



This is a repository copy of *Motivation, Identity and Collaboration in the Scholarly Networks of the British Empire, 1830-1930*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:  
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/112625/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Ellis, H. (2017) Motivation, Identity and Collaboration in the Scholarly Networks of the British Empire, 1830-1930. *Jahrbuch für Universitätsgeschichte*, 18. pp. 125-142. ISSN 1435-1358

---

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

# Motivation, Identity and Collaboration in the Scholarly Networks of the British Empire, 1830-1930

Heather Ellis

## The British Empire, Scholarly Networks and the “Spatial Turn”

In recent years, under the influence of the so-called “spatial turn” in historiography and the development of transnational and global history, historians have shown a growing interest in conceiving of the British Empire as a space of knowledge production and circulation.<sup>1</sup> During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, developing networks between scholars<sup>2</sup> trained in and based at British universities and those located in the wider empire have been identified and shown to have increased significantly in number and complexity. These connections assumed a number of different forms from the migration of students and scholars to the exchange of publications and correspondence. Indeed, some historians have felt able to describe the existence of a “British Academic world” during this period, consisting chiefly of the British Isles and those parts of the empire mainly settled by white British emigrants known as the “settler colonies” - Canada, Australia and South Africa.<sup>3</sup>

On the one hand, the influence of the “spatial turn” and of global history as an approach has brought with it many advantages for the study of scholarly activity in the British Empire, most significantly perhaps, the acknowledgement of previously unidentified

---

<sup>1</sup> Heike Jöns, *Academic Travel from Cambridge University and the Formation of Centres of Knowledge, 1885-1954*, in: *Historical Geography* 34 (2008), pp. 338-362; Tamson Pietsch, *Wandering Scholars? Academic Mobility and the British Academic World, 1850-1940*, in: *Historical Geography* 36 (2010), pp. 377-387; Tamson Pietsch, *Many Rhodes: Travelling Scholarships and Imperial Citizenship in the British Academic World, 1880-1940*, in: *History of Education* 40 (2011), 723-739; Tamson Pietsch, *Empire of Scholars: Universities, Networks and the British Academic World, 1850-1939*, Manchester 2013.

<sup>2</sup> For the purposes of this article, a “scholar” is defined either as someone who worked at a university in a teaching or research capacity or someone who received an academic appointment at a university following the conclusion of their undergraduate studies before subsequently pursuing an alternative career, e.g. in colonial administration. Many of those who officially left academia nevertheless continued to pursue scholarship during their subsequent careers. Examples of these may be found among the “scholar-administrators” referred to later in this article.

<sup>3</sup> Pietsch, *Many Rhodes*; Pietsch, *Empire of Scholars*.

networks, connections and exchanges; however, it has arguably also led to the privileging of network tracing and identification over equally important questions of motivation and identity formation. Over the last few decades, historical scholarship has tended to be characterised by two divergent developments, broadly represented by the sub-disciplines of global history, on the one hand, and the “new cultural history” on the other. As Merry Wiesner-Hanks explains, global history has been largely concerned with exploring “connections within the global human community...the crossing of boundaries and the linking of systems in the human past.” It is, she writes, citing David Northrup, the story of the “great convergence.” The new cultural history, by contrast, has “spent much more time on divergence, making categories of difference ever more complex” and highlighting the importance of an increasingly varied array of cultural and identity markers including “race”, gender, class, age-group, religion and nationality.<sup>4</sup> As a result, global history has tended to neglect, or, at least, side-line questions of identity formation and the vital role of networks and exchanges in constructing identities and motivations.

Insofar as historians have been concerned with the motivations driving the participation of scholars in British imperial networks, many have continued to assume that scholarly cooperation between individuals and institutions within the empire had the effect (and often also the aim) of strengthening imperial ties and promoting an overarching imperial loyalty.<sup>5</sup> This has been particularly noticeable when referring to the fields of geography,<sup>6</sup> ethnology,<sup>7</sup> and anthropology.<sup>8</sup> This tendency, in turn, seems closely related to another trend

---

<sup>4</sup> Merry Wiesner-Hanks, *World History and the History of Women, Gender and Sexuality*, in: *Journal of World History* 18, pp. 53-54.

<sup>5</sup> Carl Bridge and Kent Fedorowich (eds.), *The British World: Diaspora, Culture, Identity*, London 2003; Pietsch, *Wandering Scholars?*; Pietsch, *Empire of Scholars*.

<sup>6</sup> Brian Hudson, *The New Geography and the New Imperialism, 1870-1918*, in: *Antipode* 9 (1977), pp. 12-19; Gerry Kearns, *The Imperial Subject: Geography and Travel in the Work of Mary Kingsley and Halford Makinder*, in: *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 22, pp. 450-472.

<sup>7</sup> Jon Anderson, *Colonial Ethnography in British Afghanistan*, in: *Writing the Social Text: Essays on the Poetics and Politics of Social Science Discourse* ed. by Richard Harvey Brown, New York 1992, pp. 91-116; Richard Harvey Brown, *Cultural Representation and Ideological Domination*, in: *Social Forces* 71, pp. 657-676.

within the historiography of higher education institutions in Britain (and arguably across the world), namely to assume a close relationship between the flourishing of universities and the growth of the nation state and nationalism.<sup>9</sup> If we consider how frequently imperialism is treated as closely related to (even as an extension of) nationalist sentiment, it comes as little surprise that many historians have assumed that Oxford, Cambridge (and, to a lesser extent, also the Scottish and provincial English universities) promoted the idea of empire. The universities are likewise often perceived to have been enthusiastic supporters of nationalist identities over the course of the nineteenth century.<sup>10</sup> As a consequence, relatively few historians have questioned the assumption that most university scholars would be in favour of empire and would identify both personally and professionally with the imperial project.<sup>11</sup>

What I would like to introduce here, by contrast, is a distinction between imperial networks and the geographical space of empire, on the one hand, and the meanings and identities bound up with them, on the other. Conceiving of the British Empire in purely spatial terms (as David Lambert and Alan Lester have done in their 2006 study of imperial ‘careerism’ in the long nineteenth century)<sup>12</sup> ought actually to decouple it from any automatic association with imperial sentiment, allowing rather for the possibility that many different

---

<sup>8</sup> Stefan Feuchtwang, *The Colonial Formation of British Social Anthropology*, in: *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter* ed., by Talal Assad, London 1973, pp. 71-100; Henrika Kuklick, *The Sins of the Fathers: British Anthropology and African Colonial Administration*, in: *Research in Sociology of Knowledge: Sciences and Art 1* (1978), pp. 93-119; Charles Morrison, *Three Styles of Imperial Ethnography: British Officials as Anthropologists in India*, in: *Knowledge and Societies, Studies in the Sociology of Past and Present 5*, pp. 141-169; Mark Francis, *Anthropology and Social Darwinism in the British Empire: 1870-1900*, in: *Australian Journal of Politics and History 40*, pp. 203-215.

<sup>9</sup> Konrad Jarausch, *Higher Education and Social Change: Some Comparative Perspectives*, in: *The Transformation of Higher Learning, 1860-1930: Expansion, Diversification, Social Opening, and Professionalization in England, Germany, Russia, and the United States* ed. by Konrad Jarausch, Chicago 1983, pp. 9-36; John Craig, *Scholarship and Nation-Building: The Universities of Strasbourg and Alsatian Society, 1870-1939*, Chicago 1984; Jussi Välimaa, *Nationalization, Localization and Globalization in Finnish Higher Education*, in: *Higher Education 48*, pp. 31-36.

<sup>10</sup> Robert Anderson, *European Universities from the Enlightenment to 1914*. Oxford 2004, p. 149; Robert Anderson, *British Universities: Past and Present*. London 2006, p. 47.

<sup>11</sup> Important exceptions include Bernard Porter and Richard Symonds. See, in particular, Bernard Porter. *Critics of Empire: British Radicals and the Imperial Challenge*. London 1968 and Richard Symonds. *Oxford and Empire: The Last Lost Cause?*, Oxford 1991;

<sup>12</sup> David Lambert and Alan Lester. *Colonial Lives Across the British Empire: Imperial Careerism in the Long Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge 2006.

motivations drove those individuals who travelled within its borders and made use of its networks. Lambert and Lester highlight “the complexity, varied scale, constitutions and compositions of personal imperial spaces and networks”.<sup>13</sup> If this can be said of those who were directly connected with British imperial institutions such as the colonial civil service, then how much more must it apply to scholars working for universities, connected, only indirectly with the imperial project?

Another advantage of conceptualizing the British Empire primarily in spatial terms, and decoupling it from an automatic connection with empire as idea or ideology, is that it encourages us to treat it in a comparative light, alongside other spatial frames of reference such as the local, the regional, the national, and the global, which also helped to shape the experiences and identities of scholars at the time. As Frederick Cooper has written in his study, ‘Colonialism in Question’, “The spatial imagination of intellectuals...from the early nineteenth century to the mid-twentieth century was...varied. It was neither global nor local, but was built out of specific lines of connection and posited regional, continental and transnational affinities.”<sup>14</sup> In other words, the challenge is to ask how important (relative to other spatial frames) the empire was to those who traversed its networks, and under what specific conditions it emerged as especially relevant. Here, we should heed the call of Robin Butlin to pay more attention to “the dynamics and spatial scales of cultural circuits” in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.<sup>15</sup> As we will see, many scholars were able to travel and work within the networks of the British Empire without attaching themselves to the ideal of empire or imperial expansion. Indeed, the “spatial turn”, with its emphasis on competing geographical frames of reference demands that we treat the British Empire as but one of a set of interlocking and overlapping globe-spanning spaces within and between which individual (and groups of) scholars lived, worked and travelled.

---

<sup>13</sup> Robin Butlin. *Geographies of Empire: European Empires and Colonies c. 1880-1960*. Cambridge 2009, p. 5.

<sup>14</sup> Frederick Cooper, *Colonialism in Question*, Berkeley, C.A. 2005, p. 109.

<sup>15</sup> Butlin, *Geographies of Empire*, p. 41.

Indeed, many academics continued to see themselves as participating in an international “republic of letters” of which the British Empire was only one part. International relationships in university study, declared the educationalist Michael Sadler, in his introduction to the 1906 English translation of Friedrich Paulsen’s work on the German universities, are closer today than at any previous time since the beginning of the sixteenth century.<sup>16</sup> Traditionally, the nineteenth century has been seen by historians as the era of nationalism and imperialism; however, in recent scholarship, it has been increasingly recast as a period of growing globalization.<sup>17</sup> This argument gains strength from the fact that many commentators at the time remarked on the growing interconnectedness of the various parts of the world, particularly in the field of scholarship. As Benedict Stuchtey and Peter Wende have argued in their study of British and German historiography between 1750 and 1950:

...[T]he great European *res publica litteraria* still existed, that international community which, in the Middle Ages, had been attached to the church of Christ, and which, since the Renaissance and especially during the Enlightenment, had become a transnational congregation of men of letters. Out of this tradition, still vigorous in [the] nineteenth-century, grew numerous contacts, mutual perceptions, and transfers which contributed to the formation of modern university education in the age of nationalism.<sup>18</sup>

Writing in the *Contemporary Review* in 1886, the German scholar and Professor of Comparative Philology at Oxford, Friedrich Max Müller, remarked upon the continuing vitality of what he described as a universal republic of letters encompassing not only Europe but the entire globe:

*The whole world seems writing, reading, and talking together...Newton’s “Principia” are studied in Chinese, and the more modern works of Herschell [sic], Lyell, Darwin, Tyndall, Huxley [and] Lockyer, have created in the far East the same commotion as in*

---

<sup>16</sup> Friedrich Paulsen. *The German Universities and University Study*. London 1906, p. vii.

<sup>17</sup> See, e.g. Roland Wenzlhuemer and Isabella Loehr (eds.), *The Nation State and Beyond: Governing Globalization Processes in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries*, Heidelberg 2012.

<sup>18</sup> Benedict Stuchtey and Peter Wende (eds.), *British and German Historiography, 1750-1950: Traditions, Perceptions and Transfers*. Oxford 2000, p. 3.

Europe. Even books like my own, which stir up no passions, and can appeal to the narrow circle of scholars only, have been sent to me, translated not only into the principal languages of Europe, but into Bengali, Mahratti, Guzerathi, Japanese – nay, even into Sanskrit.<sup>19</sup>

Indeed, he described eloquently how such an ideal could quite happily co-exist with a hearty love of nation and empire. It does not follow, he wrote,

that because our Imperial patriotism is keen, our hearts are incapable of larger sympathies...We want patriotism, just as we want municipal spirit, nay even clannishness and family pride. But all these are steps leading higher and higher till we can repeat with some of the greatest men the words of Terence, 'I count nothing strange to me that is human.'<sup>20</sup>

Moreover, it is important to remember that the British Empire furnished networks and resources accessed by a wide range of scholars from different countries, who worked with each other, as well as with the British. While we should certainly recover historical evidence for a “British academic world”, this should not be achieved at the expense of recognising vital ties which continued to exist between British (and colonial British) scholars and their counterparts based in other (especially European) countries who also made profitable use of the spaces and networks of empire.<sup>21</sup> With a view to reconstructing a clearer picture of the motivations driving scholars who made use of British imperial networks in their work and the identities which they fashioned in relation to their participation in these networks, this article is divided into three distinct sections: first, an examination of those scholars, for whom an identification with imperialism and the ideal of empire was indeed an important factor; second, a section exploring alternative reasons for participating in imperial networks and the multiple loyalties and attachments which frequently co-existed in individual scholars who traversed them; and finally, a section which focuses upon the development of discourses

---

<sup>19</sup> Friedrich Max Mueller, Goethe and Carlyle, in: Contemporary Review 49, p. 790.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., 789-790.

<sup>21</sup> Heather Ellis and Ulrike Kirchberger (eds.), Anglo-German Scholarly Networks in the Long Nineteenth Century, Leiden and Boston 2014; Heather Ellis, Review of Tamson Pietsch, Empire of Scholars: Universities, Networks and the British Academic World, 1850-1939, in: History of Education 44 (2015), pp. 115-117.

directly hostile to the concept of empire, and the construction of identities based upon alternative geographical scales such as regionalism and internationalism.

### **Motivations Driving Scholarly Networking within the British Empire: The Imperialists**

A variety of motivations drove scholars attached to universities in Britain to travel across the empire and engage in a range of collaborative projects with colleagues working in the colonies. There is no doubt that a desire to deepen imperial ties and promote imperial unity lay behind the actions of some scholars. One well-known example would be Sir Bartle Edward Frere, who rose through the ranks of the Indian Civil Service (I.C.S.) to become Governor of Bombay in 1862. Alongside his career in the Indian Civil Service, he was active in linguistic, geographical and historical scholarship of the peoples of India and held a number of academic appointments, most importantly, as Chancellor of the University of Bombay also from 1862. In addition, he was elected President of the Royal Asiatic Society on three occasions, a fellow of the Royal Society and President of the Royal Geographical Society in 1873-4. For Frere, geographical study of the empire was inseparable from a desire to promote the imperial project, and, in his own words, to replenish the vital springs of national life.<sup>22</sup>

In the last decades of the nineteenth century, the University of Oxford as an institution showed some evidence of an increasingly imperialist stance. In 1895, the 'Oxford Magazine', one of the official publications of the university declared, We are all Imperialists nowadays<sup>23</sup> and published a range of patriotic poetry including a poem written by A.G. Butler, tutor of

---

<sup>22</sup> Quoted in John Benyon, Frere, Sir (Henry) Bartle Edward, first baronet (1815-1884), in: Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford 2004. Retrieved September 23, 2014, from <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10171>

<sup>23</sup> [Anonymous], Oxford Magazine 13 (1895), p. 196.



classics at Oriel College, who numbered the imperialist diamond magnate, Cecil Rhodes, among his pupils. His poem began:

The little Englander is dead and gone  
There lives a greater England far away  
Behind the rising of the Eastern day  
Beyond the setting of the Western sun<sup>24</sup>

In 1908, the university hosted a lavish celebration of Empire Day together with the Mayor and city council in Oxford's cathedral during which a children's choir sang appropriately patriotic and imperial hymns. A few years later, Sir Herbert Warren, Oxford's Professor of Poetry, spent his lectures comparing the merits of Virgil and Tennyson as poets of empire.<sup>25</sup> In the edition of the 'Oxford Magazine' which was published the week in which the Great War came to an end, its editor expressed his views about the great importance of the empire for his university and how the promotion and extension of the imperial ideal must lie at the heart of all that Oxford and her scholars did. Oxford, he declared, is a national and Imperial *asset, and has Imperial responsibilities...we have received a great heritage which we hold in trust for mankind. To spread that inheritance more widely is the task laid upon us.*<sup>26</sup> It is possible, indeed, to find similar language expressed at Oxford right from the beginning of the period of the so-called "new imperialism", dating back to the late 1860s and early 1870s. As part of his Inaugural Lecture as Slade Professor of Fine Art in 1870, John Ruskin spoke passionately about the inseparable nature of Oxford's educational and imperial mission, linked, in his mind, to the peculiar superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race:

There is a destiny now possible to us, the highest ever set before a nation to be accepted or refused. We are still undegenerate in race; a race mingled of the best northern blood. We are not dissolute in temper, but still have the firmness to govern and the grace to obey. This is what England must do or perish. She must found Colonies as fast and as far as she is able, formed of her most energetic and worthiest

---

<sup>24</sup> [Anonymous], Oxford Magazine 13 (1895), p. 213.

<sup>25</sup> Symonds. Oxford and Empire, p. 16.

<sup>26</sup> Quoted in Ibid., p. 19.

men, seizing every piece she can get her feet on and teaching these Colonists that *their chief virtue is to be fidelity to their Country...*<sup>27</sup>

In a number of ways, Oxford scholars heeded this clarion call as they travelled the length and breadth of the empire, promoting the imperial ideal and Britain's special mission to rule. Some did so as colonial Bishops, clergymen and religious missionaries. Long before Ruskin's lecture, Daniel Wilson, who had been Vice-Principal of St Edmund Hall, Oxford, was appointed Bishop of Calcutta in 1832 and the first Metropolitan of India. A later example would be Thomas Valpy French, a Fellow of University College, who became the first Bishop of Lahore in 1877; others traversed the networks of empire with a deliberate view to promoting the goal of imperial federation. James Bryce, Regius Professor of Law, from 1870 to 1893 was also Chair of the Oxford branch of the Imperial Federation League and travelled across the empire advocating the federal ideal. In the early 1900s, an influential group of Oxford academics, politicians and civil servants founded the informal dining club known as the Pollock Committee. The club's chair was the Corpus Professor of Jurisprudence at Oxford, Sir Frederick Pollock, and the group's chief purpose was to discuss ways of improving future imperial cooperation. Among other places, Pollock and members of the Committee visited Canada to promote the group's ideas and proposals.<sup>28</sup>

Following brief academic appointments as college fellows, other Oxford scholars went out to different parts of the empire as colonial administrators, dedicated to pursuing the ideal of empire in that capacity. Among the most famous was Hon. George Nathaniel Curzon, who, following a career as a Balliol undergraduate and an All Souls Fellow, served as Under Secretary for India and ultimately went out to the subcontinent as Viceroy. While still an undergraduate, he declared to his friend, Rennell Rodd, *There has never been anything so great in the world's history as the British Empire, so great an instrument for the good of*

---

<sup>27</sup> John Ruskin, *Lectures in Art*, vol. 20, in: John Ruskin, *Collected Works*, London 1903, p. 41.

<sup>28</sup> See Symonds, *Oxford and Empire*, pp. 69-70.

humanity.<sup>29</sup> Reflecting many years later on his undergraduate years at Oxford, he wrote that he could not understand how anyone educated at Oxford at that time could not be an imperialist. Alfred Milner was a similarly grand example of a scholar-administrator and dedicated servant of the imperial ideal. After a glittering undergraduate career at Balliol College, Oxford, during the course of which he won almost every university prize in existence, he obtained an Open Fellowship at New College. Soon after he went into colonial administration, travelling to Egypt as the Director General of Accounts in 1889. After this he moved on to India as Finance Member of the Viceroy's Council before taking up the powerful position of High Commissioner in South Africa and Governor of Cape Colony. Writing at the end of his life in 1925, he looked forward to a time when Imperialism...should become an accepted faith of the whole nation.' 'In another twenty years, he continued, it is reasonable to hope that...all Britons, alike in the Motherland or overseas, will be Imperialists.'<sup>30</sup>

### **Multiple Loyalties and Attachments**

However, by no means all scholars shared Milner's view. It is possible to find many academics who travelled widely in the British Empire and collaborated with a range of colleagues at colonial universities, for whom the empire itself and the furtherance of its interests, were not of prime importance. Such individuals have not as yet received the attention they deserve from historians. More recently, however, scholars have become more sensitive to the multiple motivations driving those actors moving within the sphere of empire. In particular, there have been calls for a more nuanced understanding of the figure of the explorer who has traditionally been viewed as a "tool" of empire. As Felix Driver has argued, "the idea of exploration was freighted with multiple and contested meanings, associated

---

<sup>29</sup> Rennell Rodd. *Social and Diplomatic Memories* vol. 3, London 1925, p. 393.

<sup>30</sup> Alfred Milner, *Key to My Position*, in: Alfred Milner. *Questions of the Hour*, London 1925, p. 211.

variously with science, literature, religion, commerce and empire.”<sup>31</sup> In his work on the imperial fashioning of Vancouver Island, Daniel Clayton has likewise identified a variety of motivations driving explorers including humanitarian sentiments and a scientific and philosophical agenda.<sup>32</sup> When examining the lives and trajectories of individual scholars, we must, of course, think in terms of a sliding scale when it comes to the relative importance of imperial loyalty and the imperial project vis-à-vis other motivations driving them to travel across imperial networks. Chief among these other motivations would have been the goals of their particular discipline. For many, we must visualize the relationship in terms of a partnership, with the interests both of the individual disciplines and of the empire being served. Representative here might be the career of Roderick Impey Murchison, a military man by training, but who went on to serve as Director-General of the Geological Survey from 1855 and President of the Royal Geographical Society from 1843 until 1871. Personally, Murchison was an imperialist who wanted to deepen imperial ties; however, at the same time, his involvement with the Geological Survey saw university-trained geologists sent out to nearly every colony of the empire, which in turn produced an unprecedentedly detailed picture of geology in these regions. Indeed, T.G. Bonney has written of “the mutually beneficial bargain...struck by Murchison” in which “science helped take an inventory of, develop, and justify the empire, while the empire offered science access to invaluable overseas data”.<sup>33</sup> The discipline of geography offers a comparable case in the figure of Halford Mackinder. Traditionally, scholars have tended to interpret the career of the first reader in Geography at the University of Oxford and father of

---

<sup>31</sup> Felix Driver. *Geography Militant: Cultures of Exploration and Empire*, Oxford 2001, p. 2.

<sup>32</sup> Daniel Clayton. *Islands of Truth: The Imperial Fashioning of Vancouver Island*, Vancouver 2000, pp. 8-9.

<sup>33</sup> Thomas George Bonney, *Murchison, Sir Roderick Impey, baronet (1792-1871)*, rev. Robert A. Stafford, in: *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford 2004. Retrieved September 23, 2014, from <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19555>

the “new geography” as a classic example of an academic serving the interests of empire.<sup>34</sup> Mackinder, however, denied this late in life, declaring that the interests of geography as a science had always been uppermost in his mind. At the very least, we ought to give equal weight to his academic interests in assessing his career. ”In truth”, his biographer, Brian Blouet has written, “his political and geographic aims were inseparable; he wanted to create a new scientific geography which could be pressed into the service of imperialism.”<sup>35</sup> There were other scholars such as John Holland Rose, appointed Reader in Modern History at the University of Cambridge in 1911, who, while interested in, and enthusiastic about, the empire, nevertheless pursued work in a wide range of research areas which frequently caused them to work both within and outside the networks of empire. Thus, on the one hand, Rose joined together with A. P. Newton and E. A. Benians to edit successive volumes of the “Cambridge History of the British Empire” (1925-36) and founded the “Rose studentship for Imperial History” in 1932; however, in the main, his research focused on the history of continental Europe from 1780 to the present day with a particular interest in the life and career of Napoleon. Like many of his contemporaries, Rose had huge respect for the achievements of German historians and worked hard to promote friendship and collaboration between the scholarly communities in Germany and Britain on the eve of the First World War. In addition to winning a high reputation within Britain and the empire, he received honorary degrees from extra-imperial universities in America and Poland.<sup>36</sup>

Far more numerous though, than these enthusiasts of empire, were those scholars who made use of imperial networks in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries with little or no concern for the imperial project. A useful early example of such a career is that of the

---

<sup>34</sup> James Ryan, *Visualizing Imperial Geography: Halford Mackinder and the Colonial Office Visual Instruction Committee, 1902-11*, in: *Ecumene* 1 (1994), pp. 157-176; Kearns, *The Imperial Subject*.

<sup>35</sup> Brian Blouet, *Mackinder, Sir Halford John (1861-1947)*, in: *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford 2004. Retrieved September 23, 2014, from <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/34760>.

<sup>36</sup> Thomas Otte, *Rose, John Holland (1855-1942)*, in: *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford 2004. Retrieved September 23, 2014, from <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/35829>

astronomer, Sir John Herschel. Educated at Cambridge and elected to a fellowship at St John's College in 1813, Herschel engaged in a wide range of collaborations with scholars in the empire in order to further his astronomical research. Thus in 1833, he travelled to the Cape of Good Hope so he could view stars from the southern heavens, which he had already observed in England. In this task, he worked closely with the London-trained doctor, Thomas Maclear, who had been appointed Director of Britain's Royal Observatory at the Cape. Maclear was likewise assisted by the Australian-born astronomer, James Dunlop and his catalogue of nebulae, which he had observed from Parramatta in New South Wales. During his stay at the Cape, between 1833 and 1838, Herschel served as president of the South African Literary Association and Scientific Institution and corresponded from there with several leading British scientists, in particular, Charles Lyell, professor of Geology at King's College, London, although there is very little evidence that he held any strong views about the British Empire or Britain's imperial mission. Herschel's research enjoyed worldwide renown, several of his works being translated into Chinese and Japanese.<sup>37</sup>

Many similar cases could be mentioned such as the entomologist, William Sharp Macleay, educated at Trinity College, Cambridge. Despite having a Colonial Secretary of New South Wales, Australia, for a father, in both his published and private writings, Macleay expressed few strong views about the empire. In terms of his academic contacts, he was deeply embedded in the world of continental European science, corresponding at length with German and French natural philosophers on various topics of physiological entomology. He was likewise in regular contact with American entomologists and was elected a corresponding member of the Academy of Natural Sciences at Philadelphia. However, at the same time, he made extensive use of British imperial networks to pursue his scientific researches. One of his most successful studies, 'Annulosa Javanica' (which was published in

---

<sup>37</sup> Michael Crowe, Herschel, Sir John Frederick William, first baronet (1792-1871), in: Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford 2004. Retrieved September 23, 2014, from <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13101>

1825) comprised a systematic description of insects collected in Java between 1812 and 1817 by Thomas Horsfield under the aegis of the East India Company and Sir Stamford Raffles. Once again, in 1838, he published illustrations of various insects collected in South Africa between 1834 and 1836 during an expedition, under the direction of Andrew Smith, which had been funded by the Cape of Good Hope Association for Exploring Central Africa.<sup>38</sup>

Those working within the emerging disciplines of archaeology and anthropology were particularly astute at using the networks provided by the British Empire to further the interests of their own studies. Take, for example, John Garstang, Honorary Reader in Egyptian Archaeology at the University of Liverpool from 1902. Educated at Jesus College, Oxford, Garstang made the acquaintance of the Egyptologist, Flinders Petrie and joined his excavations at Abydos in Egypt. Although Garstang was to spend several years working in Egypt, he did not confine himself to the boundaries of the British Empire, going on to dig in areas such as Jerusalem and Palestine. Likewise, his scholarly contacts were by no means dominated by members of the so-called British academic world; indeed, he corresponded regularly with academics from many different countries, particularly from France, which even presented him with the Legion d'Honneur in 1920.<sup>39</sup>

Such weaving in and out of the space of empire (as dictated by the interests of their disciplines) by university scholars in this period was most likely typical of the majority of careers. The anthropologist and anatomist, Elliot Smith, who was born in New South Wales, Australia and educated at the University of Sydney, made extensive use of imperial networks in the course of his career. After coming to England in 1896 on a James King travelling scholarship, he continued his research at St John's College, Cambridge under the anatomist, Alexander Macalister, publishing some eight papers on cerebral morphology

---

<sup>38</sup> John Clark, Macleay, William Sharp (1792-1865), in: Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford 2004. Retrieved September 23, 2014, from <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/17661>

<sup>39</sup> Oliver Robert Gurney, Garstang, John (1876-1956), in: Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford 2004. Retrieved September 23, 2014, from <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/33341>

between 1896 and 1897. In 1901, he acted as consultant to the University of California's Hearst Egyptological expedition and in 1907 carried out an archaeological survey of Nubia together with Sir Gaston Maspero, George Andrew Reisner and Frederic Wood Jones. However, later in his career, after being appointed to the chair of Anatomy at University College, London, he also became involved with anthropological fieldwork outside the empire, in particular, Davidson Black's paleontological Chinese research which yielded the famous "Peking skull" and other human fossils. His work too gained him fame outside the confines of British academia; in 1911, he was awarded the Prix Fauvelle by the Anthropological Society of Paris.<sup>40</sup>

The empire was thus one of many spheres in which British scholars were active in this period. Moreover, it was not simply British scholars who were drawn to the various parts of the empire for purposes of scientific research. Egypt, India, Australia and many other locations attracted scholars from all over the world, particularly from other European countries, and, in this sense, the British Empire must be conceptualized as an international space of research. To take just one example, the German orientalist scholar, Heinrich Blochmann, having studied Persian and Arabic under H.L. Fleischer at Leipzig and Friedrich Haase at Paris, joined the British army in 1858 with the expressed intention of travelling to India to pursue his study of Eastern languages. There he collaborated with the British-born Arabic scholar, William Nassau Lees, and through him was appointed Assistant Professor of Arabic and Persian at the Calcutta Madrasa in 1861. In 1862, he became pro-Rector of Doveton College, Calcutta and went on to carry out archaeological tours in India and British Burma.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> Graham Richards, Smith, Sir Grafton Elliot (1871-1937), in: Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford 2004. Retrieved September 23, 2014, from <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/36143>

<sup>41</sup> Henry Beveridge, Blochmann, Henry Ferdinand (1838-1878), rev. Parvin Loloi, in: Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford 2004. Retrieved September 23, 2014, from <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2659>



Nor were scientific societies based in Britain bound by the borders of empire. Thus the 'Royal Geographical Society' (RGS) awarded medals in the late 1880s not only to British and colonial scholars, but also to continental European explorers of Africa including the Germans, Georg Schweinfurth and Gustav Nachtigal. University professors, from France, Germany and Holland, in particular, gave papers before the Society and its members regularly corresponded and exchanged papers with their counterparts abroad.<sup>42</sup> In 1877, the RGS's Expeditions Committee said it wanted to advance geographical science to the exclusion of any dealings with territorial and commercial undertakings.<sup>43</sup> As D.R. Stoddart has shown, the final years of the nineteenth century certainly witnessed growing numbers of purely theoretical papers appearing in the Society's journals.<sup>44</sup> Despite the apparent similarities between the discipline of geography and the notion of imperialism, in terms of their shared focus on identifying, mapping and controlling territory, the role played by the RGS was clearly not that of a straightforward "tool of empire". Michael Heffernan was right to challenge the long-standing view that "European geography was European imperialism, albeit dressed up in a slightly more academic and scholarly guise."<sup>45</sup> Indeed, despite representing the high point of popular imperialism in Britain, the late nineteenth century also witnessed a resurgence of support for scientific internationalism among British scholars. Although no doubt related to broader technological developments rendering long-distance transport and communication much easier by the end of the century, this renewed interest in international cooperation also grew out of the mid-century trend of staging great international exhibitions of culture, education and science like the famous Great Exhibition of 1851 held in

---

<sup>42</sup> Butlin, *Geographies of Empire*, pp. 268, 280.

<sup>43</sup> Roy Bridges, *Europeans and East Africans in the Age of Exploration*, in: *The Geographical Journal* 139 (1973), pp. 220-232, here: pp. 222-223.

<sup>44</sup> David Stoddart, *The RGS and the 'New Geography': Changing Aims and Changing Roles in Nineteenth Century Science*, in: *The Geographical Journal* 146 (1980), pp. 190-202, here: p. 197.

<sup>45</sup> Michael Heffernan, *The Science of Empire: The French Geographical Movement and the Forms of French Imperialism, 1870-1920*, in: *Geography and Empire*, eds. by Anne Godlewska and Neil Smith, Oxford 1994, pp. 92-114, here: p. 93.

the specially built Crystal Palace in London. Many British scholars took a leading role in establishing international organizations and conferences related to their particular disciplines. Thus, Sir Archibald Geikie, appointed Professor of Geology at Edinburgh in 1871, was not just president of the British Geological Association but was also active in setting up the first international geological congresses.<sup>46</sup> Likewise, Sir John Keltie, Secretary to the Royal Geographical Society, was instrumental in organizing the sixth International Geographical Congress held in London in 1895.<sup>47</sup>

Even the organization which sounds from its name as though it would be particularly national, perhaps imperial, in focus – the ‘British Association for the Advancement of Science’ (BAAS) – was becoming considerably more cosmopolitan in the final years of the nineteenth century. When the Association met for the first time outside the British Isles – namely in Montreal in 1884, it was not national or imperial identity that took centre stage in the discussions but rather the priorities of the various scientific disciplines represented there. In welcoming the delegates, who, significantly, included prominent European and American scholars, the Canadian Prime Minister, John A. Macdonald, addressed his audience in the following terms. I really do not know in what capacity I am called upon to address this audience, whether as a scientist or as a Canadian or as a member of the government. I cannot well say – I will say, however – I come here as a scientist.<sup>48</sup> Likewise, Jean-Louis Beaudry, the Mayor of Montreal, stressed in his address that the student of almost every branch of science must find something worth learning at the meeting.<sup>49</sup> The cosmopolitan attitude of the Association is also clear from the fact that it had deliberately scheduled its meeting in Montreal so its members could also visit the meeting of the American Association

---

<sup>46</sup> David Oldroyd, Geikie, Sir Archibald (1835-1924), in: Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford 2004. Retrieved September 23, 2014, from <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/33364>

<sup>47</sup> Elizabeth Baigent, Keltie, Sir John Scott (1840-1927), in: Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford 2004. Retrieved September 23, 2014, from <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/34269>

<sup>48</sup> Quoted in Clara Rayleigh, *The British Association’s Visit to Montreal, 1884: Letters*, San Diego 2008, p. 35.

<sup>49</sup> Quoted in Rayleigh, *The British Association’s Visit to Montreal, 1884*, p. 33.

for the Advancement of Science which was being held in Philadelphia a week later.<sup>50</sup> A similar sense of the international perspective of the BAAS is gained from looking at the causes it agreed to fund at the 1884 meeting. Along with the predictable grants to scientific projects within the British Isles and Empire, it was agreed to provide funding to investigate the ‘volcanic phenomena of Vesuvius’ and ‘earthquake phenomena of Japan’.<sup>51</sup>

### **Critiques of Imperialism**

While “cosmopolitan” societies like the BAAS confined themselves to promoting the gospel of scientific internationalism, some of their disciples went on to develop nuanced critiques of imperialism while still making extensive use of the networks of empire. One of the earliest such critiques was developed at Oxford by the university reformer and Regius Professor of Modern History, Goldwin Smith. In a series of anti-imperial letters to the ‘Daily News’ in 1862-3, Smith argued that the British were keeping the Colonies in a perpetual state of infancy and preventing the gristle of their frames from being matured into bone. He went so far as to recommend decolonisation of Gibraltar and several other British possessions as well as the granting of independence to several of the settler colonies including Canada and Australia.<sup>52</sup>

Goldwin Smith’s concerns were shared by a larger group of dons based at Wadham College, Oxford, and known to posterity as the “Wadham Positivists”. Indeed, Smith was connected to them directly – via Richard Congreve – the most prominent of the group who had tutored Smith when he was a student. Following the teachings of Auguste Comte, the positivists argued that nations, like individuals, ought to subjugate self-love to the general

---

<sup>50</sup> George Monro Grant, The British Association at Montreal, in: *Contemporary Review* 46 (1884), pp. 235-251, here: p. 246.

<sup>51</sup> [Anonymous], British Association Meeting at Montreal, Grants of Money Made at, *Academy* 26 (1884), p. 188.

<sup>52</sup> Goldwin Smith. *The Empire*, Oxford and London 1863, p. 3.

good of society. The logical consequence of this, they argued, was that no nation should dominate another. Like Goldwin Smith, Congreve recommended withdrawal from Gibraltar and other British territories, most provocatively perhaps – India. Together with several colleagues at Oxford, Congreve wrote a book on ‘International Policy’, published in 1866, in which E.H. Pember, who had been a Student at Christ Church, extended the case Congreve had made for Britain giving up India. Pember likewise stressed the need for far greater numbers of Indians to be allowed into the Indian Civil Service, advocated that Princes, whose states had been annexed by Britain, should have them returned to them and was especially condemning in his assessment of Christian missionaries whom he described as for the most part rash and ignorant men...with the scantiest knowledge of Hindoo society.<sup>53</sup> The most vocal of the Wadham Positivists, however, was J.H. Bridges, who went on to become a fellow of Oriel College. Referring to British imperial policy in Uganda, in 1893, he condemned what he saw as the combination of Christianity and commerce to force Western civilisation on negro tribes by Bibles and Maxim guns.<sup>54</sup>

The Oxford classics course, known as “Greats”, which acted as the training ground for so many colonial civil servants has been treated by historians as a particularly prominent instance of a university curriculum being tailored to an ideal of empire. In particular, historians have commented on the way in which the study of Platonic philosophy, introduced into the undergraduate course by Benjamin Jowett at Balliol, encouraged undergraduates, and particularly, those intended for the Indian Civil Service, to think of themselves as Platonic guardians, an elite, chosen on personal merit, to rule over subject peoples.<sup>55</sup> Yet, even within Oxford Greats, counter discourses developed. J.A. Hobson, for example, who read classics at

---

<sup>53</sup> Edward Henry Pember, *England and India*, in: *International Policy*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, ed. by Richard Congreve, London 1884, pp. 155ff.

<sup>54</sup> Quoted in Frances Torlesse. *J.H. Bridges and his Family*, London 1912, p. 210.

<sup>55</sup> Phiroze Vasunia, *Greek, Latin and the Indian Civil Service*, in: *The Cambridge Classical Journal* 51 (2005), pp. 35-71.

Lincoln College, attributed his anti-imperial attitudes, feelings which he condemned in the passage quoted below as ‘materialistic and narrowly utilitarian,’ to his classical training at Oxford:

The contributions which Plato and Aristotle made to the permanent possessions of the *human mind, what to feel and what to think about man's inner nature* and his place in the universe and the methods of testing and achieving knowledge, were of immense service in liberating me from the easy acceptance of current ideas and feelings in an age rightly described as materialistic and narrowly utilitarian.<sup>56</sup>

Another leading critic of empire who traced much of his scepticism about the imperial project to his “Greats” training was Gilbert Murray, who studied at St John’s College, Oxford before going on to become Regius Professor of Greek. In his book on ‘Liberalism and the Empire’, published in 1900, Murray compared the practices of forced labour in Rhodesia with those found in ancient Greece. He repeatedly pointed to the fate of Athens, whose people, he wrote, abandoned democracy, became corrupted by love of Empire and ultimately declined and fell into desuetude. He warned that Britain too might be overcome by hubris.<sup>57</sup> Nor was Murray alone in using classics in this way. Even in the Indian Civil Service examinations themselves, candidates were expected to use their classical training critically to think about the risks and disadvantages of empire as well as the benefits. The examination questions thus reveal a persistent interest in the rebellions, which took place in the Roman Empire, especially in the grievances that lay behind them. In particular, candidates were asked to assess the justness of complaints against Rome and to estimate the level of oppression caused during conquest. In 1911, for example, they were asked to estimate the degree to which the Pictish chief Calgacus was justified in making his famous denouncement of Roman Imperialism: *ubi solitudinem faciunt pacem appellant*.<sup>58</sup>

Similar critiques were also to be found among the colleges making up the newly

---

<sup>56</sup> John Atkinson Hobson. *Confessions of an Economic Heretic*, London 1938, p. 36.

<sup>57</sup> Gilbert Murray, *Liberalism and the Empire: Three Essays*, London 1900.

<sup>58</sup> English translation: “Where they create a barren wilderness, they call it peace.” Indian Civil Service Examination Papers (1911), British Library India Office Collections.

constituted University of London. A number of leading anti-imperialists found long-term positions there in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Thus E.H. Beesley, a favourite pupil of Richard Congreve at Wadham, and a leading positivist, served as Professor of History at University College, London, from 1860 to 1893. Leonard Trelawny Hobhouse, a former “Greats” student at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, lectured at London in 1904 on comparative ethics and in 1907 was elected as the first Professor of Sociology at the London School of Economics. This was despite the publication in 1904 of his most sustained attack on imperialism, a book entitled ‘Democracy and Reaction’. In it, he condemned the notion of liberal imperialism as an empty farce. The central principle of Liberalism is self-government, he proclaimed. The central principle of Imperialism is the subordination of self-government to Empire. The one stands for autonomy and the other for ascendancy.<sup>59</sup> It should likewise not be forgotten that the London School of Economics owed its foundation in 1895 to Sidney and Beatrice Webb, leading lights of the Fabian society and profoundly skeptical in their attitude towards the empire. Although they stopped short of outright condemnation, the Society put forward a very different concept of empire, which stressed that the ultimate goal was the independent self-government of the colonies. Their views are illustrated very clearly in George Bernard Shaw’s pamphlet of 1900, ‘Fabianism and the Empire’, in which he denounced “imperialism” in its popular jingoistic sense as a mere catch-word vaguely denoting our insular self-conceit.<sup>60</sup>

Similarly important in developing a persuasive anti-imperial critique were a group of British academics gathered around the social evolutionist and town planner, Patrick Geddes. He had been one of Thomas Henry Huxley’s pupils at the School of Mines in London and had gone on to study natural sciences at the Sorbonne under Huxley’s friend, Henri de Lacaze-Duthiers. A complex character, holding chairs at the Universities of Dundee and

---

<sup>59</sup> Leonard Trelawny Hobhouse. *Democracy and Reaction*, London 1904.

<sup>60</sup> George Bernard Shaw. *Fabianism and the Empire*, London 1900.

Bombay, Geddes not only imbibed Huxley's cosmopolitanism; he also pioneered the concept of regionalism as an alternative to national and imperial identity.<sup>61</sup> In 1903, together with his friend and fellow sociologist, Victor Branford, Geddes founded the 'Sociological Society' in London which was used, in the words of John Scott, as a "vehicle" for Geddes' ideas, in particular, the concept of regionalism.<sup>62</sup> Branford, moreover, actively sought to promote regionalism internationally, corresponding with such eminent figures as Emile Durkheim, Marcel Mauss and Ferdinand Toennies. In 1913, Geddes founded the 'International Regional Survey Association' and during the First World War preached the importance of regionalism as an antidote to conflict through both his academic writings and peripatetic public exhibitions which he displayed in Britain, Belgium and India. War, he argued, had been the outcome of the machinations of national and imperial governments based in capital cities; regional centres, on the other hand, were dedicated to the peaceful exchange of goods and ideas. Together with Branford, he published a series of volumes under the title, 'The Making of the Future', which set out his vision for a future society based on regional identity.<sup>63</sup>

Indeed, it is noteworthy how many of those scholars who developed critiques of imperialism were working in disciplines directly related to the growth of the empire and with most experience of travelling within its boundaries. Such, for example, was Andrew Davidson, a former superintending surgeon in Mauritius, who was appointed as the first Lecturer in Tropical Diseases at the University of Edinburgh. In his 'Geographical Pathology', published in 1892, he warned against further imperial expansion primarily on health grounds. Much of India, he concluded, had a pathology inimical to Europeans and continued emigration of Britons to this and other parts of the empire would only further the

---

<sup>61</sup> Helen Meller, Geddes, Sir Patrick (1854-1932), in: Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford 2004. Retrieved September 23, 2014, from <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/33361>

<sup>62</sup> John Scott, Branford, Victor Verasis (1863-1930), in: Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford 2004. Retrieved September 23, 2014, from <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/97274>

<sup>63</sup> Meller, Geddes, Sir Patrick (1854-1932), in: Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford 2004. Retrieved September 23, 2014, from <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/33361>

physical degeneration of the race.<sup>64</sup> Henry Martyn Clark, a medical doctor, trained at Edinburgh and working in Amritsar, launched a similar critique of Britain's westernizing policy in India on the grounds of its dangerous side effects for public health. In a paper presented to the Royal Scottish Geographical Society in 1893, he condemned, in particular, what he described as this:

mania for widening and improving streets, for introducing costly schemes of drainage and water-supply and for approximating Indian towns to the Western ideal...In the East everything Eastern is not of necessity bad, nor is a thing that is good in the West always suitable in the East...to supplant old habits by others, acquired under totally different conditions of life – natural[,] social, climatic – is not for the benefit of the people. By removing protecting walls and deflecting angles, we do but lay the city more open to the enemy.<sup>65</sup>

The Society which was based in Edinburgh and enjoyed close links with the university's medical community provided a forum for many a critical discussion of empire in the period following its foundation in 1884.<sup>66</sup> In a lecture given to the Society in 1897, G.W. Prothero, Professor of Modern History at Edinburgh, gave a gloomy forecast for the future of the empire, whose greatest problem, he argued, was an inability to function effectively across such a great expanse of territory.<sup>67</sup> Another speaker, the Edinburgh trained medic and Lecturer in Tropical Diseases and Climatology, Robert W. Felkin, made the provocative suggestion that the British should take a much greater account of native customs in its government of India. This was particularly so in the case of health policy, he argued, where national self-conceit should play no role. *Every medical man owed a duty to science*, he

---

<sup>64</sup> Andrew Davidson. *Geographical Pathology*, Edinburgh 1892.

<sup>65</sup> Henry Martyn Clark, *Remarks on Malaria and Acclimatisation*, in: *Scottish Geographical Magazine* 9 (1893), pp. 281-302.

<sup>66</sup> Morag Bell, *Edinburgh and Empire: Geographical Science and Citizenship for a 'New' Age*, ca. 1900, in: *Scottish Geographical Journal* 111 (1995), pp. 139-149.

<sup>67</sup> George Walter Prothero, *The Unity of the Empire. The British Colonial Empire*, in: *Scottish Geographical Magazine* 13 (1897), pp. 308-315.



*declared, 'to observe with critical, but at the same time with no unfriendly or sarcastic eye, the acquired skill and empirical remedies used by uncivilized races.'*<sup>68</sup>

## Conclusion

This article has not sought to contest the fact that British scholars and British universities became closely entangled with the language and ideology of empire and imperialism in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This is indisputably true. What it has attempted to reconsider, however, is the effect of this entanglement on the attitudes and identities of the scholars themselves. It should not simply be assumed that a closer involvement in the networks of empire necessarily led to an identification with its aims. It was suggested at the beginning that an important reason for the popularity of this assumption is the tendency in recent years for global history and cultural history to diverge quite substantially from each other as approaches to understanding the past. Global history, with its reliance upon macro-scale studies and network theory as a key analytical tool, has been arguably less concerned with questions of individual identity and motivation, which provide the focus for much of the work of cultural historians. Similarly, the cultural historical approach has been relatively slow to engage substantively with key questions and concepts developed by global historians, network analysis providing a good example of this.

It has, therefore, been an important aim of this article to investigate, through the case study of scholars networking within the British Empire, the relationship between the act of traversing networks, on the one hand, and the self-fashioning of those who traverse them, on the other. While studies adopting a global history approach have tended to assume a fairly straightforward relationship between network participation and identity-construction (in this case – engagement with British imperial networks must translate into identification with

---

<sup>68</sup> Robert Felkin, *Introductory Address to a Course of Lectures on Diseases of the Tropics and Climatology*, Edinburgh (undated), p. 16.

empire and its aims), the research presented in this article makes clear that there was in fact a wide variety of responses among the British scholarly community. Certainly, there were many individuals who identified strongly with the imperial project and sought to further its aims through their own work. However, at the same time, there were many others who made regular use of the networks of empire while following aims little if at all connected with imperialism or imperial identity. Rather, their movements and collaborations were dictated primarily by what they perceived as the particular interests of their discipline or field of research. Such motives frequently caused them to operate within the boundaries of the empire, but equally led them to participate in extra-imperial networks if the need arose. More than this, frequent experience of imperial networks and collaboration within the space of empire did not preclude the development of discourses critical of the imperial project; as we have seen, in a number of cases, for groups of scholars and individual researchers, familiarity with the empire, its structures and inhabitants, appears to have bred contempt rather than loyalty. Some, indeed, openly rejected empire, preferring instead to construct both personal and professional identities linked to collaborative relationships and networks operating at alternative geographical scales, above all, the international and the regional.