

This article is downloaded from



<http://researchoutput.csu.edu.au>

It is the paper published as:

Author: J. van Duinen

Title: The Borderlands of the British World

Journal: Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History

ISSN: 1532-5768

Year: 2014

Volume: 15

Issue: 1

Pages: 15pgs

URLs: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/cch.2014.0008>

http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_colonialism_and_colonial_history/

http://primo.unilinc.edu.au/primo_library/libweb/action/dlDisplay.do?vid=CSU&docId=aleph001516765

Author Address: jvanduinen@csu.edu.au

CRO Number: 56572

The Borderlands of the British World

***Empire, Migration and Identity in the British World.* Edited by Kent Fedorowich and Andrew S. Thompson. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013.**

***Empire and Globalisation: Networks of people, goods and capital in the British world, c. 1850–1914.* By Gary B. Magee and Andrew S. Thompson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.**

***Empire of Scholars: Universities, networks and the British academic world, 1850–1939.* By Tamson Pietsch. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013.**

***North American Borderlands.* Edited by Brian DeLay. New York: Routledge, 2013.**

***Understanding Life in the Borderlands: Boundaries in depth and motion.* Edited by I. William Zartman. Athens and London: University of Georgia Press, 2010.**

***Pacific Connections: The making of the U.S.–Canadian borderlands.* By Kornel Chang. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2012.**

This review article seeks to explore the benefit that might result from bringing two hitherto separate theoretical frameworks into conversation with each other. These two frameworks are the British World and borderlands theory. The British World is a relatively new development in the historiography of the British Empire. The framework was conceived and developed over the course of a series of conferences held between 1998 and 2007 and the edited collections that these conferences produced.¹ This approach took its cue from J.G.A. Pocock’s 1973 call for a “new British history” that would bring into closer propinquity the hitherto largely separate histories of the British Dominions and the wider British Empire. Thus the British World’s chief remit was to “bring the old Dominions back into the mainstream of imperial history and to examine their connections to the United Kingdom and with each other.”² Borderlands theory initially began by examining those regions of

interface between “Anglo” North America and Hispanic South America. It has since been adapted to any number of similar “borderlands” regions around the world and in world history. Through reviewing recent books that utilise these separate theoretical frameworks, this article will propose that the transposition of borderlands theory to the British World offers a means for redressing certain blind spots within the British World framework.

By and large, the British World framework has as its object of study the British sphere of influence created by the mass emigration of Britons to settler colonies like Australia, Canada, South Africa and New Zealand in the approximate period of the 1850s to the 1940s. By bringing Britain and these Dominion colonies within the same frame of reference, British World studies has aimed to transcend the parochial and insular nationalist histories that have tended to dominate the historiographies of settler colonies like Australia and Canada. To this end, the British World framework is more concerned with exploring the networks and flows of people, goods and ideas that connected these various settler colonial spaces and places. As such, the British World framework fits within a broader field of scholarship which contends that the British Empire, ca. 1850s–1940s, was a precedent to the globalisation/transnationalism that is of such interest to scholars of contemporary society. Viewed in this way, the seeds of transnationalism are imperial rather than postcolonial.³

The adoption of such an explicitly transnational perspective fulfils a couple of functions. First, it sets the terms of reference beyond the parameters of the nation-state. As such, a settler colony like Australia is not viewed in terms of a nation-state-in-waiting, as has frequently been traditionally depicted in Australian historiography, but rather as one of many “nodes” dotted around the British World web. These nodes could operate as regional centres to their immediate hinterland or periphery while simultaneously occupying a peripheral status to other centres, the most obvious and dominant one being Britain.⁴ Furthermore, although a number of important administrative, commercial, humanitarian and bureaucratic networks had been established in the early nineteenth century,⁵ it was in the late nineteenth century that a whole new plethora of networks in these and other non-elite spheres (labour and itinerant workers’ networks; familial and community networks; various religious,

educational and professional associations, even crime and prostitution networks) appeared. These networks were the concomitant of a late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century explosion of mass migration from Britain to various parts of the British/Anglo World. This mass movement of Britons, in essence, was the catalyst for the creation of the British World and the resultant networks have been described as the “cultural glue” that bound the British World. Moreover, the fact that these networks were enacted below the elite echelons of diplomacy and high politics means that they effected a kind of “globalisation from below.”⁶

The most recent of the books to be based on the British World conferences is Fedorowich and Thompson’s *Empire, Migration and Identity in the British World*. The book’s introduction offers a succinct overview of the parameters of the British World framework and, at first glance, it appears that not much has changed in the ten years since the first collection of essays was published in 2003.⁷ Indeed, even the titles of the respective introductions are remarkably similar—“Mapping the British World” (2003) and “Mapping the Contours of the British World” (2013). Although the editors don’t state it, this similarity may have been intentional since they also state in the introduction to *Empire, Migration and Identity* that “the concepts elaborated at the first British World conference... have proved central to the development of Commonwealth-Imperial historiography in the intervening years.”⁸ The introduction then goes on to rehearse a number of these now-familiar concepts and themes: the centrality of the settler/Dominion colonies; the transcendence of national(ist) historiographies through emphasising the transnationalism of the British World; the identity politics of Britishness; and the importance of networks for constituting, bounding and sustaining the British World.

Upon reading closer, though, one can discern some subtle shifts and modifications to the framework. For example, although the role of migration, particularly the mass migration of Britons to various settler colonies in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, always fulfilled a fundamental role in the framework, this appears to now occupy a primary, even definitional, position. Fedorowich and Thompson foreground this renewed emphasis in the opening paragraph of the introduction by claiming that the study of migration has not figured as explicitly in the scholarship of imperialism as one might expect. Thus, much of the

rest of the introduction elaborates the various ways in which migration played a seminal and constitutive role in the British World, so much so that by the end of the introduction migration operates as, if not the *raison d'être*, then at the very least the *modus operandi* of the British World. For example, if we take the following quotation—“migration was imperial, transnational and global; it relied on a variety of networks and webs that facilitated the sharing of local knowledge and the exchange of ideas that flowed and rebounded on a regional, national and international scale”—we can see that migration has virtually become a metonym for the British World *per se*.⁹ This emphasis on migration is reflected in the chapters contributed to the volume, with all dealing more or less explicitly with some aspect of the migratory process.¹⁰

On the other hand, some of the shifts in the British World, as outlined in the introduction, appear to be responding to various critiques of the framework that have appeared in the intervening ten years.¹¹ For example, a common criticism has been that in seeking to reassert the importance of the basically white settler colonies—those “Britons of Greater Britain”—British World scholarship has neglected the exclusionary and, in some cases, genocidally destructive effects that this British World had on indigenous and other non-British peoples with which it came into contact. Thus, Fedorowich and Thompson are at pains to highlight the “biopolitics” upon which much of the British World was based. Moreover, whilst explicating the facilitative role that networks played in the British World, they acknowledge that these same networks could also be “racially circumscribed and hence exclusive to peoples or regions not deemed white and ‘British.’”¹² This less flattering but nevertheless important aspect of the British World is the chief focus of a number of the contributing chapters. As such, the introduction and the accompanying spread of chapters in *Empire, Migration and Identity* offers a good exemplar of how the British World framework has adapted since its formulation more than ten years ago and where it stands today.

Thompson is also the co-author (with Gary B. Magee) of *Empire and Globalisation: Networks of people, goods and capital in the British World, c. 1850–1914*, a book which provides a great example of how the British World approach functions. A notable feature of the book is the exhaustive historiographical detail that is interwoven throughout the narrative and that positions the British World framework

within the broader terrain of British imperial history. The book incorporates and elaborates upon many of the features of the British World framework outlined above. Thus migration features prominently, with a whole chapter (chap. 3) devoted to an examination of the migratory flows that circulated around the British World. As Magee and Thompson have said elsewhere, “waves of emigration not only helped to integrate large portions of the [British] world materially, spiritually, intellectually, and politically, but engendered new, more trans-national ways of thinking.”¹³ For Magee and Thompson (as with the British World framework more generally), migration is the engine-room that drives a number of other important aspects of the British World, including networks and the cultural politics of Britishness.

One function of networks in the British World framework has been an attempt to move away from a linear metropole-periphery binary model and present the relationship between Britain and the settler societies as a more complex, multilateral phenomenon. People, goods and ideas are seen as moving around a web-like structure with many points of contact and intersection. *Empire and Globalisation* adopts this networked conceptualisation but what is particularly noteworthy is that it moves beyond the abstraction to put real meat on the bones of networks. A key method by which Magee and Thompson do this is through a meticulous examination of remittance records. These records provide a detailed picture of just how funds flowed through and along these networks in order to connect the many nodes of the British World. Moreover, they also show how these networks could often produce a hierarchy of privilege and power, depending on one’s access (or not) to the network structure. As Magee and Thompson put it, the power of imperial networks “consisted not only of the formal power of the colonial state, but the informal power conferred by belonging to a pan-British community, membership of which, while open to negotiation, was profoundly skewed along ethnic and racial lines.”¹⁴ And this is where the role of Britishness was all-important. These networks were most often based on *British* people, goods and ideas and hence one’s ability to access and utilise them depended on how well one enacted Britishness.

While *Empire and Globalisation* includes a number of standard features of the British World like migration and networks, it also broaches more contentious aspects of the framework. For example, the position in, or relation to, the British

World of the USA has been an oft-debated point. In *Empire and Globalisation* the USA occupies a somewhat ambiguous position. Magee and Thompson raise this point early on in the book and argue that the British World consciousness of a “Britain beyond the seas” neither fully embraced, nor wholly excluded, the United States: “The sense that America was a part of the British diaspora was real, but it was also ambivalent, open to dispute by contemporaries, and it eroded over time.”¹⁵ This ambivalence is a constant theme throughout the book and, in a fashion, reflects the ambivalent position that America has occupied in the British World framework over the years. *Empire and Globalisation* also attempts to address the charge that has been occasionally levelled at the British World framework that it potentially reinforces and celebrates Britishness to the exclusion of “others.”¹⁶ As alluded to above, Magee and Thompson are at pains to point out that “material power relations exposed the limits of... imperial networks to provide a counter-weight to the ethnic divisions, discrimination and dispossession associated with settler colonialism.”¹⁷ It must be noted, though, that at no point does *Empire and Globalisation* go on to explore in any detail the exclusionary power and impact of these imperial networks.

Empire of Scholars: Universities, networks and the British academic world, 1850–1939 offers a more narrowly focused case study of the British World in action. As with *Empire, Migration and Identity*, Tamson Pietsch’s *Empire of Scholars* is published in the Manchester University Press *Studies in Imperialism* series, a series that has long championed a “new imperial history” approach of interdisciplinarity with an emphasis on social and cultural history. *Empire of Scholars* tells a story of thickening and then disintegrating networks within the British academic world, roughly spanning the period 1850–1939. Pietsch shows that in the early decades, universities in the settler colonies were a product of, and responded to, essentially local exigencies, largely isolated from their metropolitan counterparts. The 1880s and 1890s witnessed a “turn to Britain,” which was facilitated through a number of formal and informal channels (scholarships, institutional affiliations, networks of academic sociability etc.). World War I served to intensify these connections through the mobilisation of academics throughout the British World, particularly those involved in scientific and technological research. This British “empire of scholars” persisted, somewhat surprisingly and despite contemporary rhetoric to the contrary, into the interwar period. However, the interwar years also set in motion forces which would

eventually contribute to its disruption and eventual disintegration. These included the increasing encroachment of American scholars into this British academic world; the rise of anti-colonial activism in various colonies of the British Empire, which sought reforms to the exclusionary practices of the British World system; the arrival of refugee scholars into Britain from Germany and Eastern Europe; and a turn to national priorities on the part of the settler universities. As such, we can see that Pietsch's story of the rise and fall of this British academic world aligns closely with at least the chronological contours of the British World framework.

There are other ways in which *Empire of Scholars* fits neatly within the British World framework, thereby providing a useful case study of British World theory. Despite Pietsch's equivocations in the introduction that the book differs from Bridge and Fedorowich's "concept of a 'trans-oceanic British world' that included the colonies 'set going' by mass migration from Britain," it's difficult to see how it does so in any significant way.¹⁸ While the British academic world may differ in type from some of the "globalisation from below" networks set in motion by mass migration—more "limited, exclusionary and irregular," as Pietsch points out—it does not do so in kind. *Empire of Scholars* still broadly aligns with a number of British World tenets: the downplaying of national histories, the significance of transnational networks, and the efficacy of Britishness for the functioning of these networks. Another way in which *Empire of Scholars* accords with a typical British World study is by explicitly excluding the United States. This is not an arbitrary choice on the part of Pietsch but rather a response to the structure and prejudices of this British academic world. Indeed, she provides some striking evidence demonstrating this bias against American scholars. For example, although there were often a number of American applicants for positions in British World universities they were almost never appointed. A case in point: "Between 1880 and 1930, ninety per cent of professorial appointments at Toronto, ninety-five per cent of those at Cape Town and all of those at Sydney were born either in Britain or in the colonies."¹⁹ Along with this exclusion of Americans, Pietsch also recognises racial and gendered exclusions, responding directly to the criticisms outlined above that have been levelled at the British World framework. She explicitly acknowledges that this British academic world privileged "raced and gendered forms of trust and sociability, [and that] the social and institutional practices

that connected settler scholars to those in Britain simultaneously sidelined the empire's various 'others.'"²⁰

Borderlands theory has been most commonly associated with the regions surrounding the now US–Mexican border. It originated as a critique of Frederick Jackson Turner's thesis of the American frontier as the crucible for the creation of modern America and Americans. In Turner's view, settlers who journeyed to the American frontier were transformed and, essentially, "Americanised" by the experience. Thus it was the frontier that created the distinctive American character and way of life.²¹ Forty years later, Herbert Eugene Bolton critiqued this national(ist) narrative by replacing the frontier with the borderlands. Bolton's borderlands were coterminous with Turner's frontier but offered a variant picture. Bolton saw these frontier/borderlands areas as the "meeting and fusing place of two streams of European civilisation, one coming from the south, and the other from the north."²² If, for Turner, frontiers were the places which produced the American grand narrative, under Bolton's gaze they became the borderlands where those narratives came undone. So while both Turner and Bolton emphasised the dynamism and agency of the periphery, they did so for different reasons. Put simply, the Turnerian periphery (frontier) was the crucible of the national story of American exceptionalism, while the Boltonian periphery (borderlands) was where this national story was challenged and became entangled.

North American Borderlands, edited by Brian DeLay, sits firmly within this Boltonian tradition. The book is essentially a statement regarding the current state of play in North American borderlands historical research. DeLay notes in his introduction that most current research employing the term "borderlands" does so in a decidedly modern context. That is, its subject of study is the various borderlands regions found between the territorial limits of modern states. DeLay correctly points out that, as a result, much contemporary borderlands scholarship overlooks the fact that "for millennia prior to the rise of nation states, distinct neighbouring polities interacted with each other in landscapes where boundaries were usually less precise than modern borders but nonetheless critical to collective identity, access to resources, and patterns of interchange and conflict."²³ DeLay then makes the case for the deployment of "borderlands" in an historical, North American, post-Turnerian sense

with the assembled chapters in the volume serving to illustrate the point. The essays are all derived from the “past generation of scholarship” (the original publication dates range from 1991 to 2011) and trace the history of these North American borderlands from the early seventeenth century to the end of the twentieth. They are organised into six themes—authority, Columbian Exchange, gender, war, ideas and crossings—and, taken together, serve to showcase the latest iteration of borderlands history in its originary North American context.

DeLay also mentions in his introduction that “borderlands history as it’s emerging is [both] broader than the American Southwest, and deeper than the study of modern state border regions.”²⁴ *Understanding Life in the Borderlands: Boundaries in depth and motion* exemplifies precisely the way in which borderlands history has spread beyond these early parameters. As I. William Zartman states in his introduction:

Borderlands have existed during all times. Whenever there have been political communities so large that distinctions could be made between the power centre and a periphery far enough away from it to be able to enjoy some degree of difference and autonomy, relations between centre and periphery tended to be counterbalanced by relations between neighbouring peripheries or by relations within the autonomous periphery. Empires both ancient and modern, cultural blocs and civilisational areas, and evolving states... all have had their borderlands.²⁵

The range of the contributing chapters testifies to this broad application and relevance. The chapters vary in geographic location from Albania to Africa and many places in between and in historical period from ancient Egypt through mediaeval Cyprus and the Ottoman Empire to the present day.

Thus *Understanding Life in the Borderlands* expounds a more open-ended interpretation and application of borderlands theory than the narrowly North American strictures of *North American Borderlands*. Essentially, borderlands in this more general understanding, can be taken to be “inhabited territories located on the margins of a power centre, or between power centres, with *power* understood in the

civilisational as well as the politico-economic sense.” The book is divided into two parts with the first section exploring “borderlands as the fringes of structures of power in evolution.” Various borderlands are depicted negotiating with power centre(s) and are shown to have the ability to pit rival power centres against each other for their own regional benefit, as Judith Vorrath explicates in numerous African borderlands.²⁶ Borderlands are also shown to be surviving the decline and death of the power centre, a situation most clearly shown in the cases of Albania and Yemen *vis-à-vis* the Ottoman Empire.²⁷ The second section of the book analyses “identities in transition” and demonstrates how the use and manipulation of multiple identities is a commonplace in borderlands. Thus, fourteenth-century Cyprus is shown to have a “complex interweaving of cultures washing around some very deliberate attempts to assert [multiple] identities” while the borderland inhabitants of the US–Mexican border possess “multiple notions of identity that [they] carry along with them in movement.”²⁸

As quoted above from *Understanding Life in the Borderlands*, “empires both ancient and modern, cultural blocs and civilisational areas, and evolving states... all have had their borderlands.”²⁹ *Pacific Connections: The making of the U.S.–Canadian borderlands*, by Kornel Chang, offers an extended study of how borderlands theory can be used profitably within an imperial framework. Chang’s work focuses on the US–Canadian borderlands in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and, by extension, the borderlands between the British Empire (as represented in Canada) and the United States. This is far from an Anglocentric world, however, as a central concern of *Pacific Connections* is the ways in which this borderlands region was disrupted by the presence of other actors from a “Pacific World,” namely Chinese and Japanese labourers and businessmen. The study offers an instructive example of the borderlands possessing a character and agency independent of the power centre(s). In particular, attempts on the part of both American and Canadian/British power centres to circumscribe labour and migration—chiefly along racial lines—are effectively resisted in the borderlands by the playing off of each power centre against the other. The resultant “polyglot assemblage,” which included “Chinese merchant contractors, Japanese and European migrant workers, Anglo labour activists, and South Asian and white radicals... propelled the circulation of people, goods and ideas across boundaries.”³⁰ Thus Chang paints a

scene of “identities in transition” similar to those that can be found in a number of the case studies in *Understanding Life in the Borderlands*.

But where *Pacific Connections* is most useful (at least for this review essay) is in providing an example of the analytical potential to be derived from applying borderlands theory to the British World. *Pacific Connections* corresponds to the British World framework both in terms of geopolitics (Canada, the British Empire and the United States) and period (late nineteenth/early twentieth centuries). However, by viewing the British World through a borderlands lens it is able to offer a new perspective, particularly regarding some of the critiques of the British World framework that were outlined above. One example is the way it addresses the issue of the inclusion of America in the British World. On one level, *Pacific Connections* can be seen to be expounding a more expansive Anglo-world by focusing on relations between Canada and America and how they interfaced in the borderlands. However, by exploring the ways and means by which the borderlands played the British-Canadian power centre off against its American counterpart, it could also be argued that Chang’s study has the effect of further illustrating the ambivalence with which America related to the British World.

But arguably the more profound contribution that *Pacific Connections* makes through its incorporation of borderlands theory into an imperial context is in regards to the racially exclusive practices of the British World. Indeed, Chang places these practices front and centre—not in any artificial or contrived way but because the nature and character of the borderlands (the “polyglot assemblage”) necessitates that such issues feature prominently. Chang demonstrates that “even as the migration of people and capital across borders gave rise to a fluid regional world with shifting boundaries, Canada, Britain, and the United States sought to police such global flows through hardened borders, restrictive immigration laws, and state systems of surveillance and control.”³¹ Thus the racially circumscribed practices of the British World are shown to play a central role in the demarcation of this world, particularly in such borderlands where the British imperial project began to blur at the edges. In this way, Chang’s study offers a penetrating analysis of the process by which Aron and Adelman have described borderlands becoming “bordered lands.”³²

I would like to finish by suggesting one final way in which an application of borderlands theory to the British World might be useful. One issue which the British World framework (including those British World books surveyed above) has tended to overlook is the presence of nascent national identities within this transnational British World; what Darian-Smith, Grimshaw and Macintyre have termed the condition of a “nation-in-Empire.”³³ For as British World scholars have sought to move away from national histories in order to view the British World and its constitutive settler colonial parts through a transnational lens, much in the way of the local or regional (and obviously national) has tended to recede from view. But I would argue that although transnationalism is a useful tool through which to view the British World, it is also important to not abandon the national scale and entity entirely but rather to recognise “the interdependence... of national/imperial formations in any given historical moment.”³⁴ In other words, we should attend to the complexities of how the national worked within the imperial transnational. Chang’s *Pacific Connections* is cognisant of such variable spatial and relational scales. His study accounts for the “contingent process of the territorial state, and considers the multiple and overlapping sites—the local, the national, and the imperial—that shaped its formation.”³⁵ The borderlands that form the focus of his study were necessarily a product of Euro-American imperialism but, at the same time, they resisted Euro-American imperium and, by doing so, exposed “the fissures between empire and nation.”³⁶ Thus, Chang’s *Pacific Connections* shows how the national was not subsumed by the transnational/imperial but, rather, that there was an important yet ambiguous dynamic that existed between these spatial ambits.

Jared van Duinen
Charles Sturt University

Notes

¹ Carl Bridge and Kent Fedorowich, eds., *The British World: Diaspora, culture and identity* (London: Frank Cass, 2003); Phillip Buckner and R. Douglas Francis, eds., *Canada and the British World* (Vancouver and Toronto: UBC Press, 2006); Phillip Buckner and R. Douglas Francis, *Rediscovering the British World* (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2005); Kate Darian-Smith et al., eds., *Exploring the British World* (Melbourne: RMIT Publishing, 2005); Kate Darian-Smith, Patricia

Grimshaw and Stuart Macintyre, eds., *Britishness Abroad: Transnational movements and imperial cultures* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2007).

² Buckner and Francis, *Rediscovering the British World*, 18.

³ Tony Ballantyne, *Orientalism and Race: Aryanism in the British Empire* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002); John Darwin, *The Empire Project: The rise and fall of the British world-system, 1830–1970* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009); A.G. Hopkins, “Back to the Future: From national history to imperial history,” *Past and Present* 164 (1999): 198–243; Kevin Grant, Philippa Levine and Frank Trentmann, *Beyond Sovereignty: Britain, empire and transnationalism, c. 1880–1950* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 1–15; Gary B. Magee and Andrew S. Thompson, *Empire and Globalisation: Networks of people, goods and capital in the British world, c. 1850–1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

⁴ Lester, “Imperial Circuits and Networks,” 133.

⁵ Alan Lester, *Imperial Networks: Creating identities in nineteenth-century South Africa and Britain* (London: Routledge, 2001).

⁶ Bridge and Fedorowich, *The British World*, 6–7.

⁷ Bridge and Fedorowich, *The British World*.

⁸ Kent Fedorowich and Andrew S. Thompson (eds.), *Empire, Migration and Identity in the British world* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), 2.

⁹ Fedorowich and Thompson, *Empire, Migration and Identity*, 25.

¹⁰ The earlier publication—*The British World*—contained chapters that addressed subjects ranging from a critique of the 1901 royal tour of Canada to an analysis of the propaganda content of the BBC in the Second World War.

¹¹ See for example, Katie Pickles, “The Obvious and the Awkward: Postcolonialism and the British World,” *New Zealand Journal of History* 45 (2011): 85–101; Saul Dubow, “How British was the British World? The case of South Africa,” *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 37 (2009): 1–27; Adele Perry, “Whose World was British? Rethinking the ‘British World’ from an edge of empire,” in *Britishness Abroad*, ed. Darian-Smith, Grimshaw and Macintyre, 133–52. For a recent critique, see Pietsch “Rethinking the British World”.

¹² Fedorowich and Thompson, *Empire, Migration and Identity*, 15–16.

- ¹³ “Round-Table: Magee and Thompson, *Empire and Globalisation: Networks of people, goods and capital in the British World, c. 1850–1914*,” *British Scholar* 3 (2010): 155.
- ¹⁴ Magee and Thompson, *Empire and Globalisation*, 112, see also 57–58.
- ¹⁵ Magee and Thompson, *Empire and Globalisation*, 19.
- ¹⁶ Pickles, “The Obvious and the Awkward,” 92, 95.
- ¹⁷ Fedorowich and Thompson, *Empire and Globalisation*, 57.
- ¹⁸ Tamson Pietsch, *Empire of Scholars: Universities, networks and the British academic world, 1850–1939* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), 4.
- ¹⁹ Pietsch, *Empire of Scholars*, 72.
- ²⁰ Pietsch, *Empire of Scholars*, 6; see also 72–84.
- ²¹ Frederick Jackson Turner, “The Significance of the Frontier in American History,” *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1893* (Washington, 1894), 197–227; See also Ramon A. Gutiérrez and Elliot Young, “Transnationalising Borderlands History,” *Western Historical Quarterly* 41 (2010): 29.
- ²² Herbert Eugene Bolton, “Defensive Spanish Expansion and the Significance of the Borderlands,” in *Wider Horizons of American Literature*, ed. Herbert Eugene Bolton (New York, 1939), 98.
- ²³ Brian DeLay, ed., *North American Borderlands* (New York: Routledge, 2013), 2.
- ²⁴ DeLay, *North American Borderlands*, 3.
- ²⁵ I. William Zartman, ed., *Understanding Life in the Borderlands: Boundaries in depth and motion* (Athens and London: University of Georgia Press, 2010), 2–3.
- ²⁶ Judith Vorrath, “On the Margin of Statehood? State-society relations in African borderlands,” in *Understanding Life in the Borderlands*, ed. Zartman, 85–104.
- ²⁷ Isa Blumi, “Illicit Trade and the Emergence of Albania and Yemen,” in *Understanding Life in the Borderlands*, ed. Zartman, 58–84.
- ²⁸ Zartman, *Understanding Life in the Borderlands*, 15–17.
- ²⁹ Zartman, *Understanding Life in the Borderlands*, 2–3.
- ³⁰ Kornel Chang, *Pacific Connections: The making of the U.S.–Canadian borderlands* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2012), 2.
- ³¹ Chang, *Pacific Connections*, 4.

³² Jeremy Adelman and Stephen Aron, “From Borderlands to Borders: Empires, nation-states, and the peoples in between in North American history,” *American Historical Review* 104 (1999): 814–41.

³³ Darian-Smith, Grimshaw and Macintyre, *Britishness Abroad*, 10.

³⁴ Antoinette Burton, “Who Needs the Nation? Interrogating British history,” in *Cultures of Empire: A reader*, ed. Catherine Hall (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 140.

³⁵ Chang, *Pacific Connections*, 4.

³⁶ Chang, *Pacific Connections*, 5.