Published on *Reviews in History* (http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews)

Australia, Canada and Empire

Review Number:
760
Publish date:
Monday, 1 June, 2009
Editor:
Deryck Schreuder
Stuart Ward
ISBN:
9780199273737
Date of Publication:
2008
Price:
£35.00
Pages:
418pp.
Publisher:
Oxford University Press
Place of Publication:
Oxford
Editor:
Philip Buckner
ISBN:
9780199271641
Date of Publication:
2008
Price:
£35.00
Pages:
294pp.
Publisher:
Oxford University Press
Place of Publication:
Oxford
Reviewer:
Andrew Dilley

The bowels of university libraries are often cluttered with the remnants of past historical approaches. The *Cambridge History of the British Empire* (1929-59) is one such work. At its core was a triumphal tale of the

constitutional evolution of an empire into the ?British Commonwealth?, a narrative which placed the old dominions (as Britain?s various self-governing settler colonies became known in 1907) centre stage. Its Canadian and Australian volumes were largely written by Australians and Canadians, reflecting how far their histories were constructed within an imperial paradigm.(1) [3] Flawed by an increasingly unconvincing teleology and unpalatable racism, the *Cambridge History* was eclipsed in the 1950s. Following Robinson and Gallagher?s historiographical revolution, those studying the British empire tended to focus on the dependent empire in Africa and Asia or on ?informal empire? (areas where Britain exerted substantial influence).(2) [4] Meanwhile, historical agendas within the former ?dominions? turned inwards or (in the Canadian case) southwards. Where connections with Britain were analysed, the dominant trope was to describe the evolution of ?colonies into nations?, often dubbed ?the old dead tree and the young tree green? school (after a quote from the republican poet Henry Lawson).(3) [5]

The *Oxford History of the British Empire* (1999, *OHBE* hereafter), now a decade old, reflected these trends. The settlement colonies competed amongst other regions for individual case studies, or featured as components within broader thematic chapters. Only John Darwin?s chapter in volume four served as a reminder that in the first half of the 20th century, the dominion connection had become perhaps the crucial economic and geopolitical relationship within the old empire, the core of a ?third British empire?.(4) [6] By then, interest in British relations with the settlement empire had revived. Along with Darwin, imperial historians such as P. J. Cain and A. G. Hopkins, and Andrew Thompson have come full circle and re-emphasised the growing importance of Australia and Canada from the 1880s.(5) [7] In addition a growing literature on ?multiple? identities facilitated a more nuanced analysis of local, colonial/national, and British/imperial identities than the older search for colonial nationalism permitted. Transnational history, tracing circuits of ideas and people across borders, similarly expanded frames of analysis beyond colonial/national units; the mid-Victorian period is particularly well served in this new literature on ?networks?.(6) [8] Finally, and bringing many of these trends together, the publications surrounding the ?British World? conferences have also emphasised the power and endurance of Britishness as an identity, and the dense social networks stretching across the empire; especially but not exclusively in the dominions.(7) [9]

Now the *OHBE* Companion Series seeks to rectify the lacunae in the original volumes. *Australia?s Empire* (*AE* hereafter) and *Canada and the British Empire* (*CBE* hereafter) both aim to offer a more penetrating treatment than the original *OHBE* achieved, without reviving the flawed triumphalism narrative of the old *Cambridge History*. Their editors ? Philip Buckner, Stuart Ward and Deryck Schreuder ? insist that the ?lodestone of empire? (critically re-examined) is an essential component of the history of the two former dominions (*AE*, p. 11; *CBE*, p. 20). Both are quite clear that this is not a tale of domination ? of imperialism in the most familiar sense of the word. Rather editors and authors in both volumes emphasise the ?capacity? of (white) Australians and Canadians to shape connections with the empire to their own ends. It is this assertion of ?local agency? which leads Ward and Schreuder to title their volume *Australia?s Empire* rather than ?Empire in Australia? ? a semantic shift praised by Buckner (AE, pp. 9?10; CBE, p. ix). In this the two edited collections present one viewpoint: they share enough to be reviewed together. Nonetheless, there are important differences between the two, and in the approaches taken by their various contributors. Each will be examined in turn.

Phillip Buckner?s preface to *CBE* emphasises that it ?presents a Canadian perspective of Canada?s long participation in the British Empire?, something which was not ?an elite preoccupation?. It was not true that ?support for the empire did not have deep roots in Canadian soil?, especially amongst the ?Anglo-Celtic? majority? (*CBE*, pp. vii, 19?20). The next five chapters offer ?a chronological narrative of the Imperial connection and of the attitude of Canadians to the Imperial relationship?(CBE, p. viii). Reid and Mancke?s chapter on the period prior to 1783, and Hurd?s and Buckner?s on the 20th century, helpfully reconstruct the role of the British connection in periods where a North American perspective often predominates. Buckner and Bumsted offer a rich account of the more familiar territory of the 19th century, especially the crucial period of constitutional change in the mid 19th century. Hiller?s chapter on Newfoundland?s 80 years outside confederation, focuses on narrating the main political and geo-political developments, and should

prompt further study of this neglected fifth dominion. These chapters afford both editor and authors opportunities to reflect on various themes: interactions between Europeans and indigenous peoples (especially Reid and Manke); the development of the state (Bumsted); and the adaption of British legal and cultural forms (Buckner). The latter forcefully (perhaps, as we shall see, too forcefully) rejects Ronald Robinson?s (and later Cain and Hopkins?) portrayal of the period from responsible government onwards as an informal empire based on the ?collaboration? of Canadian elites, cemented by economic dependence.(8) [10] Canadians successfully manipulated metropolitan connections to their own ends while the real basis of Canadian ?loyalty? was cultural: a shared sense of Britishness. (*CBE*, p. 13?14, 68?70, 107?8). Following from this, the end of Canada?s empire resulted from a cultural shift in the 1960s caused by the co-incidence of shifting patterns of immigration, French Canada?s ?Quiet Revolution?, the baby boom, the influx of American culture, and frosty political relations with Britain (*CBE*, p.108?25).

The narrative is followed by four chapters exploring the experiences of particular groups. The migratory origins of the anglophone majority (who lie at the core of the narrative sections) are discussed in chapters by Elizabeth Jane Errington and Marjory Harper. Errington?s chapter outlines the period between 1783 and 1867, noting the fluidity and particularity of the resulting identities, especially early in the period when it was ?only among colonial leaders, a few merchants who were tied to the Atlantic economy, and members of garrisons that there was a sense of being part of the British world? (*CBE*, p. 145). Marjory Harper?s more synoptic contribution tackles migration from Britain in the century after confederation, emphasising that the driving force was ?individual or family decisions shaped by private encouragement or agents? advice? (*CBE*, p. 167). In contrast to Errington she observes the potential for intermarriage and mingling overseas to make ?the celebration of their specific origins ? cosmetic rather than crucial? (*CBE*, p. 179). Two further chapters are devoted to the experiences of French Canadians and First Nations. Colin M. Coates narrates the experiences of the former, arguing that for a long period the British Empire provided an ?ambiguous space where a fair amount of autonomy was possible? (*CBE*, p. 199). Sarah Carter usefully traces indigenous peoples? interactions with European incomers from the fur trade through to the present, contrasting declining metropolitan involvement in relations their relations with Europeans with the continuing symbolic role played by the crown.

The final three chapters explore three themes: gender, economics, and the law. Adele Perry ably tackles empire and gender, drawing on a well developed international literature, albeit one in which ?Canada has played a conspicuously small role? (*CBE*, p. 238). The chapter teases out various informal connections with Britain, the critical role of gender in structuring settler-first nation relations, and the ways it shaped migration policy (especially towards Chinese immigrants). Douglas McCalla examines the role British trade and capital played in Canadian economic development from the late 18th to the 20th century. He argues that this role was not specifically imperial, arising rather from Britain?s role as a leader of the emerging world economy. Similarly, he downplays the importance of imperial economic regulation prior to the mid 19th century, concluding that the empire?s most important contribution was in ?creating the colonies, defending them and endowing them with the basic institutions of a market economy?, a conclusion which might have been developed further. A final chapter, by Philip Girard, does pick up on this theme, exploring the frequently overlooked role of the principles and practices of English law in Canada.

Overall *CBE* contains many interesting and useful contributions. Nonetheless, the division between general narrative, and more focused chapters does create overlaps, and means that the ?deep roots? Buckner claims for empire in Canadian history are not always given sustained attention. Buckner?s own contributions, and those of Harper, are notable exceptions.The hybridity of *CBE* contrasts with *Australia?s Empire*, which adopts a the purely thematic approach. The book is arranged in three sections: ?Contact: The Projection of Empire?; ?Dynamics: The Instrument of Empire?; and ?Cultures: The Conception of Empire?, in a way offering a structural metanarrative of the process of colonisation and the subsequent elaboration and development of a colonial and imperial society. The first section (?Contact?) opens with Aboriginal storyteller Hobbles Daniaiyarri?s ?Saga of Captain Cook?. The saga makes for fascinating reading and opens themes of history and memory, violence, and dispossession which recur subsequently. Next, Alan Atkinson?s chapter on ?Conquest? describes the violent process of dispossession, contrasting this with the

still powerful myth of *Terra Nullius*, while Richard Waterhouse explores the economic dynamics of settlement, and especially competing visions of large and small scale farming. Both also tackle the convict system, the subsequent evolution of a rural proletariat in the pastoral industry, and the gold rushes of the 1850s, shifting between the often violent social and economic processes surrounding settlement, and their cultural repercussions ? themes complemented in Anne Gray?s chapter on Australian art. Ann Curthoys writes from the ?other side of the frontier?. While genocide is discussed and the ?disastrous consequences? of colonization acknowledged, Curthoys stresses the agency of Aboriginal Australians in the face of settler hostility and ?a system of totalitarian or near-totalitarian control?, including appeals to British public opinion to embarrass Australian governments ? with limited results (*AE*, p. 97-8).

The second section examines five key ?Instruments? of empire. John Hirst?s contribution on ?Empire, State, Nation? stresses the transfer of liberal ?virtues? by early British administrators, namely the creation of ?a secure world in which all subjects enjoyed protection of their property and liberty?, an interpretation which sits uneasily with many contributions in the previous section (*AE*, p. 145). Eric Richards? chapter, unlike Harper?s in *CBE* does not delve significantly into the dynamics ? especially the private connections ? underpinning movements of people, and focuses on regulation, and the way in which this shaped flows to Australia from Britain and Europe while excluding Asians. Hilary Carey, in an excellent chapter on religion, emphasises the role of missionaries and humanitarians in mediating between Aboriginees and the emerging settler society ? often via the metropole ? and also its role in maintaining and mediating separate identities (especially Irish and Scottish) among settlers. Geoffrey Bolton (writing on ?Money?) tackles the economics of Anglo-Australian connections offering a concise overview of the ?pre-eminent? role of trade and investment in Australian development. It is a shame that his introduction and conclusion focused on refuting the radical historian Brian Fitzpatrick?s 68-year-old allegations of British exploitation.(9) [11] Instead, much more might have been made of his throwaway comment that ?a shared culture? might have ?facilitated? the pre-eminent role of British capital and trade in economic development (*AE*, p. 230). While Bolton?s subject is well established, Stuart Ward (writing on ?Security?) offers a reflective exploration of the way in a sense of strategic vulnerability ? first from other European imperial powers, and then from East Asia ? was central to Australian commitment to the empire, yet simultaneously a source of frustration and conflict with a seemingly unresponsive metropole.

The final section focuses on ?Cultures?. Mark McKenna charts the shifting, and ultimately declining role of the monarchy while Joy Damousi offers an insightful account of the shifting commemoration of imperial wars in Australian life, focusing particularly on ANZAC Day. Angella Woollacott?s stimulating chapter on gender and sexuality concisely tackles broad themes of masculinity and violence, the complex fears surrounding miscegenation, the development of Australian feminism, and the connections between gender, racial, and national identities. Richard White and Hsu-Ming Teo?s chapter on popular Australian culture, charts the way in which cultural production (for example of books) took place in a market place at times ? but only at times ? dominated by Britain and imagery of Britain. Neville Meaney offers an insightful overview of the role of the British connection in history and memory, emphasising its ebbs and flows, and the contrasting experiences of different groups ? for example Irish Catholics ? within those shifts. Ward and Schreuder offer a final chapter on the ?de-dominionisation of Australia?, drawing on Ward?s earlier work. (10) [12] In contrast to Buckner, the process they describe is not purely cultural. Rather (and *contra* Bolton), the unravelling of Australia?s empire was driven by British geo-political and economic reorientations in the late 1950s and 1960s (especially the decision to seek entry into the EEC, and the withdrawal from a role East of Suez) which shattered Australia?s imagined ?community of interest? with Britain, and precipitated a cultural reconstruction in the late-1960s and 1970s.

This extensive summary indicates the wealth of these two companion volumes. The reviewer found himself taking copious notes. Together they will doubtless form an essential addition to many reading lists. In particular, the accessible chapters on gender (Wollacot and Perry), relations with indigenous peoples (Reid and Mancke, Carter, and Curthoys), migration (Errington, Harper, and Richards), popular culture (White and Teo, Damousi), and ?de-dominionization? (Buckner, Schreuder and Ward) will prove invaluable for those teaching both Australian and Canadian history, and the history of the British Empire. The volumes ought

also to provoke broader debate about the role these two dominions played within the British Empire, and of the British connection in their respective histories. With this in mind, what issues emerge from *Canada and the British Empire* and *Australia?s Empire*? The remainder of the review will tackle four issues: omissions, the spatial dimensions of empire in the two volumes, the way in which empire is conceptualised, and in order to illustrate some of these points, the treatment of economics. In particular it is suggested that both volumes focus too much on connections with Britain at the expense of the remainder of the empire, and that the concept of empire is insufficiently refined to dissect its influence fully.

Naturally, some topics are not covered in the volumes ? and of course constraints of space and within the existing literature play a part. Buckner himself in his preface draws attention to many, including: ?the attitudes of non-British, non-French immigrants (including Americans)?; working-class attitudes; the connection between religion and empire; critics of empire; imperial policy making and policy-makers views; the persistence of cultural links with Britain; Canadians in Britain; Canada?s relationships with other dominions (*CBE*, p. xiii). With the exception of religion these omissions largely hold for *Australia?s Empire* . Some are particularly telling. In particular, while there is extensive discussion of race and gender, less is said on class ? that other element of the ?unholy trinity?. Neither volume has much to say on labour movements, and either their views on imperialism or the extent to which they were themselves embedded in broader networks stretching back to Britain.(11) [13] Australian labour certainly possessed links ?back home?, as revealed in the 1889 London dock strikes, by the role of individuals such as Tom Mann, or through exchanges of ideas. Moreover, Jonathan Hyslop has shown how flows of population and ideas around the world, and *between* settler colonies, shaped a developing ?white labourism?.(12) [14] In Canada, imperial networks competed with North American ones (although Canada could also link the two fields). Thus, labour movements illustrate the way in which connections with Britain were complemented by connections with other regions of the empire, and in the Canadian case, connections beyond it. This raises the issue, rarely addressed in the volumes, of why links with Britain were important in some aspects of Australian and Canadian life but not others. Was this the result of conscious choice, of the indirect consequence of linguistic bonds, and patterns of communication, travel, and exchange, or of the shifting distribution of power between Britain and these colonies?

This leads more broadly to a consideration of the geographical dimensions of *Australia?s Empire* and Canada?s empire. Both emerge as fundamentally bi-lateral affairs. As Schreuder and Ward observe:

> Australia?s empire was fundamentally about Australia and Britain. While the cartographic projection of a worldwide British empire- chequered in swathes of red- had long served to reinforce the timelessness and durability of Australia?s self-styled Britishness, it was never its primary source or inspiration (*AE*, p. 391).

This raises two questions. Firstly, how useful are Australia, Canada, as categories of analysis. Australia was only united in 1901, Canada in 1867. Prior to this important regional rivalries existed, but more importantly variations in environment, the timing of settlement, patterns of political economy, and communication. As Bumsted observes in *CBE*, in the mid 19th century British Columbia, ?fitted more neatly into the new British empire of simultaneously exploited and protected Aboriginals than it did into the older one of European settlement? (*CBE*, p. 63). *Australia?s Empire* in particular, through its thematic approach, tends to underemphasise such local variations. The aspiration to produce histories of national engagement with empire raises questions about ?national history?.

Secondly, was empire really only about relations with Britain? It is questionable how far this holds in first half of the 19th century, a period now well served by a literature emphasising the role of inter-colonial networks.(13) [15] A few authors in the volumes explicitly discuss or explore inter-colonial connections, or perceptions of the empire beyond Britain. Perry and Woollcott both describe the intra-imperial connections of Canadian and Australian feminists. Buckner and Ward note the interest in, and occasional involvement of, late 19th century (anglophone) Canadians and Australians in the Sudanese campaign of the 1880s, and the

South African War. However, more could be said links with other regions of the empire, as Buckner acknowledges in the Canadian volume (*CBE*, p. vii?ix). For example, Bolton?s chapter on Australian economic development makes little mention New South Wales? early trading links with South Asia or the Pacific, or the connection with Cape Colony facilitated by communications with Britain. Canadian connections with the West Indies receive little mention in *CBE*. More surprisingly, there is only scattered reference in the Australian volume to New Zealand, or its later ?sub-imperialist? role in the Pacific islands. The development from 1887 of the Colonial (later Imperial) conference, along with many informal equivalents, also fostered inter-dominion connections, as well as links with Britain. If some (and perhaps the most important) aspects of Australia?s or Canada?s Empires were *fundamentally* bi-lateral affairs (especially in the 20th century), this must be explained by considering the forces shaping those connections, and also by acknowledging *disconnections*, or *connections elsewhere*.(14) [16]

Such issues raise the problem of the meaning of empire found in the volumes. At least four approaches can be found in the various contributions, often reflecting dominant approaches within the particular sub-disciplines. Some treat empire as synonymous with almost any connection to Britain, others focus on the institutions of governance and regulation, and still others concentrate on imperialismor (more frequently) *Britishness* as a set of ideas. Most contributors on connections with Britain, and Britishness as a component of emerging Australian and Canadian identities. This begs questions, especially in the context of Ward and Schreuder?s distinction between Britain and the ?world wide British empire?. Given the ongoing debate about the centrality of empire in British identities and cultures, is it entirely disingenuous to ask whether a connection with British, or a British identity, is necessarily imperial? Furthermore, different assumptions about the nature of empire can produce very different analyses and conclusions. As a result it is hard to draw too many general conclusions about the impact of empire in Australia and Canada when the contributors are often describing different phenomena.

The treatment of economics in the two volumes offers an illustration. In contrast to many other chapters, Douglas McCalla emphasises that Canada?s economic relations with Britain were driven by ?market forces? rather than its *specifically* imperial aspects (particularly institutional and regulatory intervention). This stringent test produces an account minimizing the importance of the British connection. Bolton?s chapter catalogues Australia?s economic links with Britain without applying this test; consequently they look rather more important. (This should not obscure the fact that by the early 20th century at the latest, British trade and capital *were* much more important in Australia). My point is not to defend Bolton?s approach; McCalla?s is well grounded in an analytical tradition that can, ultimately, be traced back to Adam Smith. However, it does overlook the important connections forged by businessmen with Britain. It occludes the ?softer? role of businesses as catalysts for migration, exchanges of ideas, or the frequency with which colonial business elites were promoters of imperialism. Such a role would have been enough for heavy emphasis in chapters placing more weight on connections with Britain per se, for example Perry?s or Woollacott?s chapters on gender. Surely more Australian (and Canadian) businessmen travelled to Britain than feminists. As Miss Mack, the ?Australian Girl? who, as Woollacott recounts, visited London around the turn of the 20th century, wrote: ?The sort of people who travel? What a disillusionment! They who travel from Australia are the money-makers, the business people? (*AE*, p. 327).(15) [17]

One repercussion of the more exacting frameworks adopted is that both volumes downplay the broader importance of economic connections (other than the migration of labour). Such scepticism perhaps results from the importance of economic elites in models of ?collaboration? deployed by Robinson, and Cain and Hopkins.(16) [18] These models run counter to *AE*?s and *CBE*?s claims about colonial agency. Ward and Schreuder argue that ?colonial politicians and financial institutions were able to manipulate the system to their own ends ? or at least more so than the ?gentlemanly capitalism? model has allowed? (echoed by Buckner, *AE*, p. 17, *CHE*, p. 68). This overlooks Cain and Hopkins? recent works which acknowledge the independent goals of these dominions (and much hard bargaining), but argue that insofar as these goals depended on economic (and in principle other) connections with Britain, they subjected Australia and Canada to ?structural power?: in order to achieve these goals they had to comply with ?rules of the game? set in Britain.(17) [19] One can question the strength of the resultant imperialism but this more nuanced

model is a significant advance and it a shame it did not find a place in either volume. It has obvious affinities with Ward?s subtle analysis of Australian defence, which revolves around Australians? (realistic) perception of dependence on the British for defence, and desire for different policy priorities. This has the merit of describing how Australians (mainly policy makers) sought to assert themselves *within* a particular context or system (as Ward shows, not necessarily an economic system). Lest this be considered a purely antipodean point, it ought to be remembered that Canadians (perhaps more than Buckner emphasises, but for the essentially cultural reasons he emphasises) often saw the British connection as a counterbalance to their southern neighbour?s growing dominance. Thus there is need to consider the limits of colonial agency emphasised in the introductions to the two volumes. Structure, and at times power, require consideration.

In the end both *Australia?s Empire* and *Canada and the British Empire* contain many thoughtful contributions. Their best essays are excellent. Yet collectively they struggle to fulfil their goal of restoring empire to its rightful place in Australian and Canadian history. Omissions, an excessive focus on relations with Britain, and loose treatment of the word ?empire? all weaken the central argument. Moreover, in stressing Australian and Canadian ?agency? in relations with Britain and empire, the forces structuring those relations are often occluded. There were clearly different factors at work: varying degrees of economic and strategic dependence; the numerous networks (including many between colonies) spawned by communications and migrations of people and ideas; and complex elaborations of Britishness. Each had its own dynamics. Some relationships operated from the bottom up, others were elite affairs. Some were open to considerable colonial manipulation, others were asymmetrical. Only by acknowledging these differing strands, exploring their inter-relationships and the forces shaping them, could the full significance of empire have become apparent in these volumes. This may be an unfair criticism of an edited collection, where coherence is difficult to achieve. It is a limitation shared with both the original *OHBE* and many other volumes of the *Companion Series*. Certainly neither of these volumes deserves to join the *Cambridge History of the British Empire* in the stacks of university libraries. Each offers digestible and stimulating contributions which will provoke further study and debate even if they do not fully capture Australians? and Canadians? defiantly complex relationships with both Britain and the British Empire.

I would like to thank Frank Bongiorno, Marjory Harper and Rachel Bright for reading earlier drafts of this review. Its contents and any errors herein are, naturally, my own.

Notes

1. J. H. Rose et al., *Cambridge History of the British Empire*, (8 vols, Cambridge, 1929?1959).Back to (1) [20]
2. J. Gallagher and R. Robinson, 'The imperialism of free trade,' *Economic History Review*, 6 (1953), 1?15.Back to (2) [21]
3. N. Meaney, 'Britishness and Australian identity: the problem of nationalism in Australian history and historiography,' *Australian Historical Studies*, 32 (2001), 76?90; A.G. Hopkins, 'Back to the future: from national history to imperial history,' *Past and Present*, 164 (1999), 216?21. The original poem, dating from 1887, can be found at <http://www.poemhunter.com/poem/a-song-of-the-republic/ [22] >[Accessed 24 March 2009].Back to (3) [23]
4. J. Darwin, 'A third British Empire? The dominion idea in imperial politics,' in *Oxford History of the British Empire: The Twentieth Century*, ed. J. M. Brown and W. R. Louis (5 vols., Oxford, 1999), vol. 4, pp. 64?87.Back to (4) [24]
5. P. J. Cain and A.G. Hopkins, *British Imperialism: Innovation and Expansion, 1688?1914*, (London, 1993); P. J. Cain and A.G. Hopkins, *British Imperialism: Crisis and Deconstruction, 1914?90*, (London, 1993); A. S. Thompson, *Imperial Britain: The Empire in British Politics, c.1880?1932*, (London, 2000).Back to (5) [25]
6. A. Lester, 'Imperial circuits and networks: geographies of the British Empire', *History Compass*, 4 (2006), 124?41; A. Lester, *Imperial Networks: Creating Identities in Nineteenth Century South Africa and Britain*, (London, 2001); T. Ballantyne, 'Race and the webs of Empire: Aryanism from India to the Pacific', *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History*, 2 (2001); Z. Laidlaw, *Colonial Connections, 1815?45: Patronage, the Information Revolution and Colonial Government*

, (Manchester, 2005).Back to (6) [26]

7. *The British World: Diaspora, Culture and Identity*, ed. C. Bridge and K. Fedorowich (London, 2003); *Rediscovering the British World*, ed. P. A. Buckner and R. D. Francis (Calgary, 2005).Back to (7) [27]
8. R. Robinson, 'The non-European foundations for European imperialism: sketch for a theory of collaboration,' in *Studies in the Theory of Imperialism*, ed. R. Owen and B. Sutcliffe (London, 1972); Cain and Hopkins, *British Imperialism: Innovation and Expansion*, chapter 8.Back to (8) [28]
9. B. Fitzpatrick, *The British Empire in Australia: an Economic History: 1834?1939*, (Melbourne, 1941). Back to (9) [29]
10. S. Ward, *Australia and the British Embrace: the Demise of the Imperial Ideal*, (Carlton South, Vic., 2001).Back to (10) [30]
11. I must thank Frank Bongiorno for this point.Back to (11) [31]
12. J. Hyslop, 'The imperial working class makes itself ?white?: white labourism in Britain, Australia, and South Africa before the First World War', *The Journal of Historical Sociology*, 12 (1999), 398?421. Back to (12) [32]
13. See references in note six.Back to (13) [33]
14. For a useful contribution to this end, see S. J. Potter, 'Webs, networks and systems: globalization and the mass media in the nineteenth- and twentieth-century British Empire', *Journal of British Studies*, 46 (2007), 621?646.Back to (14) [34]
15. Quoted in M. Shanahan, 'Tracing the crimson thread: United Kingdom residents holding probated South Australian assets, 1905?1915', *Australian Economic History Review*, 43 (2003), 223.Back to (15) [35]
16. For references see note 8.Back to (16) [36]
17. P. J. Cain and A. G. Hopkins, 'Afterword: the theory and practice of British imperialism,' in *Gentlemanly Capitalism and British Imperialism: The New Debate on Empire*, ed. in R. E. Dumett(London, 1999), p. 204; A. G. Hopkins, 'Gentlemanly capitalism in New Zealand,' *Australian Economic History Review*, 43 (2003), 287?97; B. Attard, 'From free-trade imperialism to structural power: New Zealand and the capital market, 1856?68', *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 35 (2007), 505?527.Back to (17) [37]

Other reviews:
[38]

Source URL: http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/review/760b

Links:
[1] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/item/4374
[2] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/item/4375
[3] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#f1
[4] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#f2
[5] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#f3
[6] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#f4
[7] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#f5
[8] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#f6
[9] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#f7
[10] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#f8
[11] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#f9
[12] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#f10
[13] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#f11
[14] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#f12
[15] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#f13
[16] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#f14
[17] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#f15
[18] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#f16

[19] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#f17
[20] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#t1
[21] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#t2
[22] http://www.poemhunter.com/poem/a-song-of-the-republic/
[23] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#t3
[24] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#t4
[25] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#t5
[26] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#t6
[27] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#t7
[28] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#t8
[29] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#t9
[30] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#t10
[31] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#t11
[32] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#t12
[33] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#t13
[34] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#t14
[35] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#t15
[36] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#t16
[37] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/../../../../reviews/articles/dilleya.html#t17
[38] http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews