriculum: the relationship between human beings and the natural environment, social structures, science and technology, co-operation and conflicts, with a special emphasis on the worldwide dimension of

these themes. In this final phase of the study of history, some conclusions should be drawn out of the study of the past, and these final considerations should be combined with the short and middle-term forecasts of futurology.

Let us now examine the didactic organization of these eras, first of all in the core curriculum and then in the more in-depth studies. In the core curriculum, planispheres illustrating particular topics on a worldwide scale will play a crucial role. They will synthesize the state of the whole world at various points in time, highlighting not only the main developments taking place in some areas, but also the regions characterized by a more stable or unchanging situation. For instance, a planisphere on the relationship between human beings and the natural environment in the second era (*The Neolithic revolution*) must illustrate the spread of agriculture, either dry or irrigated, the development of pastoral nomadic societies and the persistence of societies based on hunting and gathering; a planisphere on the development of States during the third era (*From cities to empires*) will highlight the areas where they developed, but will also show the other patterns of social organization existing in other areas; and, finally, a planisphere on the development of trade during the fourth era will reveal not only the nature and intensity of trade, but also its absence. From these general planispheres, particular maps will be drawn, highlighting the main societies that will be studied. For example, in the third era attention needs to be paid to the Ancient Near East, Egypt, the steppes of Central Asia, classical Greece, ancient Rome and its Empire, the Maurya dynasty in India, the unification of China, the Kush and Meroe kingdoms in Africa, but also the Bantu migration, American

history (the Adena culture, the Olmecs, the pre-classical Maya period, the Moche and Nazca societies, the Chavín culture) and the first phase of the colonization of the islands in the Pacific. The fourth era will focus on the further developments of these areas, always with the help of maps, but a new emphasis will be put on Japan, the Khmer Kingdom and the Arabs. An so on.

The combination of temporal and geographical continuity, that is to say a synchronic geographical approach to the study of societies and of the relationships between them, is thus the main didactic principle of the core curriculum.

As far as the didactic organization of the second level of the curriculum is concerned, the starting point might be, again, the geographical dimension. Indeed, the adaptation of the core curriculum to the various school contexts must take place in accordance with the place, State and macro-region where the school is located. The teaching of history (and of geography as well) should provide students not only with a general knowledge of history (and geography) on a worldwide scale, but also with a more detailed knowledge of the society where they live, so that they may understand its environmental, social and cultural features. For example, the European feudal system, the Ottoman Empire, the Inca Empire and the Meiji restoration cannot be ignored, in their main features, in any school, but they will be studied with different levels of complexity in Rome, in Cairo, in Lima or in Tokyo.

In other words, the second level of the curriculum must be organized by presenting the different geographical dimensions of history on a decreasing scale, starting from world history and moving

on to the history of large regional areas, then to the history of States, and finally to local history. It must be pointed out here that in some States, such as the US, there are two parallel history curricula, one centered on national history, and the other on the history of the rest of the world; in other States, such as Italy, these two histories are merged in the same curriculum. This situation has a technical but not a substantial, impact on a world history teaching plan, for national history automatically becomes the second level of this plan.

The more in-depth studies may be carried out with an active method of teaching: they will thus become history workshops, which will put students in contact with the work of historians and will develop their critical abilities. These studies will be structured as independent learning modules and will thus be interchangeable; they will combine operative aspects (inviting students to work on material or narrative sources, iconography, historiography) with the study of particular topics with an historical or interdisciplinary approach. It will thus be possible not only to study some themes of the core curriculum (such as the Roman Empire, or the Ming dynasty in China) in greater depth, but also to deal with topics spanning longer periods of time, such as population, diseases, religions, climate or the arts. The latter are, in my opinion, an important, though often neglected, didactic resource for building up world history frameworks: indeed, by emphasizing how art represents a constant feature of all human societies, from the Paleolithic onwards, teachers will help students to appreciate the value of all human cultures and to go beyond the deeply rooted distinction between barbarous and civilized peoples, or between primitive and developed societies. A planisphere showing the

artistic products of different societies at a given time is a powerful educational tool. Finally, teachers may present learning modules over longer periods of time, for instance in order to show overlapping sea and land routes and produce didactically effective syntheses, such as the model of three Oceans (Indian, Atlantic, Pacific) that unfolded one after the other over the past 2000 years.

It goes without saying that in the overall didactic plan, whether for one or for more years, a constant relationship between the two levels of the curriculum must be maintained and the various parts of the curriculum must be effectively spread over time in order to avoid gaps or repetitions.

Table 1*Core curriculum for world history*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<i>Era</i>	The hominization process and the Paleolithic Age	The Neolithic revolution	From cities to empires	Crisis and restructuring of empires	The worldwide expansion of Europe	The industrial revolution	From the age of imperialism to the world wars	The world split up in two blocks	The history of the present time	Future perspectives
<i>Chronology</i>	<i>Up to the 9th millennium BCE</i>	<i>9th - 4th millenniums BCE</i>	<i>4th millennium BCE - 5th century CE</i>	<i>5th - 15th centuries</i>	<i>15th - mid-18th centuries</i>	<i>mid-18th - mid- 19th centuries</i>	<i>mid-19th century - 1945</i>	<i>1945-1989</i>	<i>1989 - present day</i>	