Tony Ballantyne and Antoinette Burton

Introduction: Bodies, Empires, and World Histories

We live in a world profoundly shaped by cross-cultural encounters, slavery, colonization, and migration. These forces have not only been central in determining the distribution of wealth and power at a global level, but they have also molded the world's demographic profile, dictated where national boundaries have been inscribed, influenced the legal regimes that govern people's lives, and shaped the ways different ethnic, religious, racial, and national communities relate to each other. The impact of colonialism and the results of empire building are not restricted to "high politics" and state practices, but also shape everyday life at a global level, influencing the languages we speak, the clothes we wear, the food we eat, the music we listen to, and the arts and culture we are inspired by. The legacies of slavery, empires, and mobility are frequently painful, but they are inescapable: in many ways, these legacies are at the heart of what it is to be modern, what it is to be human, at the start of the twenty-first century.

As a distinctive approach to the past, one that focuses on cross-cultural encounters, institutions, and ideologies and the integrative power of various types of networks, world history allows us to scrutinize the diverse forces that have brought various communities into contact, concert, and conflict. World history has enjoyed renewed popularity in recent years, in part because economists, sociologists, anthropologists, and other students of the present moment are increasingly interested in how areas of the globe that were once thought to be distinct have actually been interconnected for a very long time. It is no longer possible, or even desirable,

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

to uncritically think in terms of "the West," "Asia," "Europe," or "the Third World"—not only because each of those categories tends to homogenize the geographical region it evokes, but equally because all of those places have been interdependent from the fourteenth century onward, if not before. Scholars have been at work investigating what many of us in the first decades of the twenty-first century take for granted in the present: that because of trade, migration, revolution, war, religion, and travel, goods, people, ideas, and civilizations themselves are all the result of transnational processes. In other words—and to use a common buzzword of the moment—they are the result of "globalization." Here we agree with Laura Briggs that the term *globalization* is often "a placeholder, a word with no exact meaning that we use in our contested efforts to describe the successors to development and colonialism."[1] Current debates on globalization emphasize some of the same processes of interconnection and mutual dependence that practitioners of world history have examined in the past twenty years. Their teaching and research have suggested that far from being fixed within borders or limited to local communities and national states, many of the world's most important commodities, political systems, and spiritual practices are the consequence of diverse cultural encounters over time and space—so much so that we now have to rethink terms like "European progress," "Chinese trade," and "Western Christianity." Coming to these subjects from the perspective of world history allows us to appreciate how they came to be identified with such geographical precision. It also underscores the limits of understanding them merely as insular national or territorially based phenomena. World history, in short, enables us to take a global view of ostensibly local events, systems, and cultures and to reevaluate the histories of connection and rupture that have left their mark, in turn, on our contemporary condition.

The influence of societies on each other across regions and, in some cases, across the globe does not mean, of course, that they have been uniform or anything like united, even at the same moments in history. This is in large part because empires and imperial ambitions have been among the most powerful sponsors of "cultural contact"—and of the processes of intermixture, borrowing, fusion, and appropriation that such contact has given rise to over the course of centuries. So, for example, European cultures have been immeasurably shaped by their encounters with African, Indian, and Mesoamerican peoples in ways that make

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Europe itself one of the greatest examples of transnationality in the world. But the often violent imposition of European modernity on "subject peoples" in the form of technology, capitalist labor practices, and the Christian civilizing mission has meant that cultures on the receiving end of such contact have been in a reactive and at times defensive posture with respect to dominant forms of "global" influence. Nor are such imperial strategies unique to the "West." Both the Han and the Mughal empires produced similar forms of colonial encounter with the indigenous communities they came into contact with, models of which later, Western imperial advocates (notably the British) were acutely aware. The impact of empires on global processes and transformations has thus been considerable, as well as historically significant. That is why this collection focuses on the role of imperial ideologies—their agents and their enemies, their collaborators and their resisters—in helping to shape world history.

A few caveats are in order. We use the term "empire" quite loosely here, intending it to mean webs of trade, knowledge, migration, military power, and political intervention that allowed certain communities to assert their influence and sovereignty over other groups.[2] In other words, these "imperial webs" functioned as systems of exchange, mobility, appropriation, and extraction, fashioned to enable the empire-building power to exploit the natural resources, manufactured goods, or valued skills of the subordinated group. In offering the image of the web, we want to emphasize interconnected networks of contact and exchange without downplaying the very real systems of power and domination such networks had the power to transport. The web's intricate strands carried with them and helped to create hierarchies of race, class, religion, and gender, among others, thereby casting the conquerors as superior and the conquered as subordinate, with important and lingering consequences for the communities they touched. We do not wish to suggest that empires functioned as colossal juggernauts, razing everything in their paths and putting into place systems of domination that were unaffected by "native" agency or uncontested by indigenous interests. Indeed, the image of the web also conveys something of the double nature of the imperial system. Empires, like webs, were fragile and prone to crises where important threads were broken or structural nodes destroyed, yet also dynamic, being constantly remade and reconfigured through concerted thought and effort.

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

As the essays that follow amply demonstrate, empires have not simply been carriers or enablers of global processes, they have in turn spawned new hybrid forms of economic activity, political practice, and cultural performance that take on lives of their own—in part because of the ways colonized peoples and cultures have acted on or resisted imperial political and social forms. Nor do we want to imply that all world history can be reduced simply to the fact of empires. Not only does such a claim stake too much ground for imperial histories, but it is in danger of blinding us to stories large and small which cannot always be glimpsed through the archives that empires leave behind. But we do believe that targeting empires is *one* way of making sense of world history because it requires us to pay attention to big structural events and changes as well as to ask what impact they had on microprocesses and the historical subjects who lived with and through them. Tracking empires in a global context is, in other words, one way of reimagining the world's history so that both its monumental quality and its ultimately fragmented character can be captured simultaneously.

Why the focus on bodies as a means of accessing the colonial encounters in world history? Quite simply, we are seeking a way to dramatize how, why, and under what conditions women and gender can be made visible in world history—a challenge on many levels. Women do not tend to enter the primary source materials that remain from imperial and colonial archives because, for the most part, they did not hold positions of official power. This absence has meant that it is difficult to see them, and to understand their historical roles, in world civilizations. There are exceptions, of course. Queens and elite women can be recaptured from obscurity through texts and visual images; they dot the landscape of world history textbooks and even some books devoted to women of the past across the globe. But this leaves us with a less than satisfying view of how women experienced the movement of history, how dominant and indigenous regimes saw them, and what role gender has played in helping to shape civilizational attitudes as well as transnational movements and processes.

What is striking, however, is the extent to which women's bodies (and, to a lesser degree, men's) have been a subject of concern, scrutiny, anxiety, and surveillance in a variety of times and places across the world. Whether it was native Indian women's sexuality that caused concern for a colonizing Catholic Church in colonial Mexico or that of Japanese women under

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

postwar U.S. military occupation, the female body has gotten—and kept—the attention of imperial officials in ways that demonstrate how crucial its management was believed to be for social order and political stability. The stakes of this stability were perhaps especially high for imperial powers, which were de facto trying to impose specific political forms and cultural practices on often unwilling populations. What this means is that the body can be read by us as evidence of how women were viewed by, and how gender assumptions undergirded, empires in all their complexity. Some of the essays in this collection focus on the body very explicitly, as in Patrick McDevitt's essay on contact sport as a national pastime in colonial Ireland and Hyun Sook Kim's on the fate of "comfort women" in the context of World War II. Other essays use the body as a metaphor for citizenship and the nation, as in Elisa Camiscioli's work on interwar French immigration controls as expressions of concern about the racial purity of the "national body." Others focus on examples of cultural contact through bodies literally in motion, like Siobhan Lambert Hurley's essay on the begam of Bhopal and Carter Vaughn Findley's research on the Ottoman traveler and writer Ahmed Midhat. Still others, like Melani McAlister's essay that begins with Muhammad Ali, show how famous bodies can be used as a jumping-off point for seeing connections between local communities (African Americans during the cold war) and transnational events with global significance (the Arab-Israeli War and the international Islamicist movement).

The volume is divided into three sections. The first section, "Thresholds of Modernity: Mapping Genders," focuses on the place of race, gender, and sexuality in empire building during the early modern period. Although the essays range over disparate geographic and social contexts, they underscore the centrality of the body in the articulation of imperial ideologies and in the often fraught dynamics of cross-cultural contact. More generally still, the contributions in this first section reveal how the operation of early modern empires began to reconfigure understandings of the body at a global level, as the languages of gender and race grew in authority and imperial systems began to "globalize" and universalize legal regimes, religious beliefs, and understandings of sickness and death. The essays that make up the second section of the volume, "Global Empires, Local Encounters," examine a wide array of very specific local colonial encounters from the close of the eighteenth century to the middle decades of the twentieth century. These essays chart the diverse locations where

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

understandings of the body were defined and contested: from the sports fields of Ireland to Australian courtrooms, from the prairies of the American Midwest to the clubs of colonial India, from swimming holes in Mozambique to the British Columbia frontier. The contributions to this section foreground the ways the boundaries of race and gender were negotiated, policed, and reinforced in an age of colonial modernity and demonstrate the processes that increasingly undermined the flexibility and fluidity that characterized many earlier social formations.

The third section of the volume, "The Mobility of Politics and the Politics of Mobility," focuses on the battles over empire from the final decade of the nineteenth century to the late twentieth century. While many of the essays examine the politics of anticolonialism and nationalism, they all reflect on the ways our modern world was shaped by greater mobility, whether in travel, migration, the flow of ideas and information, war, or imperial expansion itself. The fierce debates over imperialism reconstructed in this section turn on the body, how it was managed, how it could be represented, and how the brutalities visited on particular types of bodies should be remembered or understood. The collection closes with a final essay that reflects on the volume as a whole and that uses the notion of "bodies in contact" to map some future directions for both world history research and teaching.

THE ESSAYS COLLECTED here have, then, a dual purpose. First, they emphasize the centrality of bodies — raced, sexed, classed, and ethnicized bodies — as sites through which imperial and colonial power was imagined and exercised. By thus foregrounding the body, this volume marks a fundamental reconception of the nature and workings of empires: we focus on the material effects of geopolitical systems in everyday spaces, family life, and on-the-ground cultural encounters. Rather than privileging the operations of the Foreign Office or gentlemanly capitalists, for example, this attention to bodies means that the plantation, the theater, the home, the street, the school, the club, and the marketplace are now visible as spaces where people can be seen to have experienced modes of imperial and colonial power. Although the past two decades have witnessed a tremendous boom in scholarly production on colonialism and empire, with feminist historians taking the lead in the project of recovering the experiences of women and other "others," this research has not received the attention it should in world history textbooks and hence in

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

world history courses. There, high politics and commerce still dominate accounts of empire in ways that certainly remain useful. Women and gender are now scrupulously attended to but most often not in ways that underscore their constitutive role in the shaping of global power or cross-cultural social organization.[3] Long after women's history has moved beyond the "add women and stir" formula, world history surveys still tend to take an additive approach, so that each unit "covers" women, but discretely; rare enough is the approach taken by Peter Stearns, which emphasizes "particular historical episodes" in tension with "higher-level analysis of patterns over time."[4] And, as shall be discussed in more detail below, scarcely any attention is paid to masculinity as a cultural (let alone a political) category.[5] This is especially regrettable because colonial projects and their processes were frequently believed to throw white male bodies into crisis (making them vulnerable to disease, insanity, and hybridization), and the supposed "femininity" of colonized men was frequently used as a political tool to justify their exclusion from positions of power and as a means of justifying their colonization in the first place.[6] The abstractions, omissions, and facile categorizations that tend to follow from a historiographical literature that overlooks gendered subjectivities and experiences need qualification and elaboration. This is all the more important because the quest for generalization can take people—especially women, children, and "natives"—out of the story, thereby often relegating human agency in its particulars to the margins of historical understanding.

This is not to say, of course, that women, gender, and sexuality represent the full extent of what bodies in history can and do signify. Bodies evoke birth and death, work and play, disease and fitness; they carry germs and fluids as well as a variety of political, social, and cultural meanings; they are the grounds of political economies and the pretext for intrusion, discipline, and punishment at both the individual and the collective levels. Although the essays that make up this collection treat subjects as diverse as slavery and travel, ecclesiastical colonialism and military occupation, marriage and property, nationalism and football, immigration and temperance, we do not propose to offer anything like a global history of the body.[7] For our purposes, the gendered bodies invoked by the authors collected here serve as entrées into larger discussions of how the body can give shape to themes of relevance to world history, as well as how they can reorient that project so that it encompasses different bodies

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

of evidence.[8] Of equal importance is the opportunity to bring into view research published in venues that may be ignored or underutilized by European or American audiences, such as the *Indian Journal of Gender Studies*, the *Journal of African History*, and *Australian Feminist Studies*. In doing so we can better appreciate both the applicability of Euro-American theoretical models of gender and the body to diverse geographical sites and the very real limits of those frameworks for historicizing "global" realities. *Bodies in Contact*, in short, enables readers to access some of the most recent and significant scholarship on women, gender, and the colonial encounter so that students with a variety of disciplinary interests can appreciate the tensions between macro and micro perspectives on the globe—and so that the constitutive impact of gender and sexuality in all their historical complexity can be more fully appreciated.

Second, the volume insists on the centrality of imperial and colonial bodies in the circuits of global politics, capital, and culture. This commitment stems from our conviction that historically, empires have been constitutive of global systems, but that in contemporary debates about how to think and teach world history and globalization the centrality of imperial power and knowledge is often excised or downplayed or occluded, a situation that may or may not change with the arrival of new forms of U.S. imperialism at work in the global arena. Collectively these essays map the transformative power of imperial systems and the ways in which the development of global empires have been entwined historically with bodies in contact: that is, bodies not just involved in intimate personal, sexual, or social relations but bodies in motion, bodies in subjection, bodies in struggle, bodies in action. This move effectively recasts readers' understanding of the contemporary world, where empires are clearly not over, even and especially in this particular global moment. Each of the essays we have chosen makes visible the ideological work of imperial or colonial mentalities in a specific moment and a specific set of locations, demonstrating both the need for historical contingency when creating global narratives and the fundamentally transnational operation of colonial power. Once again, feminist scholarship has been crucial to recent developments in comparative, imperial, and world histories, but in ways that have not been easily accessible to students in the classroom.[9] *Bodies in Contact* thereby offers students of globalization an opportunity to appreciate the role of empires in shaping world systems by tracking embodied experiences across historical time and cultural space. It also makes recent

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

scholarship available to instructors, who can then test it against the overarching claims and theories made in the textbooks that are inevitably used in large courses. This, we hope, creates a series of heretofore unavailable pedagogical opportunities by setting up supposedly "small" histories that may ratify some established syntheses, question others, and perhaps even chip away at the long-standing distinction between big and small processes of historical continuity and change.[10] In the process, *Bodies in Contact* also enables students to interrogate the totalizing narratives that can arise under the rubric of "world history" and to ask when, why, and under what conditions the global is a desirable category of historical analysis.[11]

If this collection brings together a series of essays that foreground race, gender, and sexuality in ways that challenge the traditional foci of global narratives, many of the essays reflect perhaps the most important contribution of recent world history research: the critique of long-established narratives of "the rise of the West." The emergence of world history as a distinctive approach to the past in the early twentieth century coincided with a moment of European paramountcy and a widespread faith in the West's civilizing mission. Within such a context, it was hardly surprising that early world histories, written by H. G. Wells, Oswald Spengler, and Arnold Toynbee, played a central role in consolidating Europe and North America at the heart of understandings of global history and articulating a powerful narrative that molded the complex, fragmentary, and heterogeneous nature of the human past into a striking account of the creation, consolidation, and extension of the power of the "West."[12] Even as world history slowly became professionalized after World War II, this narrative continued to provide a key framework for understandings of the global past in undergraduate lecture halls, graduate seminar rooms, and faculty lounges. In turn, this model was fortified by sociologists and area studies specialists who promulgated world system and dependency theories that firmly located Europe and North America as the "core" of the modern world.[13] In 1963 W. H. McNeill published his paradigmatic *The Rise of the West*, a work that had sold over 75,000 copies by 1990 and that continues to be widely used in college classrooms and to attract a wide public audience. The subtitle of McNeill's work (*A History of the Human Community*) reduces human history to a narrative of the "rise of the West" and underscores the profoundly teleological assumptions that shaped world history in the 1960s and 1970s.[14]

Such assumptions do linger today, but research undertaken by world

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

historians since the early 1980s has explicitly challenged the primacy attached to Europe or the West as the prime historical agent of cross-cultural integration. The work of Janet Abu-Lughod, for example, called into question the belief that Europeans were central in driving cross-cultural exchanges, by drawing attention to the complex circuits of long-distance trade that integrated Eurasia in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.[15] This emphasis on the importance of changes taking place in central Asia has been extended by other scholars who have identified the "Mongol explosion" in this period as marking the emergence of the first truly "world empire."[16] Most important, however, it has been the historians who work on China and its connections with inner Asia, Southeast Asia, the rest of East Asia, and Europe who have transformed our understandings of the basic pattern of world history. At the same time, research on the economic history of South Asia has both revised an image of a corrupt and weakening Mughal empire inherited from British colonial discourse and has emphasized that the Indian Ocean was the center of a series of interlocking commercial networks that reached out as far as East Africa and Indonesia. Europeans were latecomers to this cosmopolitan commercial world and their arrival caused little concern to the Jewish, Arab, Gujarati, Tamil, Malay, and Chinese traders who dominated the bazaars and shipping routes of the region. It was only as a result of the militarization of trade during the eighteenth century and the growing colonial aspirations of European East India Companies that Europeans gradually came to dominate the long-established markets and commercial hubs around the Indian Ocean.

In effect, this work on Asian economic history and Asia's trade with Europe has both called into question the exceptional status so frequently accorded to Europe and recast our understandings of the chronology of world history.[17] One of the crucial debates that continues to exercise world historians is the relationship between Europe's rise, imperialism, and the emergence of global capitalism. While some historians, such as David Landes, continue to attribute Europe's rise to power to supposedly intrinsically European cultural qualities ("work, thrift, honesty, patience, tenacity"), recent research has tended to underscore the centrality of imperialism in the New World in both allowing Europe to escape from its ecological constraints (by making a host of new natural resources and valuable commodities available to Europe) and constituting the very nature of European culture itself.[18] Moreover, where McNeill might have

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

given shape to history by discerning the rising dominance of the West, what has emerged out of recent world historical research is an image of a multicentered world during the period between 1250 and 1800, when China was perhaps the single most powerful region. In the 1800s, it seems that Europe did exercise increasing power at a global level as a result of the military-fiscal revolution that consolidated its military advantage over non-European nations, its harnessing of its natural resources, especially coal, to its industrial revolution, and a sustained period of imperial expansion beginning from the 1760s.[19]

Of course, the spectacular rise of European empires from the middle of the eighteenth century was also intimately connected with the "hollowing out" of the Safavid and Mughal empires and the ability of European agents to turn these older imperial structures to their own advantage.[20] At the same time, the consolidation of imperial authority at the margins of Europe (especially in Ireland and the Mediterranean) and the thrust of European powers in South Asia, Southeast Asia, and the Pacific incorporated vast territories into the political, commercial, and religious ambit of European colonial systems. There is no doubt that this new age of global imperialism marks a profound disjuncture in world history, as the pull of European markets, the practices of imperial/colonial states, the "universal" languages of science and statistics, and the international reach of missionary organizations fashioned new and profoundly uneven forms of interconnection and interdependence.[21] Many of the essays in this collection trace these transformations, reconstructing how specific colonial encounters produced understandings of gender, race, and sexuality and revealing the ways these local exchanges were increasingly assimilated into broader imperial debates over cultural difference. The tremendous variety of human social arrangements remained a key concern of the scientists, historians, and theorists of empire in the mid-nineteenth century. And although a great range of cultural variation remained, the reach of European empires rendered much of this complexity legible through the (distorting) languages of race and gender.

But the thrust of much recent work is that European ascendancy was never uncontested and Europe's position as the global center of imperial power was relatively short-lived. The United States, the Soviet Union, and Japan emerged as both industrial forces and imperial powers around the turn of the twentieth century, and Tokyo, Hong Kong, Singapore, and Bombay emerged as new commercial, cultural, technological, and

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

migratory centers. World history research on migration, economics, empires, and ideologies suggests that history cannot be imagined as an inexorable march to Western dominance and global homogeneity, but is a more complex and ambiguous set of interwoven and overlapping processes driven by a diverse array of groups from a variety of different locations.[22]

These arguments frame this volume, and in various ways, the essays in this collection reinforce this emergent image of a multicentered, even a de-centered, world, evoking a fluidity that gender and the body, especially when read as performative categories, contingent for its manifestations as much on space as on time, can help us immeasurably to appreciate. While many of the authors pay close attention to the uneven power relations of colonialism and the profound inequalities created by European imperial systems, they explore the imperial projects carried out by non-European powers, reconstruct the ability of subaltern groups to challenge colonial authority and puncture colonial ideologies, and map the sophisticated cultural complexes created by peoples at the supposed "periphery" of empires.

Equally important, however, this collection foregrounds the body in a way that world history scholarship to date has resisted. World history, at least in its dominant institutional form, has not only clung to an "additive" view of women's history but has also generally remained insulated from (if not resistant to) new directions in cultural history, especially gender history. As a result, "masculinity" is an analytical category that remains, for all intents and purposes, unheard of in the field. Reconstructing the variable and culturally contingent historical forms of masculinity, and their relationship to economics, politics, culture, religion, class, and sexuality, is a project that has only just begun. Rosalind O'Hanlon's essay on imperial masculinities in Mughal north India, Patrick McDevitt's examination of the place of sports in Catholic masculinity in Ireland, and Joseph Alter's examination of celibacy and the place of masculine constraint in Indian nationalist thought suggest the important insights into the place of gendered bodies and embodied subjectivities in empire building, anticolonial resistance and nationalist ideologies that critical histories of masculinity offer. Much of the pioneering work in the field, especially with regard to modern imperial masculinities, has suggested that the male-dominated archives that are the stock in trade of the world historian can be read in new and interesting ways. Rather than searching only for

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

notable women or seeking to access an unmediated female subjectivity, we can assemble a richer understanding of the operation of gender in world history by examining the ways these archives articulate competing visions of and anxieties about masculinity, while attending equally to the pressures that class, racial, ethnic, and religious affiliations have historically exerted on it as both an embodied and a performative articulation of identity.

Whether interpreted broadly or narrowly, then, the category "bodies in contact" can enable us to appreciate histories we might not otherwise have seen and to make visible connections between the colonial and the global that scholars are, in some instances, just beginning to make into "history." As important, recovering women and gender in world history not only permits us to see them as historical subjects, it also means that we have to understand empires as gendered projects—endeavors in which, it turns out, women and gender mattered tremendously. Our focus on bodies, then, reorients both imperial history and world history by rooting the phenomenon of "encounter" in a gendered, sexualized context, and often throws light on practices of daily life and experience that are otherwise obscured. As important, it allows us to reimagine the global past as a space of contact between women and men, between "woman" and colonizer, between colonizing men and cultures that were often considered "effeminate" by imperial observers. The fact that these gendered relationships recur fairly consistently across empires, across the world—as exhibited from the early modern period down to the late twentieth century, from China to the Americas and in a variety of locations in between—suggests that it is a subject that undergraduates need to learn about if they are to have as full an understanding of world history as possible. This collection represents a beginning in that direction; we hope it will stimulate debate, discussion, and even perhaps a new generation of historians interested in further exploring the relations between bodies, empires, and the worlds of the past.

Notes

1. Laura Briggs, *Reproducing Empire: Race, Sex, Science and U.S. Imperialism in Puerto Rico* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 1.
2. This vision of empires and imperial history is developed in Tony Ballantyne, *Orientalism and Race: Aryanism in the British Empire* (Basingstoke, England: Palgrave-

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Macmillan, 2001). More recently, a slightly different vision of the "web" has been harnessed to world history in J. R. McNeill and William H. McNeill, *The Human Web: A Bird's-eye View of World History* (New York: Norton, 2003).

3. One recent exception is Robert Tignor et al., *Worlds Together, Worlds Apart* (New York: Norton 2002).

4. Peter N. Stearns, *Gender in World History* (London: Routledge, 2000), 4.

5. For a discussion of this problem, see Margaret Strobel, "Women's History, Gender History, and European Colonialism," in *Colonialism and the Modern World: Selected Studies*, ed. Gregory Blue, Martin Bunton, and Ralph Crozier (New York: M.E. Sharpe, 2002), 51–68.

6. Many thanks to Adele Perry for this point.

7. For an extremely compelling version of this project, see Valerie Traub, "The Global-Body," in *Early Modern Visual Culture: Representation, Race and Empire in Renaissance England*, ed. Peter Erickson and Clark Hulse (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), 44–97.

8. We are grateful to Clare Crowston for urging this point.

9. For one exception, see Sarah Shaver Hughes and Brady Hughes, eds., *Women in World History*, 2 vols. (New York: M.E. Sharpe, 1997).

10. See, for example, Charles Tilly, *Big Structures, Large Processes, Huge Comparisons* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1984).

11. For more on teleologies of globalization from a feminist perspective, see Jean Allman and Antoinette Burton, eds., "Destination Globalization? Women, Gender and Comparative Colonial Histories in the New Millennium," *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History* 4, 1 (2003) http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/cch/.

12. Oswald Spengler, *The Decline of the West* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1922); Arnold J. Toynbee, *A Study of History*, 10 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1934–1954); H. G. Wells, *Outline of History* (London: Cassell, 1920). Spengler certainly recognized the significance of non-Western civilizations, but for him only "Western Civilization" had fulfilled its potential, and the crisis that he diagnosed in the early twentieth century reflected a crisis born out of the decline of "Western Civilization."

13. For a bracing account of the stakes of American civilization for 1990s politics, see Thomas C. Patterson, *Inventing Western Civilization* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1997), 9–15. For an equally compelling analysis of Western Civ textbooks, see Daniel A. Segal, "Western Civ and the Staging of History in American Higher Education," *American Historical Review* 105, 3 (2000); also available at http://www.historycooperative.org/journals/ahr/105.3/ah000770.html.

14. McNeill reflects critically on the "Rise of the West" model in his essays: "The *Rise of the West* after Twenty-five Years," *Journal of World History* 1, 1 (1990): 1–21 and "World History and the Rise and Fall of the West," *Journal of World History* 9, 2 (1998): 215–236. In J. R. McNeill and William H. McNeill, *The Human Web*, his work is fashioning a new understanding of the multiple forms of contact and interdependence that have shaped human history.

15. Janet L. Abu-Lughod, *Before European Hegemony: The World System A.D. 1250–1350* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989).

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

16. See S. A. M. Adshead, *China in World History* (Macmillan, 1987) and *Central Asia in World History* (New York: Macmillan, 1993); David Christian, *A History of Russia, Central Asia, and Mongolia* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998).
17. Much of this work is synthesized in the *Cambridge History of China*. For a collection of work that explores the connections between the development of the Chinese economy and global trade, see Dennis O. Flynn and Arturo Giráldez, eds., *Metals and Monies in an Emerging Global Economy* (Brookfield, Vt.: Variorum, 1997). Also see the provocative arguments forwarded in Dennis O. Flynn and Arturo Giráldez, "Born with a 'Silver Spoon': The Origin of World Trade in 1571," *Journal of World History* 6, 2 (1995): 201–221. On South Asia and the Indian Ocean, see Satish Chandra, *The Indian Ocean: Explorations in History, Commerce and Politics* (New Delhi: Sage, 1987); K. N. Chaudhuri, *Trade and Civilisation in the Indian Ocean: An Economic History from the Rise of Islam to 1750* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1985); Kenneth McPherson, *The Indian Ocean: A History of People and the Sea* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1993).
18. David Landes, *The Wealth and Poverty of Nations: Why Some Are So Rich and Some So Poor* (New York: Norton, 1998), 523; compare the works listed in the next two notes.
19. Kenneth Pomeranz, *The Great Divergence: China, Europe, and the Making of the Modern World Economy* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2000); Kenneth Pomeranz and Steven Topik, *The World That Trade Created: Culture, Society, and the World Economy, 1400–the Present* (Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 1999); and the essays in the forum on the "great divergence" in *Itinerario* 24, 3/4 (2000).
20. See C. A. Bayly, *Imperial Meridian: The British Empire and the World 1780–1830* (White Plains, N.Y.: Longman, 1989) and *Empire and Information: Intelligence Gathering and Social Communication in India, 1780–1870* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
21. C. A. Bayly, "The First Age of Global Imperialism, c. 1760–1830," *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 26, 2 (1998): 28–47; Tony Ballantyne, "Empire, Knowledge and Culture: From Proto-globalization to Modern Globalization," in *Globalization in World History*, ed. A. G. Hopkins (London: Pimlico, 2001), 115–140.
22. See, for example, Arjun Appadurai, *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990); Michael Geyer and Charles Bright, "World History in a Global Age," *American Historical Review* 100, 4 (October 1995): 1034–1060; Akira Iriye, "The Internationalization of History," *American Historical Review* 94, 1 (February 1989): 1–10; Adam McKeown, *Chinese Migrant Networks and Cultural Change: Peru, Chicago, Hawaii, 1900–1936* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001).

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Tony Ballantyne and Antoinette Burton

Postscript: Bodies, Genders, Empires: Reimagining World Histories

When the Italian traveler Girolamo Benzoni arrived in Venezuela in 1541, among his very first encounters was with an Indian woman "such . . . as I have never before nor since seen the like of." He went on: "My eyes could not be satisfied with looking at her for wonder. . . . She was quite naked, except where modisty [*sic*] forbids, such being the custom throughout all this country; she was old, and painted black, with long hair down to her waist, and her ear-rings had so weighed her ears down, as to make them reach her shoulders, a thing wonderful to see. . . . her teeth were black, her mouth large, and she had a ring in her nostrils . . . so that she appeared like a monster to us, rather than a human being."[1]

Anyone familiar with exploration and travel writing from the New World knows how common such observations are. Benzoni's anatomical catalogue, which materializes the woman in Benzoni's sights *as body*, registers a preoccupation with the physical embodiment of indigenous populations that was a constitutive feature of such accounts. Benzoni and those who followed after him established the female body in particular as a recurrent emblem of native savagery and monstrosity, to be wondered at as one of the many astonishing "resources" of the world beyond Europe. Here as elsewhere, the body becomes an occasion for a taxonomical reflection as well as for translations of "the native woman" to European audiences. In the context of uneven power relations, bodies in contact provided a unique opportunity for the production of knowledge around gender and sexual difference, knowledge that, in turn, offered apparent

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

proof of the comparative humanity of European civilization. *Bodies in Contact* suggests that the knowledges generated by such highly gendered contact had, and continue to have, ramifications far beyond the history of empires and colonialism per se. Although, as Adele Perry has remarked, colonialism is "very prosaically an exercise in gender" insofar as it produces gender itself as a terrain of contested power, its centrality to the making of global regimes and their histories is not necessarily self-evident.[2] Offering students of world history the chance to understand the extent to which such powerfully embodied colonial encounters structured the workings of transnational communities and global circuits of power has been the chief purpose of this volume.

Zones of Engagement: The Body as Method

Ever since Mary Louise Pratt coined the term "contact zones" in her 1992 book *Imperial Eyes*, students of empires and colonialisms have attempted to harness it to their analyses of cultural encounter.[3] For Pratt, contact zones are both real and imagined spaces in which cultures and their agents come together in circumstances of asymmetrical power. They are also uncharted terrains from which new, hybridized, cultural forms often emerge. The body has, arguably, been crucial to the experience of such encounters, though its capacity as an archive for the pleasures of human experience and the violences of history, colonial or otherwise, has only begun to be tapped by scholars.[4] Thanks to the work of Michel Foucault, the social body can no longer be taken for granted merely as a metaphor. His notion of "biopower" allows us to see with particular vividness the variety of somatic territories that modern states have identified as the grounds for defining and policing the normal, the deviant, the pathological, and, of course, the primitive. Following Foucault, much recent work on the body has acknowledged its power as both a discursive and a material resource.[5] Judith Butler's argument about "bodies that matter" is exemplary in this regard, even if her attention to historical specificity is wanting.[6] And although Foucault himself was notoriously myopic about the domain of the colonial in his analyses of both the history of sexuality and of state-sponsored surveillance, historians of empire have scrutinized both the successes and the failures of colonial regimes that focused on the regulation of bodies as a means to promote their civilizing missions.[7] Indeed, the body is in many ways the most intimate colony, as well as the

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

most unruly, to be subject to colonial disciplines, a fact that officials, missionaries, and travelers were always quick to realize, even though they might not have articulated it in quite those terms.

To return to Pratt, the body itself has been and remains a zone of management, containment, regulation, conformity, and resistance as well as of contact tout court. Under a variety of social, economic, and political constraints it has exhibited a remarkable flexibility and resilience as both a category and as the matériel of history, even while it has also been the site of suffering, the subject of humanitarian intervention and military invasion, and the object of violence and trauma. Far from serving as passive slates on which the past has written, bodies have consistently been agents in their encounters with history — agents that command our attention as much as war, migration, religion, dynastic succession, the environment, law, capitalism, modernity, or any of the other major rubrics through which we understand world history.

The body is such a provocative investigative modality that Kathleen Canning has recently called on historians to develop a theoretical framework for "the body as method."[8] This is a tremendously challenging disciplinary task, in part because the body's oxymoronic status as a *discursive object* means that its ideological work as sign or symbol tends to exclude from view the very real stories about labor, leisure, mobility, political economy, the household, the family, and the state (among other things) that it has to tell. *Bodies in Contact* responds to this challenge by suggesting that the body-as-contact-zone is a powerful analytical term *and* a useful pedagogical tool for understanding the nature and dynamics of imperial, colonial, and world histories — precisely because it allows us to navigate the dynamic relationship between representation and "reality" and to see the work of mediation that embodied subjects perform between the domestic and the foreign, the quotidian and the cyclical, the dynamic and the static. So, for example, the discourses about Nahua sexuality that the Franciscan Bernadino de Sahagún attempted to consolidate in Book 10 of his *Florentine Codex* tell us much about how justifications for ecclesiastical colonialism developed on the ground in sixteenth-century New Spain. But those discourses also constitute an archive in which we can read in great detail about how the Church attempted to regulate the dress, behavior, and sexual cosmology of indigenous women — as well as how that particular civilizing project failed. Alternatively, something as physical as the game of football among Irish Catholics sponsored

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

a series of discourses about manliness, political viability, and cultural revivalism which, in turn, shaped the very nature and direction of political nationalism in modern Ireland. Indeed, something as em-bodied as the tattoo, something as intimate as body markings, can help us read the impact of colonial practices in southern Mozambique—a claim provocative of debates about the body as method which are joined rather than resolved here, and which can and should animate undergraduate classrooms and lecture halls. *Bodies in Contact* abounds with similar examples across time and space, giving readers the chance to see bodies in action, to assess their role in national, regional, and transnational contexts, and to ask what kinds of evidence they offer for the writing of new kinds of history.

It should be emphasized that the essays in this collection do not necessarily share an agenda, methodologically or otherwise, about the body as a tool of historical investigation. Some authors privilege the physical body quite explicitly, as in Joseph Alter's piece on celibacy and Jennifer Morgan's on African and Amerindian female bodies in early modern European travel accounts. Some see the body as a mediator, both literal and figurative, between cultures, as Julia C. Wells's and Adele Perry's essays on conjugality demonstrate. Still others use it as a metaphor for a national body politic that is diseased (Quinlan), emergent (McDevitt), segregated (Sinha), or in crisis (Camiscioli). For others, like Lambert Hurley and Findley, it is travel and the particular forms of mobility and contact that individual bodies take up that is of interest, especially when those bodies (an Indian Muslim woman and an Ottoman man, respectively) are not typically thought to be in motion. Or, in the case of Lucy Eldersveld Murphy's work on creole women in the American Midwest, it is understanding how people live in community that quietly dramatizes how mixed-raced bodies both create and transgress local, regional, national, and colonial borders. Still others, like Melani McAlister's essay that begins with Muhammad Ali, show how famous bodies can be used as a jumping-off point for seeing connections between local communities (African Americans during the cold war) and transnational events with global significance (the Arab-Israeli War and the international Islamicist movement). As we suggest in our introduction, whether interpreted broadly or narrowly, the category "bodies in contact" can enable us to appreciate histories we might not otherwise have seen and to make visible

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

connections between the colonial and the global that scholars are, in some instances, just beginning to make into "history."

Embodied Subjects: Opening World History to Women, Gender, and Sexuality

In marked contrast to the attention paid by feminists in recent years to gender and the problem of transnationalism and globalization, historians of women and gender have not viewed world history per se as their stage.[9] The early exceptions to this are, of course, the variety of textbooks, written mostly in the 1980s, that attempted to tell the stories of Western civilization (and, to a lesser degree, world civilization) from a gendered perspective.[10] Other notable exceptions are the series spearheaded by Cheryl Johnson-Odim and Margaret Strobel, "Restoring Women to History," which focused on the non-West and eventuated in single volumes on Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and Bonnie Smith's forthcoming three-volume *Women's and Gender History in Global Perspective.*[11] Taken together, these syntheses and collections are invaluable reference points for those of us who wish to reimagine college and university survey courses as places where the histories of women, gender, and sexuality can be situated squarely at the center of the aptly called "master narratives" of imperialism and globalization across the longue durée. This has proven difficult at more than a generic level because overall, scholars interested in the body as a site of gendered agency have not taken world history as their purview either, despite a genuine and often highly nuanced appreciation for the cross-cultural influences and geopolitical resonances of embodied experience.[12]

On the other hand, even though the reinvention of world history as an important area of concentration in North American graduate schools and, more generally, as a significant subfield within professional academic history in the late 1980s and early 1990s coincided with the growing authority of women's history and the emergence of gender as a key analytical category within humanities scholarship in general, world historians have shown limited interest in either women's or gender history. The *Journal of World History*, the official journal of the World History Association, was launched as a "new forum for global history" in 1990 and has been at the forefront of discussions of both world history research and

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

pedagogy. Women have been barely visible in the fourteen volumes published to date; aside from Nikki Keddie's essay on women in the Muslim world in the first issue, just two essays, by Judith P. Zinsser and Helen Wheatley, have focused on women.[13] Following on from this, Michelle Maskiell's recent essay on shawls and empires is the only essay published in the *Journal of World History* that has deployed gender as an analytical category in any sustained or sophisticated manner.[14] Equally revealing is the almost total absence of gender as an important theme for research and teaching in the field of world history in the programmatic statements published by George E. Brooks, Philip D. Curtin, T. E. Vadney, Andre Gunder Frank, and David Christian in early issues of the journal.[15] To be sure, there are other venues for world history beyond the *Journal of World History*, most particularly, the *World History Bulletin*, H-World (the heavily subscribed e-list), and, most recently, the e-journal *World History Connected* (www.worldhistoryconnected.org). Readers may find more attention to gender in these forums because of the pedagogical questions such venues deliberately address—a gendered division that is as instructive as it is unfortunate.[16] In light of this imbalance, the *Journal of World History* may well be functioning as a redoubt to which historians resistant to both women's and gender history have retreated, even as, over the same decade, the *Journal of Women's History* and *Gender and History* have been "globalizing," both by design and as a result of the increasingly self-conscious transnational agenda of women's and gender history.

Clearly, the challenge of what Judith P. Zinsser has called "women's world history" is to resist "essentializing women on a global scale." And, we would add, to understand how narratives of women's experiences can be matched with gendered analyses so that more historically nuanced accounts of the "transcultural ideal of all women's subordination to men" (also Zinsser's phrase) can reach students of world history.[17] In this respect, the challenge that *Bodies in Contact* poses to traditions of world history is considerable. For despite repeated calls for engagement with women's history and feminist scholarship more generally, gender has not featured prominently as a problematic or analytical tool in world history as a subfield of the discipline as a whole either. Gerda Lerner's landmark *The Creation of Patriarchy*, which documented the construction of a gendered division of labor and political power that ensured male dominance and female subordination in ancient Mesopotamia, indicated the importance of studying women and gender relations for world history. But this work

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

ultimately had a greater impact on women's history than on the practice of world history, even as feminists have labored to challenge some of the universalisms Lerner herself produced.[18] Other scholars have examined the role of gender in shaping the development of the societies that have traditionally been at the core of world history: China, India, Mesopotamia, Greece, and Rome. Unfortunately, this scholarship has had a civilizational focus, effacing the cross-cultural exchanges and networks that stand at the center of world history's distinct approach to the past. In part, this erasure of women, or at least their consignment to being integral to local, national, or civilizational stories rather than cross-cultural or global narratives, reflects the thematic foci that have dominated writing on world history: exploration, long-distance trade, missionary activity, empire building, and the rise of nationalism. These endeavors, which have frequently been directed by hierarchical institutions, intellectual elites, or powerful commercial interests, have been seen as integral to accounts of cultural contact, increased interregional interdependence, and the rise of Europe. Effectively, the large-scale perspective of world history has tended to render women invisible; or, alternatively, where women were prominent they are imagined as either oddities or exemplars because of their gender.

Though, again (as indicated in the introduction), we recognize that the body is not necessarily coterminous with women, gender, and sexuality, a lack of attention to embodied practices and regimes has followed from these overlooked categories of analysis. World history's effacement of women and gender not only arises out of its neglect of the histories of the family, sexuality, domestic work, and faith that have been the staple of women's history since World War II, but also reflects the kinds of sources used in reconstructing cross-cultural contact and patterns of interregional integration. Travel narratives, the archives of commercial companies and industrial concerns, the records of large religious institutions, and the mass of documentation produced by empires have traditionally been produced by men and have reflected their concerns.[19] In many imperial contexts, colonized women are rendered doubly marginal because both their gender and their position as colonized and female voices in many, if not all, colonial archives are fleeting and fragmentary. Thus, women are much less prominent in types of sources that have traditionally been used in world history, and the quest to recover female agency and subjectivities, the project of women's history as a transformative, revisionary undertaking is often frustrated by the very nature of these archives.

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Most important, however, world historians have been slow to recognize that gender is a relational category: even beyond the textbook digests, "gender" has typically been identified as a synonym for "woman" among practitioners of the genre. They have struggled to imagine in gendered terms those activities in the past that were seen as the domain of men largely because this historical approach has generally been resistant to the linguistic turn and cultural history. World history has been deeply grounded in a materialistic vision of the past and has been energized by interdisciplinary affiliations with economics, environmental studies, and sociology rather than with literary studies, anthropology, and gender studies, which were three of the key vectors that transformed the writing of European, North American, and South Asian history in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Even though "discourse," "representation," and "identity" have slowly begun to enter the vocabulary of world historians over the past decade, there is considerable resistance to these concepts, and questions of economics, environmental change, and technology remain at the core of the subdiscipline.

Perhaps not surprisingly, race has received much more attention from world historians than gender. This again reflects the kind of questions and problems that world historians have been exploring, and, in particular, it points to the centrality of slavery and imperialism in modern world history scholarship. Slavery has long been one of the central concerns and most fiercely contested issues in world history. While many historians have explored slavery's long and varied history in Europe, the Mediterranean, the Islamic world, and Asia, the bulk of research on the history of slavery has focused on the transplantation of slaves from Africa to the Caribbean and the Americas during the early modern period. This emphasis on the African slave trade and the place of slavery in the evolution of the plantation system reflects the sheer enormity of this trade—with probably 11 million Africans transported across the Atlantic from 1500 to 1850—and the importance of this population transfer in reshaping the demographic structure of the "Atlantic World." More broadly, the labor of Africans on the plantations of the New World has been identified as a key passage in the transition to modernity, where new systems of labor, production, and consumption emerged and capitalism became a truly global phenomenon. Even though the central historiographical disputes about slavery—the exact size of the trade, the profitability of the trade and of plantation agriculture, and reasons that slave-based agricultural production was

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

abolished, abandoned or supplanted — have hinged on demographic and economic issues, questions of race and racial difference have always remained prominent in this scholarship. In a similar vein, many of the debates on the role of imperialism in world history conducted from the 1950s to the 1990s — the relationship between the periphery and the metropole, the relationship between colonialism and capitalism, and the place of empires in both "modernization" and "underdevelopment" — hinged on economic and political questions. Yet, even before the work of Edward Said, numerous historians explored the place of racial thought in justifying or even driving European empire building, and race was a staple concern in the national historiographies of the United States and the British settler colonies (Canada, but especially South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand). Certainly, within world history scholarship race has rarely been given primacy as either a motor of history or even as an analytical tool, but its importance has been consistently recognized in ways that gender has not: although race and gender are frequently invoked together, these problematics occupy very different positions in the subdiscipline of world history.

As Jennifer Morgan remarks in her essay on images of African women in early modern travel writing, we are less interested in championing the primacy of gender over race than we are in providing students the opportunity to see how a variety of systems — ideological and material, symbolic and real — operate, and are entangled, in the most mundane and the most monumental of historical circumstances. We believe that it reshapes our understandings of the localized politics of slave regimes as both Atlantic and Eurasian institutions when we examine, for example, the ability of concubines in neo-Mamluk Egypt to accumulate substantial capital and construct patronage networks of their own — and see that their sexual and marital choices were heavily constrained in the process. Extending the geographical reach of the body-as-contact-zone to sites like Egypt reflects as well our commitment to engaging larger disciplinary questions in the process of reimagining women, gender, and the body in world history.

Work on women, gender, and sexuality — again, targeting the micro and macro levels and historicizing in material and discursive registers — clearly contributes to the larger project of remapping historical narratives and challenging the chronologies of "the West" and "the rest" that tend to undergird if not world history per se, then at the very least its practical pedagogical face: the undergraduate classroom. Does it not de-

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

exceptionalize the West to know that travel writers in the Qing period mobilized consistently gendered and sexualized discourses about Taiwanese, Vietnamese, and even southern Chinese women, in a tone that both resembles and is distinct from a Western "colonial" perspective? Does it not remind us that, to borrow from Richard Eaton, Islamic history *is* global history when we read about the far-ranging travels of the begam of Bhopal and learn that her travel writing did as much transnational political work as that of her English male contemporaries?[20] Or that the profoundly gendered observations of the Ottoman litterateur and traveler Ahmed Midhat returned to Europe a highly skeptical gaze, designed to encompass, evaluate, criticize, and even sometimes admire the so-called progress of Western civilization? Does it not reorient conventional understandings of the gender dynamics of non-Western societies to learn that Indian women were some of the keenest critics of the clubland culture in British India, even while their male elite counterparts sought to replicate it? Does not a detailed reading of the symbolic and spiritual power accorded to semen and other bodily properties in discussions of national character in twentieth-century India challenge commonplace understandings of the sources and scope of anticolonial thought?

The complementary as well as the oppositional character of gendered historical experience which these few examples illustrate gets us out of a binary model by emphasizing the relational character of gendered societies in colonial and global contexts.[21] It also tells us much about the limits of teleological narratives of Western civilization models, not to mention about the operation of "native" agency through a variety of embodied strategies—strategies of negotiation, compromise, conformity, capitulation, resistance, and refusal. In many cases, the ability to put a name to a phenomenon or track a particular embodied experience can add weight and dimension to extant historiographical generalizations, something a textbook can do but that requires space so that the detail can be presented and absorbed. Here again, the idea of bodies-as-contact-zone is instructive for materializing all manner of local and global dimensions and, perhaps, for derailing conventional presuppositions about how people acted in concert with or reacted against systemic change or structural forces. Admittedly, many of the essays herein deal with relatively elite subjects and their narratives, reflecting the limits of the conventional archive, at least, even for the project of transforming world history. Yet arguably, even elite stories have the capacity to provide what

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Julie Codell calls "imperial co-histories" by reminding us of the complexities of power, status, and identity in the context of imperial world systems.[22] A number of essays demonstrate the ability of subaltern communities to contest and resist imperial projects and, in the case of Hyun Sook Kim's essay, dramatize the ways exploited groups such as "comfort women" could puncture received and authoritative visions of national and imperial pasts. Whether by correcting, complicating, or reinforcing dominant narratives, the bodies that these essays cast into bold relief contribute to a more complex set of realities, thereby producing new knowledges about world history in a variety of temporal and spatial contexts.

New Imperial Histories in Global Perspective

Many of the visions articulated in this volume have grown, it must be said, out of the "new imperial history," an initially Anglocentric project entailed (in the broadest sense) by the collision of histories of empire with the historical fact of decolonization. The range of approaches that are gathered under this umbrella term display some marked continuities with the recent directions in world history and, in some cases, are explicitly increasingly engaged with the perspective of world history. Although many identify Edward Said's *Orientalism* as initiating a profound transformation of the study of empire because of its analysis of literary texts, focus on discourse and representation as analytical categories, and its exploration of Foucault's power/knowledge nexus, the intellectual projects of the new imperial history emerged as much out of the translation of social history to the realm of European empires.[23] During the 1980s, models of both British and French imperial history that focused on politics and the worlds of both colonial and indigenous elites were challenged by the work of the Subaltern Studies collective in South Asia and a wider group of social historians in Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America. These scholars drew on local archives, indigenous language sources, and oral histories to explore the history of women, families, and local communities.[24] Their works examined the experience of women, the role of race, and the operation of class (and their interrelationships) in ways that marked them off clearly from the earlier, elite-focused works produced by both nationalist and imperial historians as well as early traditions of Marxist social history.

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

From the late 1980s these revisionist approaches to the history of imperialism were increasingly brought into dialogue with and challenged by scholars energized by the "cultural turn" in humanities scholarship. The impact of poststructuralist thought (especially Foucault), the growing authority of Said's work on empire and representation, and the work of feminist historians committed to the study of gender as a relational category rather than women's history opened up a new range of approaches to the history of empires. Commonly, this shift is identified as a turn to the study of colonial discourse, but an equally important result of the cultural turn in the study of empire was the identification of new sites of inquiry for the historians of colonialism and empires. If, as we have seen, Foucault's notion of biopower transformed understandings of the relationship between individual bodies and the state, the influence of Foucault's work on power/knowledge encouraged historians to imagine the hospital, asylum, police station, museum, and even the colonial archive itself as institutions that were fundamental to the construction of colonial authority and as productive analytical sites.[25] As a result, the disciplinary power of the colonial state became an increasingly important theme in the historiography of empires, as did questions of intimacy and conjugality.[26]

One of the chief results of the new imperial history has been to reshape spatial understandings of empire and its geographies of power. Fundamental to this project has been the reimagining of the relationships between the metropole and its colonies. Imperial histories generally emerged out of a metropolitan-focused tradition that saw power, modernity, and even "civilization" as emanating in the imperial center and being projected out to the colonies. In this view, the colonies themselves were transformed by empire, absorbed into a capitalist system, civilized, modernized, or, for some, impoverished by empire while metropolitan societies simply enjoyed the economic benefits or carried the cost of empire.[27] It is perhaps no coincidence that historians of women and gender have been at the forefront of these reconceptualizations: their determination to read the false divisions between public and private, between home and the world accounts at least in part for their agility in and commitment to bridging the gap between "domestic" and imperial histories.[28] Scholarship on imperial masculinities and feminisms, on non-Europeans who visited or lived in Europe, and on the place of empire in both popular and elite European culture has destabilized this polarized image of empire by reconstructing

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

the colonial encounters that occurred at the very "heart of the empire" and demonstrating the ways metropolitan cultures were not only transformed by but actually constituted out of imperialism.[29] Remaking the cultural geographies of empire has also involved mapping the larger networks, institutions, and exchanges that integrated the empire. Rather than seeing imperial systems as containing a metropole and a series of distinct colonies, recent work has instead invoked an integrated if uneven "imperial social formation" or the "webs of empire" to refocus attention on the cultural traffic that wove colonies together into imperial systems as well as linking colonies to the imperial center.[30] These works, which coalesce in significant ways around James Blaut's critiques of Eurocentrism and the "colonizer's model of the world," are not only arguing against visions of imperialism that imagine an unproblematized Europe at the core of modern world history, but also reflect a growing engagement with anthropological and sociological studies of contemporary transnational exchanges and an awareness that the history of modern empires are profoundly implicated in our current global moment.[31]

Here as well the stories that *Bodies in Contact* have to tell put pressure on the imperial narratives that are often at the heart of global histories. We emphatically do not wish to suggest that world history can be equivalent, or should be reduced, to imperial history, let alone to the history of empires per se. Given the national chauvinisms at the heart of modern imperial historiography, together with the aspirations of a revived politically conservative British imperial history, such an equation has the potential merely to reinscribe canonical views of Europe and "the rest" as well as to re-embed triumphant nationalist narratives at the heart of research and pedagogy.[32] Nor do we wish to imply that empires acted as juggernauts, razing everything in their wake or exercising anything like total power in situ. Indeed, one of the greatest challenges of reimagining colonial histories in a global context is precisely to balance the fact of imperial power with its fragility and precariousness in the face of local history, "native" practice, and indigenous forms of authority and culture.[33] But by the same token, teachers and students of world history need a more nuanced understanding of how imperial mentalities, policies, and regimes have contributed to discourses of globalization. They need be able to see—in more refined and more detailed ways than we now have available—how and why this was so, as well as when it was *not*, in order to have more than a crude understanding of imperial power in the past and

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

into the present. The ways gendered images of racial health and national reproduction circulated and contributed to discourse and policy about a eugenic interwar France remind us, for example, of how implicated histories other than Britain's are in modern world imperialism—and of how crucial the policing of all manner of "foreign" bodies was to that project. Anxieties over gender and racial boundaries at the edge of empires, from British Columbia to Australia's Northern Territory, underscore colonial modernity's persistent equation of the bodily integrity of colonists and the integrity of the colonial body politic in the face of contact with both colonized indigenous populations and mobile non-European peoples. The fact that African Americans in the 1960s were intimately acquainted with debates about war in the Middle East and Vietnam because of some communities' involvement with the Nation of Islam (and one of its most famous spokesmen, Muhammad Ali, one of America's most celebrated "black bodies") should give us pause as well. In a similar vein, the prominence of purdah and the practice of veiling in Soviet attempts to "modernize" the Muslims of Uzbekistan reminds us that gender has not only been central in British, French, and, more recently, American incursions into the Muslim world, but also was crucial in the secularizing imperialist project of communism. And archival work on American Indian communities that uses the term "colonial" to describe the contexts of displacement and removal, surveillance and discipline of creole bodies is equally apposite, bringing what Amy Kaplan and Donald Pease have called "cultures of U.S. imperialism" squarely into line with those of other would-be world powers in the recent past.[34]

The collective weight of these essays, therefore, not only calls into question many of the narratives produced, nurtured, and cherished by nations and empires, it also presents a range of critical visions of the making of the modern world. In their consistent foregrounding of the negotiation of community identities and boundaries, materializing histories of both repression and resistance, and their sensitivity to the complex interconnections among the local, national, imperial, and global, the works collected here reveal the power struggles that have shaped histories big and small. Most important, they insist that colonialism and empires are fundamental to histories of cross-cultural relations, interregional integration, and the emergence of global institutions and cultural forms. They undercut naïvely utopian visions of an integrated global order based on liberal capitalism that supposedly marks the "end of history" by in fact

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

suggesting that critical histories are crucial to making sense of our current global moment and the ways its pasts are entangled with the long history of imperialism.[35]

Conclusion: World Histories in the New Millennium

As the preceding essays demonstrate, bodies, though policed, do not necessarily respect boundaries, and tracking the historical trajectories of bodies that either transgress or reconsolidate boundaries helps us denaturalize the geographies we have inherited in women's and gender and world histories. The contribution of this volume lies in its determination to decenter Europe in the narratives of colonial and global history; its emphasis on both the agency of indigenous people and the structural conditions of imperial and colonial power; its recovery of local histories of encounter and resistance; its genuinely transnational reach; its commitment to placing "personal stories" as well as collective community experiences at the heart of global stories; and, above all, its presumption that gender and sexuality are central to, if not constitutive of, both old and new world orders. Research shows that even before September 11, 2001, North American undergraduates, at any rate, were resistant to the critiques of imperial modernity and historicity that a gendered global history has the power to offer, though they remain intrigued by imperialism as a world system and a source of cultural hegemony.[36] Given the events of the first three years of the new millennium, when quite familiar forms of Anglo-American imperialism have reemerged on the world stage in the twin contexts of discourses about globalization and very real violences against and in the name of women and children, students of world history around the globe have never been in greater need of original and innovative scholarship that takes bodies seriously as agents of global power and transnational identities.[37] The question of how to rewrite grand narratives so that they are inclusive of, and transformed by, the stories on offer here remains among the most vital challenges for world history as an intellectual, political, and pedagogical project. Among other things, such a project raises questions about the tenability of linear-driven narratives as against the fragment, the episode, or the fugitive subaltern subject; it raises questions, in other words, about the viability of those very distinctions and in turn throws open the problem of history writing to the kind of critique that has (with the notable exception of Subaltern Studies)

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

only begun to be written in the past decade or so.[38] How to translate these revised narratives to classrooms beyond the college and university setting (i.e., to secondary school audiences) is equally daunting, though it is arguably of paramount importance for a truly educated citizenry in the twenty-first century.[39] *Bodies in Contact* points out some pathways in this direction. It is intended to enable students to juxtapose diverse imperial regimes, to bring together work on celibacy, intermarriage, and sports with scholarship on migration, citizenship, and the law, and to see a range of contrasts across time and space, thus marking a beginning, rather than an end, to the project of making visible the material consequences of colonial regimes for embodied subjectivities, their communities, their economic systems, and their political cultures across the globe.

Notes

1. Girolamo Benzoni, *History of the New World* (1572), trans. W. H. Smyth (London, 1857), 3–4; cited in Jennifer Morgan, this volume.
2. Adele Perry, private e-mail communication, fall 2003.
3. Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (Routledge, 1992).
4. For two very different but equally illuminating approaches, see Alan Sekula, "The Body and the Archive," *October* 39, 3 (1986): 3–64, and Zine Magubane, "Which Bodies Matter? Feminism, Poststructuralism, Race and the Curious Theoretical Odyssey of the 'Hottentot Venus,'" *Gender and Society* 15, 6 (2001): 816–834.
5. For a thorough review of this literature, see Kathleen Canning, "The Body as Method? Reflections on the Place of the Body in Gender History," *Gender and History* 11, 3 (November 1999): 499–513.
6. Judith Butler, *Bodies That Matter* (Routledge, 1992).
7. See Ann Laura Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire* (Duke University Press, 1995) and *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power* (University of California Press, 2002).
8. Canning, "The Body as Method?"
9. See, for example, Caren Kaplan et al., *Between Woman and Nation: Nationalism, Transnational Feminisms and the State* (Duke University Press, 1999); Sonita Sarker and Esha Niyogi Day, eds., *Trans-Status Subjects: Gender in the Globalization of South and Southeast Asia* (Duke University Press, 2002); and the special issue of *Signs* 26, 4 (summer 2001), "Gender and Globalization."
10. Bonnie S. Anderson and Judith P. Zinsser, *A History of Their Own: Women in Europe from Prehistory to the Present*, rev. ed. (Oxford University Press, 2000); Bonnie Smith, *Changing Lives : Women in European History since 1700* (D.C. Heath, 1989); Marilyn J. Boxer and Jean H. Quataert, eds., *Connecting Spheres: Women in a Globalizing World, 1500 to the Present*, 2nd ed. (Oxford University Press, 2000).

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

11. Bonnie Smith, *Women's and Gender History in Global Perspective* (University of Illinois Press, forthcoming); Marysa Navarro, Kecia Ali, and Virginia Sanchez Korrol, *Women in Latin America and the Caribbean* (Indiana University Press, 1999); Guity Nashat and Judith E. Tucker, *Women in the Middle East and North Africa* (Indiana University Press, 1999); Barbara N. Ramusack and Sharon Sievers, *Women in Asia* (Indiana University Press, 1999); Iris Berger, E. Frances White, and Cathy Skidmore-Hess, *Women in Sub-Saharan Africa* (Indiana University Press, 1999). Bonnie Smith's NEH seminar at the Institute for Research on Women at Rutgers University (July 5–6, 2000, "Women's History and Gender History in a Global Perspective") was a landmark event in the history of rethinking world history; see Margaret Strobel and Marjorie Bingham, "The Theory and Practice of Women's History and Gender History in Global Perspective" (unpublished manuscript, forthcoming, provided courtesy of Margaret Strobel).
12. See, for example, Jennifer Terry and Jacqueline Urla, eds., *Deviant Bodies: Critical Perspectives on Science and Popular Culture* (Indiana University Press, 1995).
13. Nikki R. Keddie, "The Past and Present of Women in the Muslim World," *Journal of World History* 1, 1 (1990): 77–108; Helen Wheatley, "From Traveller to Notable: Lady Duff Gordon in Upper Egypt, 1862–1869," *Journal of World History* 3, 1 (1992): 81–104; Judith P. Zinsser, "From Mexico to Copenhagen to Nairobi: The United Nations Decade for Women, 1975–1985," *Journal of World History* 13, 1 (2002): 139–168. See also Carol Devens, " 'If We Get the Girls, We Get the Race': Missionary Education and Native Girls," *Journal of World History* 3 (1992): 219–238.
14. Michelle Maskiell, "Consuming Kashmir: Shawls and Empires, 1500–2000," *Journal of World History* 13, 1 (2002): 27–65.
15. George E. Brooks, "An Undergraduate World History Curriculum for the Twenty First Century," *Journal of World History* 2, 1 (1991): 65–79; David Christian, "The Case for 'Big History,' " *Journal of World History* 2, 2 (1991): 223–238; Philip D. Curtin, "Graduate Teaching in World History," *Journal of World History* 2, 1 (1991): 81–89; Andre Gunder Frank, "A Plea for World System History," *Journal of World History* 2, 1 (1991): 1–28; T. E. Vadney, "World History as an Advanced Academic Field," *Journal of World History* 1, 2 (1990): 209–223.
16. We are grateful to Ian Fletcher and Yael Simpson Fletcher for encouraging us to consider this point.
17. Judith P. Zinsser, "Women's History, World History and the Construction of New Narratives," *Journal of Women's History* 12, 3 (2000): 198, 205.
18. Gerda Lerner, *The Creation of Patriarchy* (Oxford University Press, 1986) and *The Majority Finds Its Past: Placing Women in History* (Oxford University Press, 1981).
19. A pivotal discussion of these questions can be found in Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "The Rani of Sirmur: An Essay in Reading the Archives," *History and Theory* 24, 3 (1985): 247–273.
20. Richard Eaton, *Islamic History as Global History* (American Historical Association, 1990). For a list of pamphlets on global history produced by the American Historical Association, go to http://www.theaha.org/pubs/titles.htm.
21. Thanks to Durba Ghosh for underscoring this point for us.

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

22. Julie F. Codell, ed., *Imperial Co-Histories: National Identities and the British and Colonial Press* (Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2003).
23. Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978).
24. Ranajit Guha, ed., *Subaltern Studies: Writings on South Asian History and Society I* (Oxford University Press, 1982); David Prochaska, *Making Algeria French: Colonialism in Bône, 1870–1920* (Cambridge University Press, 1990); Charles van Onselen, *Studies in the Social and Economic History of the Witwatersrand 1886–1914*, 2 vols. (Longman, 1982).
25. See Tony Ballantyne, "Rereading the Archive, Opening up the Nation State in South Asia (and Beyond)," in *After the Imperial Turn*, ed. Antoinette Burton (Duke University Press, 2003); David Arnold, *Colonizing the Body: State Medicine and Epidemic Disease in Nineteenth-century India* (University of California Press, 1993); James H. Mills, *Madness, Cannabis and Colonialism: The 'Native-only' Lunatic Asylums of British India, 1857–1900* (Macmillan, 2000); Timothy Mitchell, *Colonising Egypt* (Cambridge University Press, 1988).
26. Antoinette Burton, ed., *Gender, Sexuality and Colonial Modernities* (Routledge, 1999); Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power*; Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire*; Frederick Cooper and Ann Laura Stoler, eds., *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World* (University of California Press, 1997).
27. See, for example, P. J. Cain and A. G. Hopkins, *British Imperialism: 1688–2000*, 2nd ed. (Longman, 2002); David Hancock, *Citizens of the World: London Merchants and the Integration of the British Atlantic Community, 1735–1785* (Cambridge University Press, 1995); and the essays in Akita Shigeru, ed., *Gentlemanly Capitalism, Imperialism and Global History* (Palgrave-Macmillan, 2002).
28. See Nupur Chaudhuri and Margaret Strobel, eds., *Western Women and Imperialism: Complicity and Resistance* (Indiana University Press, 1992) and Catherine Hall, *Civilising Subjects* (University of Chicago Press, 2002).
29. Entry points into this scholarship include Antoinette Burton, *At the Heart of the Empire: Indians and the Colonial Encounter in Late-Victorian Britain* (University of California Press, 1997); Antoinette Burton, *Burdens of History: British Feminists, Indian Women, and Imperial Culture, 1865–1915* (University of North Carolina Press, 1994); Alice L. Conklin, *A Mission to Civilize: The Republican Idea of Empire in France and West Africa, 1895–1930* (Stanford University Press, 1997); Alice L. Conklin and Ian Christopher Fletcher, eds., *European Imperialism, 1830–1930: Climax and Contradiction* (Houghton Mifflin, 1999); Catherine Hall, Keith McClelland, and Jane Rendall, *Defining the Victorian Nation: Class, Race, Gender and the British Reform Act of 1867* (Cambridge University Press, 2000); Catherine Hall, ed., *Cultures of Empire: Colonizers in Britain and the Empire in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Routledge, 2000); John M. MacKenzie, ed., *Imperialism and Popular Culture* (Manchester University Press, 1986); John MacKenzie, *Orientalism: History, Theory and the Arts* (Manchester University Press, 1995).
30. Mrinalini Sinha, *Colonial Masculinity : The "Manly Englishman" and the "Effeminate Bengali" in the Late Nineteenth Century* (Manchester University Press, 1995); Tony Ballantyne, *Orientalism and Race: Aryanism in the British Empire* (Palgrave-Macmillan,

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

2001); Alan Lester, *Imperial Networks: Creating Identities in Nineteenth-century South Africa and Britain* (Routledge, 2001).

31. See J. M. Blaut, "Colonialism and the Rise of Capitalism," *Science and Society* 53 (1989): 260–296, and *The Colonizer's Model of the World: Geographical Diffusionism and Eurocentric History* (Guilford, 1993). We would like to thank Mrinalini Sinha for reminding us of this point.

32. See, for example, Peter Stansky et al., *NACBS Report on the State and Future of British Studies in North America* (November 1999), and Antoinette Burton, "When Was Britain? Nostalgia for the Nation at the End of the 'American Century,'" *Journal of Modern History* 75 (June 2003): 359–374.

33. Thanks to Adele Perry for urging us to specify this tension.

34. Amy Kaplan and Donald Pease, eds., *Cultures of U.S. Imperialism* (Duke University Press, 1995).

35. Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man* (Penguin, 1992).

36. See Heather Streets, "Empire and 'the Nation': Institutional Practice, Pedagogy, and Nation in the Classroom," in Burton, *After the Imperial Turn*, 57–69.

37. For one example of the rush to capitalize on these events, see Niall Ferguson, *Empire: How Britain Made the Modern World* (Allen Lane, 2003).

38. See, for example, Robert F. Berkhofer, *Beyond the Great Story: History as Text and Discourse* (Harvard University Press, 1995).

39. The American Historical Association has several teaching tools to help in this endeavor; see their Web site, http://www.theaha.org/teaching/. According to Margaret Strobel, "On the AP front . . . Marjorie Bingham and Susan Gross, of the now-closed Upper Midwest Women's History Center for Teachers in the Twin Cities got an NEH grant to revise their Women in World Area Studies books to put them and other stuff on George Mason's History Matters website as a resource for people teaching AP world history." E-mail correspondence, June 26, 2003.

DUKE
UNIVERSITY PRESS