

# *Facing Empire*



# FACING EMPIRE

---

*Indigenous Experiences in a Revolutionary Age*

*Edited by*

Kate Fullagar and Michael A. McDonnell

FOREWORD BY Daniel K. Richter

Johns Hopkins University Press  
*Baltimore*

© 2018 Johns Hopkins University Press  
All rights reserved. Published 2018  
Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper  
2 4 6 8 9 7 5 3 1

Johns Hopkins University Press  
2715 North Charles Street  
Baltimore, Maryland 21218-4363  
[www.press.jhu.edu](http://www.press.jhu.edu)

[CIP data to come]

A catalog record for this book is available from the British Library.

*Special discounts are available for bulk purchases of this book.  
For more information, please contact Special Sales  
at 410-516-6936 or [specialsales@press.jhu.edu](mailto:specialsales@press.jhu.edu).*

Johns Hopkins University Press uses environmentally friendly book materials, including recycled text paper that is composed of at least 30 percent post-consumer waste, whenever possible.

*In recognition of the scholarship of  
Tracey Banivanua Mar  
(1974–2017)*



CONTENTS

---

Foreword, by *Daniel K. Richter* ix

INTRODUCTION

Empire, Indigeneity, and Revolution 1

KATE FULLAGAR AND MICHAEL A. MCDONNELL

**PART I: PATHWAYS**

1.

The Future Makers: Managing Australia in 1788 27

BILL GAMMAGE

2.

The Indigenous Architecture of Empire: The Anishinaabe Odawa  
in North America 48

MICHAEL A. MCDONNELL

3.

Exploiting British Ambivalence in West Africa: Fante Sovereignty  
in the Early Nineteenth Century 72

REBECCA SHUMWAY

4.

New Ecologies: Pathways in the Pacific, 1760s–1840s 91

JENNIFER NEWELL

5.

Closed Sea or Contested Waters? The Persian Gulf in the  
Age of Revolution 115

SUJIT SIVASUNDARAM

**PART II: ENTANGLEMENTS**

6.

Red Power and Homeland Security: Native Nations and  
the Limits of Empire in the Ohio Country 145

COLIN G. CALLOWAY

7.  
Between Reform and Revolution: Class Formation and British Colonial  
Rule at the Cape of Good Hope 163

NICOLE ULRICH

8.  
Christianity, Commerce, and the Remaking of the Māori World 192

TONY BALLANTYNE

9.  
Broken Treaty: Taungurung Responses to the Settler Revolution  
in Colonial Victoria 214

ROBERT KENNY

**PART III: CONNECTIONS**

10.  
Envoys of Interest: A Cherokee, a Ra'iatean, and the  
Eighteenth-Century British Empire 239

KATE FULLAGAR

11.  
Makahs, Māori, and the Settler Revolution in Pacific Marine Space 256

JOSHUA L. REID

12.  
Imperial Structures, Indigenous Aims: Connecting Native Engagement  
in Scotland, North America, and South Asia 281

JUSTIN BROOKS

13.  
Shawundais and the Methodist Mission to Native North America 303

ELSPETH MARTINI

AFTERWORD, by *Shino Konishi* 331

*Contributors* 339

*Index* 000



“Now you are hearing the reasons of our paying so much attention to the British,” the Seneca orator Sagoyewatha (Red Jacket) told a US commissioner in 1791. “[I]t is because they give us such good advice.” They “always tell us we must be independent, and take advice from nobody, unless it pleases us.”\* Of course Sagoyewatha was speaking to the US enemies of the British and pulling their postcolonial beards. Still, it is hard to imagine a statement more opposite to the one that opens Kate Fullagar and Michael A. McDonnell’s introduction to this fascinating volume: Woollarawarre Bennelong, visiting London from what colonizers called New South Wales, was so disgusted by what he heard—or rather did not hear—from British officials that, on his return home, he declared he would “go to England no more.” No paying attention to British advice for him. There was no single way in which indigenous peoples faced the British empire and heard its messages in the Age of Revolution.

Indeed, there were far more than thirteen ways, the number of chapters in this volume. As the following pages show, between about 1760 and 1840, empire revealed its many faces in places as diverse as the ones that Britons labeled Australia, North America, West Africa, the Pacific Islands, New Zealand, the Persian Gulf, and the Cape of Good Hope. Agents of the British empire used those labels as they looked out on peoples they ruled (or more often dreamed of ruling) around the world. To those peoples, however, the spaces had different names, and they belonged not to the British but to the Eora, Anishinaabeg, Fante, Māori, Wahhabis, Khoesan, and Macleods. The contributors to *Facing Empire* situate themselves in those contested

\*Granville Ganter, ed., *The Collected Speeches of Sagoyewatha, or Red Jacket* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2006), 27.

indigenous spaces to help us understand the varied faces that the British empire displayed—or rather the varied faces that indigenous peoples imposed on their would-be European rulers. For, as these chapters show, while there may have been one British empire, there was no single British imperial experience. Indigenous peoples saw to that.

So, too, did the varied ecological, human, and political landscapes where experiences of empire took shape. Indigenous Australians, Bill Gammage demonstrates, used “fire-stick farming” to divide their land into zones of “fire and no fire.” Anishinaabeg, McDonnell explains, used dense but flexible bonds of kinship to structure a North American Great Lakes community that absorbed or rejected European empires on its own terms. Fante, Rebecca Shumway argues, used their connections to the British on the Gold Coast of West Africa to ward off a more threatening imperial foe, their Asante neighbors. And so it went in every locale, around the Pacific, around the Indian Ocean, around coastlines and continental interiors. What Fullagar and McDonnell call “Pathways,” “Entanglements,” and “Connections” all worked out largely on indigenous terms, and, as the contributors to this volume show, it was often difficult to determine who was colonizing whom.

There was no single story, no unified British imperialism, no common experience of indigeneity. But comparisons, contrasts, and commonalities can emerge for readers who immerse themselves in the rich details these chapters provide. Familiar words take on new meanings. *Homeland security*, *class formation*, *commerce*, even *treaty* and *mission*, resonate differently after one hears from Colin G. Calloway, Nicole Ulrich, Tony Ballantyne, Robert Kenny, and Elspeth Martini. Meanwhile, unfamiliar juxtaposition—of Cherokees and Polynesians, Makahs and Māoris, Asians and Scots—reveals unanticipated connections in the hands of Kate Fullagar, Joshua L. Reid, and Justin Brooks. The authors’ approaches are as varied as the indigenous spaces they explore.

To see how the British empire functioned from these varied perspectives is not just to face empire from its peripheries rather than its metropole. It is to appreciate that what those in the imperial metropole considered peripheries are better seen as empire’s many centers, the dispersed sites of intense interactions with indigenous peoples and, in many cases, settler colonists. To face empire from these dispersed centers, then, is to see imperialism at work, to glimpse anew its mechanisms, strengths, weaknesses, and violence. Most importantly, it is to escape a view of empire in which Europeans are active and indigenous peoples passive, Europeans are aggressors and indigenous

peoples mere victims. When Sagoyewatha explained “the reasons of our paying so much attention to the British,” he was also reminding us to shift our focus from the British themselves to indigenous reasons and modes of attending to them. On the need for that shift in focus, Woollarawarre Bennelong surely would have agreed. The chapters in this volume bring us many steps closer to understanding why.

DANIEL K. RICHTER



# *Facing Empire*



---

---

*Empire, Indigeneity, and Revolution*

KATE FULLAGAR AND MICHAEL A. MCDONNELL

In the early spring of September 1795, an Indigenous Eora man arrived home on a ship from Britain. The man was Woollarawarre Bennelong. He had been gone for nearly three years, visiting the land of the people who had set up a penal colony in his native district back in 1788. Bennelong had been one of the first Aboriginal people to communicate with the leader of the New South Wales colony, Arthur Phillip. Accepting Phillip's invitation to accompany him to London in 1792, Bennelong became the first Indigenous person from today's Australia to step upon British shores.

Despite Phillip's high expectations, Bennelong did not elicit quite the level of attention in Britain that had accrued around earlier Indigenous envoys from other parts of the world. Few dignitaries were impressed enough to meet with him. Perhaps they were too distracted by the imminent prospect of war against their enemy, the French Revolutionary state. More significantly, though, Bennelong turned out to be rather "disappointed" with Britons, unmoved one way or another by their contemporary revolutionary challenges. In addition, the English weather and cramped naval living conditions made him ill and depressed.<sup>1</sup> Once back home, he was happy to dictate a letter to a British host confirming that "me go to England no more."<sup>2</sup>

Upon his return home, Bennelong forged a relationship with the incoming governor of New South Wales, John Hunter—despite his unpromising recent experience with the British. In turn, Hunter promised to maintain Phillip's open-door policy to Bennelong at Government House. Though generally unsympathetic to Aboriginal people, Hunter had learned from Phillip that the colony's success depended on good relations with Indigenous locals. For the next two years, Bennelong made occasional use of Hunter's invitation. Having seen firsthand the potential for conflict and violence between

his people and the newcomers, as well as the impact of British diseases among the Eora, Bennelong wanted to keep up with all new developments around Sydney Cove. Bennelong may have been uninterested in the Revolutionary politics of Europe, but he was concerned about the pathogenic and social revolutions that now threatened his community.

Still, by century's end, Bennelong was rarely seen among the white settlements. Most colonists at the time saw Bennelong's retreat from them as a form of backsliding. They shook their heads in resigned disappointment to see how he "preferred the rude and dangerous society of his own countrymen." They were sad that their own "effort was in vain," and that Bennelong was, after all, "beyond all hopes of amelioration by culture."<sup>3</sup> Subsequent historians have rightly cast a skeptical eye over such sentiments. But at the same time, these scholars have, on the whole, maintained the sense of decline implicit in the colonial narrative about Bennelong. They argue that Bennelong's retreat was the consequence not of his "savagery" but of his go-between status: caught between two worlds, he "rushed headlong to his dissolution"; driven by drink and despair, he "fumed his way to an outcast's grave."<sup>4</sup>

More recently, though, at least some historians have queried the idea that Bennelong's post-British life represented decline at all. Keith Smith, especially, has found that from the late 1790s Bennelong became a high-ranking elder among his Wangal people. He was beloved by his descendants and, later, even respected by many Indigenous rivals. His death occasioned a much grander ritual bloodletting among his kin than was typical. Bennelong's absence from the British colony turned out to indicate an important, and too-long ignored, presence elsewhere. His haggard looks later in life—so often taken to be a sign of drink—were instead perhaps the toll of responsibility in his own revolutionary age.<sup>5</sup>

Such a historiographical re-visioning is becoming more common in the disparate literatures on European-Indigenous relations across the globe. It has been made possible not simply by a richer and more sympathetic reading of older sources of cross-cultural encounters. It has also resulted from a total repositioning of the reader, from that of newcomers on foreign shores to that of Indigenous peoples on home shores. Drawing on innovatively researched accounts of the deep histories of Indigenous peoples—many of which have been written or recorded by Indigenous peoples themselves—historians of the colonial experience have begun to move beyond the standard encounter story to reconstruct a fuller picture of the early modern era.



This was the kind of move that both of us found ourselves undertaking, though separately, while colleagues at the University of Sydney (just a few miles south of Bennelong's country). McDonnell had published previously on conflicts between revolutionaries during the American War of Independence but was now moving toward a history of the Great Lakes Indians before and during the birth of the new republic.<sup>6</sup> Fullagar had worked earlier on popular British responses to "New World" Indigenous peoples visiting the eighteenth-century metropolis, but she was now turning the tables to investigate the experiences of the visitors themselves across the Age of Revolution.<sup>7</sup> Suddenly, our shared interest in Indigenous histories instigated serious conversations. In retrospect, it is odd that our initial research projects had not brought us together before—both dealt, after all, with the same empire in the same era. While this initial disconnect may be an indictment of the blinkering effect of national borders and historiographical trends in American and British history (and no doubt on ourselves), it was also revealing. Among the myriad promises of Indigenous history is the way it can raise questions about old historiographical boundaries and offer possibilities for new linkages and collaborations.<sup>8</sup>

One of our first conversations focused on the main models available for thinking about the Indigenous past in relation to European imperial edifices, especially in the critical period we now call the Age of Revolution. We had both benefited enormously from the finely grained studies of Indigenous societies that had flowered, in bursts, from the 1970s—especially, in our cases, of Native American and Pacific Islander societies. The depth of worlds recovered by scholars such as Theda Perdue on the Cherokee or Malama Meleisea on Samoans was a deafening rebuke to the idea that Indigenous peoples were "without history."<sup>9</sup> But these examples were not necessarily solutions to our problem of thinking about Indigenous relations with European empires from Indigenous perspectives. (Few Indigenous-focused historians, understandably, had much or any interest in diverting attention away from their recovery projects to go over what they considered to be more than well-worn historical tracks.) In other words, if we take the case of Bennelong, we valued the work done to recover his deeper Indigenous past, but we wanted eventually to return to the original question of his supposedly curious relationship with the British colony—only now with fresher eyes and more nuanced knowledge.

We also admired, and had even occasionally engaged in ourselves, the kind of "cross-cultural" history that tries to draw out "both sides" of a relationship

between European and Indigenous. “Encounter histories” such as Richard White’s influential work on the Great Lakes or Inga Clendinnen on Mexico have done much to destabilize old certainties of the imperial past. They have made us sensitive to seeing the means by which Indigenous peoples shaped relations, and ways of relating, with European newcomers in specific and often very local contexts. But including Indigenous voices is not the same as hearing the story from their perspective.<sup>10</sup> In Bennelong’s case, again, it was because so many later historians maintained the centrality of the encounter in their investigations that they did not see alternative narratives for his behavior. We wanted to write histories of empire that did more than just include Indigenous people; we wanted to write histories of empire with Indigenous people as the *main* subjects.

Finally, we wanted to try to reenvision this history across a particularly crucial era in imperial and modern history. The deep histories of Indigenous peoples, together with the creative ways historians have begun to reimagine Indigenous-European relations in a variety of contexts, raised questions for us about the role of Indigenes in world history at a moment in which older ideas about politics, economics, and societies were coming undone. While for many Europeans the Age of Revolution ushered in new democratic possibilities, newly industrialized arrangements, and new public and private mores, it also reshaped and expanded the global imperial map. There was a profound acceleration in encounters and contacts between new peoples around the world. In the end, this may constitute the most significant revolution of all.

What did revolution look like to Indigenous peoples? What connections did they make between themselves, newcomers, and other Indigenous peoples, and what lessons were learned? In what ways did Indigenous people like Bennelong shape this critical moment in the global past?

### **Facing Empire**

This collection is a first step in trying to answer these questions. Recognizing that much of the valuable insights from the new literature on Indigenous peoples still comes from those with a local or regional focus, we wanted to bring together emerging and senior scholars of often compartmentalized regions to put their work into conversation with one another in a more expansive, comparative framework. Our starting point was our shared appreciation of Daniel Richter’s conceptually innovative work *Facing East from Indian*

*Country: A Native History of Early America* (2001). This book shows ways of narrating the foundational history of neo-imperial nations where Indigenous people were not just important but center stage throughout.<sup>11</sup>

Despite increasing awareness of the place of Indigenous peoples in the history of an expanding British empire, and our increasingly sophisticated studies of Indigenous peoples themselves across the Revolutionary era, few scholars have tried to think comparatively about Indigenous experiences within and across expanding imperial borders. Historians of empire are now more attuned than ever to the interplay between the local and metropolitan, and have explored the myriad ways in which Indigenous people shaped European exploration, scientific expeditions, missionary efforts, and colonial settlement. Some scholars have also gone so far as to analyze the two-way processes at play—between colonizers and the colonized but also between periphery and metropole.<sup>12</sup> Yet comparative efforts across empire and between places have almost invariably taken a European perspective, as historians have followed on the shoulders of mobile British explorers, traders, missionaries, and settlers. In this seemingly European-driven imperial story, Indigenous peoples too often become distant and passive players—objects of European exploration, exchange, sexual relations, legalities, and academic consideration. This volume aims to switch that around, focusing instead on different Indigenous peoples and the various ways they found themselves “facing empire.”<sup>13</sup>

Certainly, there are some good reasons for the scholarly neglect of such an enterprise, and to tread carefully in thinking comparatively about Indigenous experiences across empire. The great strength of recent, deep Indigenous histories, after all, has been the careful and very local excavations of cultures and knowledges that have emphasized complex pasts, dynamic and complicated relations with newcomers, as well as Indigenous resilience and persistence to the present. When we look at suprahistorical patterns, we run the danger of losing this depth. As Peter Wood noted some time ago, the multilayered stories of protracted, cumulative, and reciprocal associations—involving war and peace, weapons and diseases, sexuality and kinship, food and clothing, songs and stories, ideas and beliefs—that extended over many generations too often in large-scale surveys give way to summaries of “brief, decisive, and one-sided confrontations.”<sup>14</sup> Given that many rich Indigenous histories are still not yet well integrated into larger national narratives, comparative work runs the risk of similar compression.

We need only look at the genealogy of Atlantic history, or even some settler colonial studies, to see just how much comparative-minded scholars can push Indigenous peoples even further into the background.<sup>15</sup> In addition, we recognize that some scholars might be reluctant to perpetuate the European framing that such a comparative effort must still entail: to place in historical relation Indigenous peoples from a scattered range of places on the globe who shared only a common experience of contact with European empires is to grant some special privilege to those very European empires.

Yet we argue that reluctance has come at a price. First, we miss opportunities to understand how Indigenous peoples shared some common means of repelling, accommodating, or appropriating the European encounter. Are there more similarities or more differences in the ways diverse peoples in the Americas, Africa, and the Antipodes treated gender relations, went to war, or conducted diplomacy with expectant Europeans? What common or opposing factors shaped Algonquian, Eora, and Xhosa responses to British trading and territorial claims in 1763, 1788, and 1795? Thanks to works that have “faced empire” in certain moments, we have more understanding of the complicated variables at play in European-Indigenous relations in specific settings from native, rather than newcomer, perspectives. But we now need to try to discover some larger patterns. Scholars sensitive to the nuances of these diverse histories must be able to answer some of these basic questions in order to inform the work of those already making comparisons across imperial sites—who too often rely on an older or more simplistic literature of Indigenous history. If historians trained and immersed in new approaches to Indigenous history do not ask and/or try to answer these questions, we lose the chance to enrich so-called transnational or global approaches.

Through comparison, we can also begin to map out possible networks of resistance, exchange, and communication among and between Indigenous communities during this period. We already know about at least some of the extensive networks of trade and communication among different Indigenous groups across rivers, lakes, and vast tracts of land in the Americas, Africa, and Australia, for example. Such networks helped prepare many Indigenous peoples for encounters with Europeans long before they ever saw them and shaped their response to the newcomers. As McDonnell points out in chapter 2, the networks also later provided the architecture for new imperial initiatives, as well as the nucleus for coordinated movements of resistance to, and exchanges with, Europeans. From time to time, too, we get tantalizing glimpses of disparate communities of Indigenous peoples laboring,

exploring, sailing, fighting, marrying, and eventually communicating across far-flung imperial quarters. In growing numbers during the eighteenth century—like the subjects of Fullagar’s and Martini’s chapters, for instance—many Indigenous peoples traveled in formal groups to Europe. Others served informally in or with European armies and navies. Many more joined crews of merchant ships plying legal and illegal waters. Who did they talk to? What stories did they tell? Imperialism was a destructive force in the lives of many Indigenous communities, but it also created opportunities for meeting new allies and for the creation of ever-wider networks of resistance. We need more focus on these moments and some thought about their possible meanings and impact.

Once we have a deeper understanding of the differences, similarities, and connections between diverse Indigenous groups, and particularly their relations with Europeans, we can measure more effectively their overall influence on European theories, policies, and practices. A new generation of historians have written not just Indigenous-centered stories, but they have also demonstrated how profoundly native peoples have shaped European history, particularly at the specific, colonial level. We now have an opportunity to think about how Indigenous-shaped local exchanges, cultural relations, and intercultural warfare provoked discussion and policymaking in Whitehall as much as it did in Charleston, Cape Town, or Sydney. Even more than this, facing empire from Indigenous perspectives may push us to reform or transform the way we think about these processes. At the very least, facing empire will help move us closer to challenging our ideas of what is central in driving imperial history, from the “newcomers” to the “natives.”

### Indigenous Experiences

With some sense of a model, then, we set about inviting scholars to join us in a collective attempt to “face empire.” Very quickly, we realized the necessity to impose some limits—for an initial publication anyway. First, we decided to deal only with Indigenous experiences of the British empire. This was the empire we knew best as historians, but it was also one of the most wide-ranging and longest-felt empires in modern times. And while we contemplated a more global approach—to encompass the extraordinary range of experiences elsewhere in this same era, such as in South and Central America—we concluded that focusing only on British expansion would help us better assess Indigenous influences on empire. Second, we narrowed the

period to what has been variously termed the Age of Revolution, the “Imperial Meridian,” or even the “birth of modernity”—again, familiar terrain for us but also, as discussed further later on, a turning point for both imperialism and Indigenous people.<sup>16</sup>

The most important limit to clarify, of course, was our definition of Indigeneity. Many historians struggle with the term. As C. A. Bayly long ago pointed out, it has always been “fractured and contested.”<sup>17</sup> If it is always tied to land, how do we account for Indigenous mobility? If it is always tied to originality, how do we account for Indigenous people who colonize? How do we deal with mixed communities? And does there have to be a straight line of descent from Indigenous people in the past to Indigenous people in the present, and if so, how is that to be measured?

Bayly himself answered these queries by taking a metahistorical approach, pointing out that as an “epistemological” (or comparable) category at least, Indigenous people were the “creation” of empire—created, indeed, during the period investigated here.<sup>18</sup> While useful in reminding us of the artifices implied in the term, such an approach does not necessarily help us bridge the divide between its emergence in an imperial language and its currency in the global present. Contemporary international organizations such as the United Nations have preferred to define Indigenous as an identity both self-claimed and community endorsed.<sup>19</sup> Such an emphasis on identity must be absorbed for our histories to have any resonance or meaning today, but then so must a nod to why organizations like the United Nations should care about this identity in the first place. The peak international body for Indigenous studies, NAISA (Native American and Indigenous Studies Association), has offered a robust combination of each of these moves, stressing the need for self- and group inclusion as well as referencing the “hundreds of years of ongoing colonialism around the world” that led to the categorization.<sup>20</sup>

Similarly, our collective comparative Indigenous history of empire combines contemporary and historical valencies in understanding who counted as Indigenous in our given period. Indigenous people facing the British empire between 1760 and 1840, then, were those living in parts of three different oceanic regions—the Atlantic, the Pacific, and the Indian Oceans—who controlled the key resources desired by imperialists during this time *and* whose descendent communities still attest to the legacies of the British arrival. Our definition of “key resources” is necessarily broad. As the chapters by Gammage, Kenny, Shumway, and others here show, land was very often the resource most desired. Scholars Zoe Laidlaw and Alan Lester have

recently commented on the “pervasive” and “close relationship” between “land-holding” and Indigeneity in both the colonial past and modern historiography.<sup>21</sup> This makes sense for readers interested solely in settler colonialism. But during the Age of Revolution, desired resources included more than just land. Reid’s chapter in this volume details how marine space was often the first resource negotiated between Indigenous people and Britons. Siva-sundaram and Ulrich point to the critical role of labor. Calloway’s chapter reminds us of the role of arms and diplomatic skill; Newell’s of food and sex; Ballantyne’s, indeed, of no less than the convertible soul. The resources embedded in Indigenous identity for our period are vast.

Our definition of “descendent communities” is less clearly stated in the following chapters, which all make their claims on the present fairly implicit. What is certain is an eschewal of blood as the only means of measuring descent. All the Indigenous societies discussed in this volume have communities who recognize them as ancestors today, but each would trace the connection through a shared sense of social, cultural, religious, or historical practice rather than any unit of modern medicine. As many of the chapters in this volume are at pains to point out, Indigenous people were often already intensely cosmopolitan figures by the time Britons turned up. Indigenous intermixing with others during the imperial moment—like the Tahitians and Samoans of Newell’s chapter or the Iroquois Confederacy of Calloway’s chapter—only added to their mixed bloodlines. Recent scholarship elsewhere has argued with some passion how tracing descent through blood has a long history of perpetuating both the inclusions and exclusions that empires sought to embed.<sup>22</sup>

So, too, we might add, our volume eschews any hard line on descent through a steady understanding of place. While some of the Indigenous subjects here would see some descendants in recognizable places—the Eora of New South Wales and the Māori of Aotearoa, for instance—others, such as the lascars around the Indian Ocean or the slaves throughout the Cape, produced people who now locate their history of removal or mobility at the heart of their sense of Indigeneity.

To say all this another way, then, our volume does not limit the Indigenous only to those associated with now-dispossessed land. As Ravi de Costa has argued, if the term “Indigenous people” was first coined to signify those victimized by the particular structures of settler (land-focused) colonialism, it now includes those with other histories of other forms of imperial reach.<sup>23</sup> Our volume’s definition of empire is much broader than merely settler colonialism.

As well, this collection does not wish to conjure the specter of authenticity when discussing Indigenous people. The proceeding chapters demonstrate that if the idea of a pure identity is a problematic notion for Indigenous people today, it was hardly less so two hundred years ago. “There was no authentic and ‘pure’ Indigenous identity” at the moment of contact, write Laidlaw and Lester, “just as there was no authentic and ‘pure’ British identity for colonial[s].”<sup>24</sup> The latter point is perhaps most aptly shown here in Brooks’s chapter on differing British relations with various Indigenes, including the sometimes-inside, sometimes-outside Highland Scots.

### A Revolutionary Age

As this volume was coming together, we were delighted to find two collections appear that answered some of our pleas for a comparative Indigenous history of empire. Jane Carey and Jane Lydon’s *Indigenous Networks: Mobility, Connections and Exchange* (2014) and Zoe Laidlaw and Alan Lester’s *Indigenous Communities and Settler Colonialism* (2015) make excellent starts on the benefits to accrue from placing deep histories of Indigenous peoples facing empire into a comparative frame.<sup>25</sup> They also challenge imperial and transnational historians to start taking seriously Indigenous peoples as dynamic and mobile historical actors. Both these volumes, however, concentrate on the nineteenth century and beyond (and Laidlaw and Lester focus, too, only on settler colonies). Neither tackles the critical period in which Britain both lost and gained an empire amid intensely global revolutionary struggles, and in which Indigenous peoples across the globe faced similar challenges and opportunities in a range of different colonizing scenarios.

The Age of Revolution is currently enjoying something of a renaissance due to both the rebirth of Atlantic history and the surge of interest around the origins of the newly coined Anthropocene. Yet whether you take your cue from the Haitian radicals of C. L. R. James’s *The Black Jacobins*, the liberal democrats of R. R. Palmer’s *The Age of the Democratic Revolution*, the industrial workers and capitalists of Hobsbawm’s *The Age of Revolution*, the motley crew of Rediker and Linebaugh’s *The Many-Headed Hydra*, or the scientists and thinkers of Paul Dukes’s *Minutes to Midnight*, one would struggle to find Indigenous peoples at all, let alone Indigenous peoples as the driving part of the story. They sometimes appear at the margins of liberationist stories, such as in North America, where they are typically depicted as being compelled by Europeans to make the best of a number of bad choices in choosing a side. In accounts of industrialization, they are



usually accorded less agency than the commodities and textiles their bodies produced in order to foster commerce and manufacturing. And, of course, we know and sometimes acknowledge that dispossessed Indian lands were used to provide much of the fuel—in the form of new crops—driving the globally momentous turn to fossil fuels. In these studies, Indigenous peoples are victims, and objects of study, often hidden pawns in a game in which they could only lose.<sup>26</sup>

The omission is curious in part because overlaid across the same decades we typically think of as encompassing the Age of Revolution, from roughly 1760 to 1840, Europeans swarmed around the globe in a period of dramatic imperial expansion. At the heart of this movement was a “swing to the east” as European attention and interest drifted from the Atlantic to new prizes and riches in the Pacific and Indian Oceans. Central to this swing were encounters with Indigenous peoples—in Africa, India, Australasia, and the Pacific. As Europeans expanded their reach, these meetings multiplied exponentially and were informed by the lessons learned or unlearned from imperial projects in the Atlantic. As Susan Thorne has noted, by 1820 the British empire alone had already “absorbed” almost one-quarter of the world’s population. It is time to take account of the new relationships across this period when we discuss and define a “Revolutionary Age.”<sup>27</sup>

In addition, when we do take into account Indigenous peoples in this Age of Revolution, we stand to gain a new perspective on the origins, nature, and consequences of Europe’s so-called democratic and industrial revolutions. Contests with Indigenous peoples over land, resources, and new commodities sparked eighteenth-century imperial expansion, fueled economic innovations, and precipitated global conflict. For example, historians have now firmly established the role Native Americans played in precipitating and shaping both the Seven Years’ War and the American Revolution—critical events that underpinned the Age of Revolution.<sup>28</sup> And as the essays by McDonnell and Calloway show, native peoples continued to influence and shape continental history in North America, but also as a consequence, conflicts in Europe and other colonial sites around the globe. As they did so, Indigenous peoples themselves were engaged in their own declarations of independence and enmeshed in vital contests over defining sovereignty that continue to reverberate today. The Age of Revolution was not merely a European construct.<sup>29</sup>

Indigenous peoples everywhere helped create and exploit the instabilities at the heart of the Age of Revolution. As Shumway’s chapter on the West

African Fante demonstrates, they sometimes exploited European political conflicts, tensions, and uncertainties to enmesh them in local conflicts that were not always advantageous to empire. At other times, as Martini's chapter on the Anishinaabe Shawundais indicates, they made vital connections with newcomers that would both lay a foundation for future relations with European empires and form precedents for pan-Indigenous resistance movements. From playing a crucial role in the movement toward a more powerful centralized neo-imperial state in North America, to accelerating British territorial expansion in Africa, and more, Indigenous peoples helped create instabilities on the new frontiers that gave geographic shape and intellectual stimulus to nineteenth-century imperialism. They also contributed to the global interconnectedness of the economic and political turbulence of this period that C. A. Bayly has described as the "world crisis" that underpinned the Age of Revolution.<sup>30</sup>

Indeed, bringing Indigenous experiences into focus across this critical period might yet also give us a basis for a new kind of thinking about periodization *per se*. Such a reconsideration would firmly tie the roots of the newly reanalyzed "Settler Revolution" to the Age of Revolution—as both Reid and Kenny here remind us. Likewise, as Ballantyne's chapter signals, the origins of the globalization of Christianity might be traced to this period, too. In turn, we would be compelled to rethink ideas and concepts such as independence, sovereignty, and even the very notion of "European" and "Indigenous" peoples that arose in this era.<sup>31</sup>

### **Pathways, Entanglements, Connections**

With these considerations and goals in mind, our contributors got to work. Some revisited and drew from recent research projects, and others saw this as an opportunity to pursue new leads. As the chapters came in, we urged engagement with each other's work, and encouraged each other to tease out the broader implications of our findings. It was no easy task. All of us found it harder than expected—not just to seek out the voices of Indigenous actors but also to keep in mind the general question about how they faced empire. And we also turned up darker stories than anticipated, too—ones where it was difficult to focus on Indigenous agency given the limited evidence available and the horrifically one-sided circumstances people suffered.

Moreover, when engaging with each other's chapters, we all found ourselves on some unfamiliar terrain, be it geographic, historic, or historiographic. But in confronting this unfamiliarity, we also found ourselves

thinking creatively about how to frame it all. Indeed, as we read the essays together, some patterns emerged that suggested an alternate arrangement from the geographic or chronological plan initially envisaged. It was clear, for example, that in different places and at different times, Indigenous peoples experienced the coming of European empire in similar ways. Their own deep histories, rivalries with one another and with other Europeans, and their expectations and interests shaped first encounters, influenced the type and degree of enmeshment with the newcomers, and created the conditions for further associations and relationships with empire or each other. Separated by time and space, Indigenous experiences of empire cycled through phases that we have labeled pathways, entanglements, and connections.

### *Part I: Pathways*

The chapters in this initial section remind us how much Indigenous peoples themselves defined the terms of new encounters in this era. It also introduces us to all five key areas canvased in the collection: North America, Australia, Africa, the Pacific Ocean, and the Indian Ocean. In each, everywhere they moved Britons traveled down distinctly Indigenous pathways. Indeed, all across the so-called old and new British empires, powerful groups of Indigenous peoples drew the British into new and uncertain environmental, diplomatic, and commercial worlds that rested on Indigenous foundations.

Bill Gammage opens the section with his bold thesis that Indigenous Australians not only practiced “fire-stick farming” in certain regions before and during Britain’s earliest settlement but managed the entire continent through their complex understanding and use of “fire and no fire.” Elsewhere, Gammage has argued that the extent of their control (“maintaining abundance” without traditional agricultural forms) is of world-historical significance. Australian Aboriginals rotated their efforts to suit conditions and to make resources “abundant, convenient, and predictable” across “the biggest estate on earth”; they encouraged a planned mobility that Europeans thought merely nomadic.<sup>32</sup> Europeans could often only make sense of the country because Aboriginal peoples had rendered it less “formidable” and more like the European “parks” that signified wealth and leisure to the invaders. It was a pathway that lured them to the most valuable land, even while they were oblivious to its managed state and importance in Aboriginal lives.

Gammage’s work raises questions about the ecological histories of other places, particularly North America, and the unseen relations between land

and people that Europeans had trouble discerning but that profoundly shaped encounters throughout the early modern period and into the Age of Revolution. Yet even while the British wondered at the “estates” they found in Australia, they grappled with a different unseen pathway in North America. As Michael A. McDonnell notes in his chapter, when the British took possession of French settlements and territorial claims around the Great Lakes region in 1763, they also inherited a set of diverse and complex *relations* with Indigenous peoples. Native peoples soon made it clear that any territorial claims the British hoped to uphold would rest on a complicated Indian history that stretched well beyond the point of contact with Europeans, and with it a well-oiled practice of conducting trade and diplomacy hammered out on Indian terms. The British came to realize how dependent they were on this Indian world and were forced to adapt—with significant consequences for imperial relations more generally. As in Australia, the architecture of empire in the new British North American territories would be built on Indigenous pathways.

Deep and long inter-Indigenous relations, as well as shrewd diplomatic and trading practices, similarly shaped British ventures in West Africa in the Age of Revolution. As Rebecca Shumway shows, in what is now southern Ghana the Fante’s relationship with the neighboring Asante compelled the British to retain and protect forts on the Gold Coast long after they wished to leave. With the abolition of the slave trade, there was little to formally hold the British in West Africa. But fear of European rivals and complicated prior commercial ties made them equivocate. Like the Anishinaabe Odawa of the Great Lakes, which McDonnell discusses, the Fante enmeshed the British in West African politics to their advantage at this very moment. Fante elites exploited British ambivalence, gaining arms and wealth in the process to help defend themselves against Asante rivals and to rebuild their economy after a drastic decline in their export trade. Though difficult to appreciate in retrospect, Indigenous peoples in West Africa thus dictated British imperial policy at a critical and uncertain moment in the Age of Revolution, even while these policies also tragically and paradoxically laid the groundwork for formal European colonization of the region later in the century.

In her exploration of British ventures in the Pacific, Jennifer Newell takes her cue from Islander scholars who have stressed Indigenous connections and knowledges across a unifying “sea of islands,” in order to return us to the importance of Indigenous and environmental interactions in shaping European colonial projects. Newell’s focus is Tahiti and Samoa. She also reminds

us of some of the unequal exchanges that shaped colonization—life-giving food and cloth for deadly viruses and bacteria. Still, what the British could and could not do in the Pacific was often controlled by preexisting Indigenous relations to the land and animals upon which they relied and the cosmology that sustained those relations. Though British ecological and religious convictions eventually had a profound effect in the Pacific, it is notable, as Newell states, that by the end of our era “Britain had surrendered its interests in both Tahiti and Samoa”—in good measure because of its inability to overcome the difficulties posed by the preexisting pathways.

Sujit Sivasundaram’s chapter on the Persian Gulf continues the maritime theme of Newell’s to close this opening section. It also affirms the explicit claim of Newell that focusing on Indigenous peoples can illuminate new ways of viewing European imperialism and the Age of Revolution. Specifically, what Sivasundaram reveals is that in this case of an Indian Oceanic entrepôt, no one prior pathway dominated later encounters. The Revolutionary Gulf proved to be a far more “tangled” scene than any single empire could hope to comprehend. It included, after all, not just the competitions of multiple Arab states but also the effects of the Parsi from Bombay and of *lascar* sailors from around the region. The British never did “fill the whole picture” in the Gulf, as Sivasundaram notes, precisely because the “circles of historical memory” there during this critical era allowed for multiple groups to simultaneously “find their own paths.”

### *Part II: Entanglements*

Across the Age of Revolution, the initial pathways laid down by Indigenous peoples and encountered by British colonizers led to maturing relations and a variety of entanglements—political, economic, social, cultural, and religious. While we often note the ways in which Indigenous peoples were affected or changed in this process, we view native peoples less frequently as agents themselves. Yet, in the key areas of warfare and diplomacy, labor activism, missionary activity, and land settlement—all areas that help further define and refine an Age of Revolution—Indigenous peoples played pivotal roles. The chapters in this section demonstrate just how much the British found themselves entangled and enmeshed in a world that they had not envisioned at the start of the era, with diverse consequences for both Indigenous peoples and newcomers.

Colin Calloway’s chapter shifts our North American focus from the Great Lakes to the Ohio Valley. Like the Anishinaabe of the Lakes, the Ohio Indians

frustrated British imperial plans and were key in both the Seven Years' War and the American Revolution. They subsequently helped keep British-American animosity alive while protecting their own interests: British dependence on Native Americans in the Age of Revolution would help precipitate another North American conflict, the War of 1812. Like other essays in this collection, Calloway reminds us of the insights to be gained when focused on Indigenous histories and perspectives. In the case of the Ohio Indians, re-centering Indigenous history allows us to move past our retrospective and distorting views of revolutionary conquest. It makes us reconsider an era in which "Indian nations stalled the 'course of empire' in the Ohio country, when Indigenous foreign policies trumped imperial ambitions, and when Indigenous power shaped imperial outcomes and threatened the future of the United States."

Nicole Ulrich returns us to the African continent, this time to the southern Cape region. Her focus on the "popular classes" in this intensely diverse place reminds us of the ways in which Indigeneity could be multiple and changing all at once. By investigating the labor activism of slaves and ex-slaves, Asian servants, Khoesan laborers, and many others, she dramatizes the "historical juncture" of revolutionary proletarian consciousness with uneven imperial expansion. She shows her "motley crew" as being both shaped by and active agents against the resultant labor regime. Despite increasing discipline, they also prompted many real reforms from the British governors at the Cape—reforms and discussions that resonated across the expanding British empire.

If Indigenous peoples could and did affect British political ambitions, they also played a role in shaping global Christian evangelicalism. Tony Ballantyne charts this development by focusing on the interplay between the Church Missionary Society (CMS) and a small but influential group of rangatira (chiefs) from New Zealand's North Island. Sharpening "entanglement" as an analytical tool, Ballantyne focuses on "improvement" as a common goal of colonizers and the colonized, and the religious, economic, and political motives that gave rise to it on both sides. In part a reaction to Indigenous resistance to missionizing efforts in Tahiti, New South Wales, and elsewhere, the CMS linked "Christianity and Commerce" from an early stage. Ballantyne reminds us that while Indigenous sociopolitical formation and the cultural logics of Indigenous actions are crucial to understanding the nature and timing of missionary efforts, we also need to know how these interacted with imperial institutions and networks to understand how Māori and

Britons were increasingly drawn together and entangled in each other's histories.

As in New Zealand, previous British entanglements with Indigenous peoples in Australia also shaped new imperial efforts, and particularly what scholars have sometimes called the “settler revolution.” The devastating tragedy of the Tasmanian Black Wars compelled British officials on the ground to turn back to the idea of treaty-making first tested in the North American context. Drawing on his previous groundbreaking work on Batman's Treaty of 1835, Robert Kenny explores the specific Indigenous world-view of one of the signatories to it.<sup>33</sup> He reminds us of the human and nonhuman relationships that shaped initial entanglements but also led to conflict. Indeed, if the more tragic consequences of Māori-British entanglements were not apparent for some time in New Zealand, such was not the case for the western Taungurung people of present-day Victoria, Australia. Within a few years of the signing of the historic treaty, the “settler revolution” had a devastating deadly effect as British settlers killed and pushed Indigenous peoples from the land—testimony to the fact that entanglements, of course, could often be more destructive than productive.

### *Part III: Connections*

Biography has rarely favored the Indigene, particularly in the early modern period when sources were scarce. But in her comparative history of two late eighteenth-century Indigenous visitors to Britain, Cherokee Ostenaco and Ra'iatean Mai, Kate Fullagar makes the argument that a biographical approach can make fruitful sense of the experiences of traveling Indigenous peoples. It can also, through its emphasis on whole lives, help bring the historical moment of imperial encounter for Indigenous people down to more modest size. As Fullagar shows, while visits to London did not figure as centrally in the lives of Indigenous travelers as we might have expected, their presence in the imperial metropole nonetheless often stirred contentious debates about the nature and meaning of empire at a critical moment. Moreover, the array of interests that brought Mai and Ostenaco to British shores connected their stories, as well as their histories, to that of empire.

Joshua L. Reid also employs a directly comparative approach in his study of Indigenous-Anglo interactions in the Pacific, specifically among the Makah of the Olympic Peninsula in northwest North America and the Māori of New Zealand's South Island. Reid pushes us to reconsider the centrality of contests over land at the start of the settler revolution and instead to see

contests over marine space and its many resources as an important component of the early conflict over the Pacific British West. From Indigenous perspectives, such contests linked disparate regions and different peoples, and established long-running patterns that shaped relations between Indigenous peoples and settler-colonial governments. They also show us how much Indigenous peoples actively sought to engage with expanding settler-colonial economies even while they retained control over their marine spaces and resources. As Reid notes, these stories complicate binary stories that are too focused on mobile settlers dispossessing Indigenous victims. They also help us understand the deep roots of contests over marine resources that continue today.

If marine space connected the experiences of Makah and Māori in the Pacific, imperial policy connected Indigenous peoples across North America, Scotland, and India. Indeed, by examining British imperial policy across its expanding empire in the mid-to-late eighteenth century, Justin Brooks pushes at the definition of Indigeneity and argues that we must not see it as necessarily fixed in any group but historically reconditioned over time. In this case, political changes in imperial administration—brought about themselves by Indigenous resistance to British reform efforts—helped redefine Indigeneity and connect diverse experiences across empire. Brooks argues that British political change and Indigenous political change have to be understood as intricately entwined and dialectically related in this era. While revealing the robust nature of Indigenous engagement with the eighteenth-century British empire, his chapter also shows that British reform efforts in North America and elsewhere were prefigured by British attempts to end similar types of decentered allied and negotiated forms of rule in India and Scotland.

The final chapter in the “Connections” section, Elspeth Martini’s study of the Ojibwe chief and Methodist missionary Shawundais shows that by the end of the Age of Revolution, Indigenous peoples themselves were making those connections across empire. Exemplifying again the strength of biography to tease out nuanced political positions, as well as the power of religion to serve Indigenous ends as much as European ones, Martini’s work recalls the mutually constitutive process of Ballantyne’s entangled empires. Drawing on the prestige he gained as a convert within the transatlantic Wesleyan-Methodist movement, Shawundais traveled to London at a critical moment—the convening of the Select Committee on Aborigines—to petition imperial officials to recognize his people’s rights as original owners of their land. In



doing so, Shawundais linked his arguments with those of his “Red Brothers” and other Indigenous peoples across empire, citing especially British restoration of Xhosa lands at the Cape as a precedent. As Martini reminds us, while not always successful in these efforts, the connections Indigenous peoples started to forge in this era need to be appreciated as part of a longer political negotiation and as part of an ongoing and global struggle to gain recognition of Indigenous sovereignty.

### Conclusion

Taken together, the chapters in this collection can chart a new way forward for historians of empire, Indigenous studies, and the Age of Revolution. While we have not been able to answer all our original questions, the collection can mark the start of a new conversation and show why scholars can no longer continue to decenter Indigenous peoples from any comparative history of the Age of Revolution and modern imperialism.

Like Bennelong in the early colony of New South Wales, Indigenous people existed in almost every nook and cranny of the revolutionary effort to expand Europe from the late eighteenth century. Few experienced this invasion solely as an unprecedented onslaught. Some saw it as a manageable recurrence, others as a defeatable threat. Occasionally, Indigenous people saw European newcomers as a chance—to employ them in a longer-running feud with neighbors, to use them in the ousting of a more deadly invader, to enrich a cultural lacuna, or even to expand themselves.

That said, Bennelong was never a Pollyanna. He lived long enough to see as well some of the more devastating effects of European arrival. But he would also have known that these same effects had to contend always with his and other Aboriginal presences. Some lands and waters were less easily displaced than others because of Indigenous decisions and pressures. Some wars were not fought because their odds against the Indigenous appeared too long for Britons on the ground. Whatever modern edifices arose on Indigenous lands during the Age of Revolution—entrepôts, trade routes, missions, cities, democracies—each was significantly shaped by the people who were there first.

Bennelong stands in our collection, too, as an emblem of the many Indigenous subjects who came to know London and other centers of British imperialism as parts of *their* world, rather than simply as the places belonging to others. Imperial historians of our period are used to identifying an increasing British recognition of the globe, from Philadelphia to Hobart to Auckland

to Durban, but they have been slower to see that from an Indigenous perspective, the reverse was also true. Like so many others, Bennelong did not experience his sojourn to London as an outsider to an insider's origin point; he saw it as an insider broadening his understanding of the outside world.

Bennelong may not have met other Indigenous people while away, but he surely heard of the many predecessors who traveled before him, forging a history of Indigenous mobility that he was active in continuing. Other native itinerants were in easier situations to become conscious of the links they were creating. Whenever the British moved across borders, countless additional capillaries of connection flowed also, in and between Indigenous societies.

Finally, Bennelong's story reminds us to rethink the very parameters of the periodization we assume when invoking an era like the Age of Revolution. As historian of Africa Joe Miller recently noted elsewhere, the Indigenous view often shows "longer and more complex rhythms of transformation" than current models of the field allow.<sup>34</sup> The stories told just in these pages alone—with their deep migratory patterns, their tales of disease, their revelations of ecological management—raise questions about the timing and nature of revolutionary change. The conflicts over space, labor and resources, and over hearts and minds that poured fuel over the fires that drove movements for the rights of man and industrialization have left a living legacy of contested relations that continue to resonate in contemporary politics and societies today.

Indigenous peoples were at the heart of the Age of Revolution. Acknowledging that history makes it clearer that we are all still living with, and are responsible for, its legacy.

### Notes

1. Keith Vincent Smith, "Bennelong among His People," *Aboriginal History* 33 (2009): 36; Kate Fullagar, *The Savage Visit: New World Peoples and Popular Imperial Culture in Britain, 1710–1795* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012), 184.
2. Kate Fullagar, "Bennelong in Britain," *Aboriginal History* 33 (2009): 92.
3. David Collins, *Account of the English Colony at New South Wales* (London, 1798), 2:49, 96; *The Times*, 29 October 1805.
4. Manning Clark, *A History of Australia* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1962), 1:145; Inga Clendinnen, *Dancing with Strangers* (Melbourne: Text Publishing, 2003), 272.
5. Smith, "Bennelong among His People." Cf. K. V. Smith, *Bennelong: The Coming In of the Eora, Sydney Cove 1788–1792* (East Roseville: Kangaroo Press, 2001), and Grace Karskens, *The Colony: A History of Early Sydney* (Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 2009).

6. Michael A. McDonnell, *The Politics of War: Race, Class, and Conflict in Revolutionary Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007); McDonnell, *Masters of Empire: Great Lakes Indians and the Making of America* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2015).

7. Fullagar, *The Savage Visit*, and her forthcoming *Faces of Empire: Three Eighteenth-Century Lives—a Cherokee Warrior, a British Artist, and a Tahitian Refugee*.

8. With the rise of the “new imperial history,” the old historiographic divide between the so-called First and Second British empires has become more permeable, though it seems to persist when thinking about linkages between Indigenous peoples throughout the empire and across this era.

9. Theda Perdue, *Cherokee Women: Gender and Culture Change, 1700–1835* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998); Malama Meleisea, *The Making of Modern Samoa: Traditional Authority and Colonial Administration in the History of Western Samoa* (Suva: University of South Pacific Press, 1987). There are now many other examples, but for another pioneering effort, see J. B. Peires, *The House of Phalo: A History of the Xhosa People in the Days of Their Independence* (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1981).

10. Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650–1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Inga Clendinnen, *Aztecs: An Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991). Cf. Henry Reynolds, *Frontier: Aborigines, Settlers and Land* (Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1987). For an extended discussion of the merits and ultimate limits of White’s work at least, see Michael A. McDonnell, “Rethinking the Middle Ground: French Colonialism and Indigenous Identities in the *Pays d’en Haut*,” in *Native Diasporas: Indigenous Identities and Settler Colonialism in North America*, ed. Gregory D. Smithers and Brooke N. Newman (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2014), 79–108, and McDonnell, *Masters of Empire*, esp. 5–19.

11. Daniel Richter, *Facing East from Indian Country: A Native History of Early America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001).

12. Again, there are many examples, but for notable works of comparative imperial history, see Marete Falck Borch, *Conciliation, Compulsion, Conversion: British Attitudes towards Indigenous Peoples, 1763–1814* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2004); Alan Lester, *Imperial Networks: Creating Identities in Nineteenth-Century South Africa and Britain* (London: Routledge, 2001); Elizabeth Elbourne, *Blood Ground: Colonialism, Missions, and the Contest for Christianity in the Cape Colony and Britain, 1799–1853* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2002); Richard Price, *Making Empire: Colonial Encounters and the Creation of Imperial Rule in Nineteenth-Century Africa* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Lisa Ford, *Settler Sovereignty: Jurisdiction and Indigenous People in America and Australia, 1788–1836* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010); Stuart Banner, *Possessing the Pacific: Land, Settlers, and Indigenous Peoples from Australia to Alaska* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007); James Belich, *Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the Rise of the Anglo-World, 1783–1939* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

13. See Karen Fox, “Globalising Indigeneity? Writing Indigenous Histories in a Transnational World,” *History Compass* 10, no. 6 (2012): 423–439, on the genealogy of comparative Indigenous history—that she claims began in the 1940s. In this respect,

the rise of settler colonial studies, too, is instructive. While generally a welcome turn in the field of Indigenous studies, settler colonial studies often focus on the colonial and imperial structures in which Indigenous people found themselves enmeshed. Starting with Patrick Wolfe's brilliant comparative analysis of the United States, Brazil, and Australia, settler colonial studies have widened our optics, given rise to new understandings of colonial-Indigenous relations, and emphasized a valuable political component to such work. But in its focus on imperial and colonial polities, legal systems, and their often genocidal policies, settler colonial studies tend to privilege the voice, and the subjectivity, of Europeans over Indigenous.

14. Peter H. Wood, "North America in the Era of Captain Cook: Three Glimpses of Indian-European Contact in the Age of the American Revolution," in *Implicit Understandings: Observing, Reporting, and Reflecting on the Encounters between Europeans and Other Peoples in the Early Modern Era*, ed. Stuart B. Schwartz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 485–486, 500–501.

15. See Michael A. McDonnell, "Paths Not Yet Taken, Voices Not Yet Heard: Rethinking Atlantic History," in *Connected Worlds: History in Transnational Perspective*, ed. Ann Curthoys and Marilyn Lake (Canberra: Australian National University Press, 2005), 46–62; McDonnell, "Rethinking the Age of Revolution," *Atlantic Studies* 13, no. 3 (2016): 301–314. Compare, for example, the lack of Native American perspectives or topics in the pioneering collection by David Armitage and Michael J. Braddick, eds., *The British Atlantic World, 1500–1800* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), and a more recent volume, Bernard Bailyn and Patricia L. Denault, eds., *Soundings in Atlantic History: Latent Structures and Intellectual Currents, 1500–1830* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009). Jace Weaver, *The Red Atlantic: American Indigenes and the Making of the Modern World, 1000–1927* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014), has made some progress in this direction, but the literature on Atlantic history—particularly for the North Atlantic—continues to ignore Indigenous perspectives.

16. C. A. Bayly, *Imperial Meridian: The British Empire and the World, 1780–1830* (London: Longman, 1989).

17. C. A. Bayly, "British and Indigenous Peoples," in *Empire and Others: British Encounters with Indigenous Peoples, 1600–1850*, ed. M. J. Daunton and R. Halpern (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), 20.

18. Bayly, "British and Indigenous Peoples," 21.

19. See the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues statement on Indigenous identity at <https://www.un.org/development/desa/Indigenouspeoples/unpfii-sessions-2.html>.

20. Home page for the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association (NAISA) website, <http://www.naisa.org/>.

21. Zoe Laidlaw and Alan Lester, "Indigenous Sites and Mobilities: Connected Struggles in the Long Nineteenth Century," in *Indigenous Communities and Settler Colonialism: Land Holding, Loss and Survival in an Interconnected World*, ed. Zoe Laidlaw and Alan Lester (London: Palgrave, 2015), 12.

22. See J. K. Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008); P. D. Palmater, *Beyond Blood: Rethinking Indigenous Identity* (Saskatoon: Purich Publishing Limited, 2011);

and Kat Ellinghaus, *Blood Will Tell: Native Americans and Assimilation Policy* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2017).

23. Ravi de Costa, "Fifty Years of Indigeneity: Legacies and Possibilities," in *Indigenous Networks: Mobility, Connections and Exchange*, ed. Jane Lydon and Jane Carey (London: Routledge, 2014), 273–285.

24. Laidlaw and Lester, "Indigenous Sites and Mobilities," 4.

25. Lydon and Carey, *Indigenous Networks*; Laidlaw and Lester, *Indigenous Communities*. Note also that we were much inspired by Tracey Banivanua Mar's even earlier comparative work, "Imperial Literacy and Indigenous Rights: Tracing Transoceanic Circuits of a Modern Discourse," *Aboriginal History* 37 (2013): 1–28.

26. C. L. R. James, *The Black Jacobins* (New York: Dial Press, 1938); R. R. Palmer, *The Age of the Democratic Revolution: A Political History of Europe and America, 1760–1800*, 3 vols. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1959–1964); E. J. Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution: Europe 1789–1848* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1962); Peter Linebaugh and Marcus Rediker, *The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2000); Paul Dukes, *Minutes to Midnight: History and the Anthropocene Era from 1763* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012). Nor does a recent comparative collection make up for the neglect (see David Armitage and Sanjay Subrahmanyam, eds., *The Age of Revolutions in Global Context, c. 1760–1840* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009). For an extended discussion of this historiographic elision, see Michael A. McDonnell, ed., *Rethinking the Age of Revolution* (London: Taylor and Francis, 2017).

27. Susan Thorne, "The Conversion of Englishmen and the Conversion of the World Inseparable: Missionary Imperialism and the Language of Class in Early Industrial Britain," in *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*, ed. F. Cooper and A. L. Stoler (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 254. In 2008, Jeremy Adelman renamed the Age of Revolution "An Age of Imperial Revolutions" (*American Historical Review* 113, no. 2 [April 2008], 319–340) but failed to note the role of Indigenous peoples in this process. On the side of the discussion, Belich, in *Replenishing the Earth*, took note of the spread of colonial settlement with little reference to the Age of Revolution.

28. See Colin Calloway, *The Scratch of a Pen: 1763 and the Transformation of North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006); McDonnell, *Masters of Empire*; Woody Holton, *Forced Founders: Indians, Debtors, Slaves, and the Making of the American Revolution in Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999); Kathleen Duval, *Independence Lost: Lives on the Edge of the American Revolution* (New York: Random House, 2016).

29. See, for example, Sinclair Thomson, "Sovereignty Disavowed: The Tupac Amaru Revolution in the Atlantic World," *Atlantic Studies: Global Currents* 13, no. 3 (2016): 407–431; Forrest Hylton, "'The Sole Owners of the Land': Empire, War, and Authority in the Guajira Peninsula, 1761–1779," *Atlantic Studies: Global Currents* 13, no. 3 (2016): 315–344.

30. Bayly, "Afterword," in *Age of Revolutions*. An older essay by John K. Galbraith, "The 'Turbulent Frontier' as a Factor in British Expansion," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 2, no. 2 (January 1960), 150–168, is instructive.

31. Bayly, *Imperial Meridian*, 166.
32. Gammage, *The Biggest Estate on Earth: How Aborigines Made Australia* (Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 2011).
33. Robert Kenny, "Tricks or Treats? A Case for Kulin Knowing in Batman's Treaty," *History Australia* 5, no. 2 (2008): 38.1–38.14.
34. J. C. Miller, "The Dynamics of History in Africa and the Atlantic 'Age of Revolutions,'" in *Age of Revolutions*.