

Crown confirmation of Haudenosaunee title to a tract of land on the Grand River. John Brant and Peter Jones would later follow Norton's example by making their own lobbying campaigns to Whitehall, Westminster, and other sites of British social and political authority. Hutchings's meticulous efforts to show how these individuals negotiated their transatlantic identities adds nuance to the established portrait of Indigenous leaders who tried to work within the framework of the colonial system and recognition-based politics. While seeking Crown favor, their participation in an activist literary politics nevertheless challenged the British colonial system and its *raison d'être*—the so-called civilizing mission of empire.

In a brief afterword, Hutchings muses on the type of readers that might be interested in this book. Scholars of British Romanticism, he notes, have shown scant interest in Upper Canada in the past—and he questions whether they will do so in the future. He states instead that he would be happy if his work was taken up by practitioners of Indigenous, colonial, and Canadian studies. Hutchings would be wise to add British studies to his list, as *Transatlantic Upper Canada* falls squarely within the domain of scholars of Britain working on the nineteenth century and those with interests in literary, Atlantic, colonial, transnational, and indigenous questions.

Joel Hebert

United States Air Force Academy
joel.hebert@afacademy.af.edu

ALAN LESTER, KATE BOEHME, and PETER MITCHELL. *Ruling the World: Freedom, Civilisation, and Liberalism in the Nineteenth Century British Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021. Pp. 510. \$89.99 (cloth).
 doi: 10.1017/jbr.2022.226

Historians of the British Empire have long sought to understand the mechanisms and personnel that made imperial rule possible. Peter Cain and Anthony Hopkins famously articulated their model of “gentlemanly capitalism” (*British Imperialism: Innovation and Expansion 1688–1914* [1993]) while Lauren Benton and Lisa Ford more recently developed their concept of “middle power” (*Rage for Order: The British Empire and the Origins of International Law, 1800–1850* [2016], 8). Alan Lester, Kate Boehme, and Peter Mitchell's *Ruling the World: Freedom, Civilisation, and Liberalism in the Nineteenth Century British Empire* fits snugly into this historiography. It is a history of the British Empire told through one of its chief institutions, the Colonial Office. As such, this history is in many ways an old-fashioned study of the “official mind” of empire—a hearkening back to the structural histories of imperial administrators and “men on the spot” made famous by Ronald Robinson and John Gallagher (*Africa and the Victorians: The Official Mind of Imperialism* [1961], xxi). Like these older histories, *Ruling the World* also centers elite, white, metropolitan actors, most of whom were men. Where *Ruling the World* differs from its Cambridge School predecessors, though, is the careful attention that Lester, Boehme, and Mitchell pay to the experiences of Indigenous and colonized peoples. In that way, the title *Ruling the World* is a bit of a misnomer, for the book is concerned not only with the individuals embedded in the imperial hierarchy, even if it primarily adopts their perspectives. In addition to this inclusive approach, *Ruling the World* shines because of the deceptively simple question that Lester, Boehme, and Mitchell pose and the methodology that follows from it: How was the British Empire ruled everywhere, all at once?

To answer this question, Lester, Boehme, and Mitchell breathe life into administrators such as James Stephen, the workaholic micromanager who played an outsized role in determining

British imperial and colonial policy during his tenure as the chief civil servant in the Colonial Office (1836–1847). Stephen, who is the protagonist for the first half of the book, had an unenviable dilemma: to strike a balance between the overarching goals of the British Empire across the globe while attending to the myriad concerns of individual colonial contexts. Simultaneously, Stephen had to emancipate enslaved persons while securing the interests of the British planter, square the metropolitan desire to protect Indigenous peoples with white settler demands for land, and navigate discourses of natural rights, free trade, and personal autonomy for white Britons against their denial for colonized peoples. Thus, unlike other histories of the British Empire, which often treat one subject or agenda at a time, *Ruling the World* shows how Colonial Office officials tackled multiple issues, at multiple sites of empire, concurrently.

Stephen's conundrum in the Colonial Office is also the underlying puzzle of *Ruling the World*. Lester, Boehme, and Mitchell handle this issue by adopting a unique and highly effective structure. The book is organized into three sections, each of which highlights a specific year: 1838, 1857, and 1879—dates of some of the most significant developments in the Victorian-era empire, including the end of slavery after the apprenticeship period (1838), the Indian Rebellion (1857), and the Anglo-Zulu War (1879). Lester, Boehme, and Mitchell also map onto each year a specific ideological dimension—an imperial zeitgeist that allows them to track change over time and engage with the big questions of imperial historiography: 1838 is coded as the year of freedom, 1857 is the year of civilization, and 1879 is the year of liberalism. This structure is valuable insofar as it allows Lester, Boehme, and Mitchell to link the central authority of the Colonial Office to concurrent developments throughout the British Empire while also demonstrating how separate colonial contexts affected imperial policy. For example, the uprisings in Lower and Upper Canada over the issue of self-government in 1837–38, from which originated the famous Durham Report, also inspired movements toward responsible government in the Cape Colony in southern Africa and in New South Wales in the Australian continent. It is in the demonstration of these interlinkages that the book is impressively successful and original.

In *Ruling the World* Lester, Boehme, and Mitchell also carefully unravel the tangled web of connections between Colonial Office policy, actions taken by men on the spot, and the lived experience of colonized people. This last point is especially important to the authors. Each story around imperial agendas, such as emancipation for formerly enslaved peoples, is accompanied by a detailed consideration of the effects on colonized people, such as the mass indenture of South Asian peasants to ensure a continued supply of cheap labor. By following this formula, Lester, Boehme, and Mitchell expose the dark underbelly of their three major themes of freedom, civilization, and liberalism. These apparently emancipatory ideologies and the policies that they inspired always contained within them contradictions and exclusions. For example, the moral promise inherent in the British concept of civilization was undermined by its facilitation of colonization efforts in southern Africa. George Grey, governor of the Cape Colony in 1857, used the humanitarian crisis sparked by the Great Xhosa Cattle Killing to repackage settler demands for Xhosa land into a program for assimilation premised on saving the Xhosa from their own backwardness. The stark contrasts between the supposedly enlightened ideal of civilization, and the rapaciousness that accompanied it in practice, paint a grim picture of a Janus-faced empire.

Though much of *Ruling the World* is about imperial administration and its consequences, it also elucidates a more pernicious aspect of modern British history. *Ruling the World* tells the story of how the Victorians developed a sophisticated sense of self-importance; it narrates the growth of British imperial hubris based on racial and civilizational supremacy. Some might like to see this theme further developed in the book, as Lester, Boehme, and Mitchell are clearly engaged with the politics of contemporary Britain. Perhaps a conclusion—absent in this book—could have provided room to elaborate the bigger takeaways and meanings for the present. Additionally, some may balk at how the authors, by and large, reproduce their archive and the categories generated from it without analyzing or thematizing the politics

of the archive and its production. *Ruling the World* is a remarkable history that belongs on the shelf of any individual interested in understanding how the British Empire was ruled everywhere, all at once.

Nick Sprenger
Rutgers University
Nicholas.Sprenger@rutgers.edu

ANNA MAGUIRE. *Contact Zones of the First World War: Cultural Encounters across the British Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021. Pp. 232. \$99.99 (cloth).
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2022.216

In *Contact Zones of the First World War*, Anna Maguire traces soldiers' experiences of and journeys through war. From recruitment station to troop ship, hospitals to commemorative parades, Maguire's examination of soldiers' voyages reveals the complex social and cultural realities of the First World War beyond the battlefield. She focuses on the experiences of soldiers and laborers from the British West Indies, New Zealand, and South Africa, primarily in Europe and Egypt. Drawing on published memoirs, private papers, images, and newspapers, she compares various combatant and noncombatant experiences. As she explains in the introduction, Maguire applies the idea of "contact zones" from Mary Louise Pratt's *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (2008) to the spaces where soldiers, civilians, and laborers lived, fought, and loved—while reconciling the inherent inequities of their service (8–9).

Constructions of racial difference influenced Maguire's decision to focus on these particular case studies. She suggests that New Zealand's forces claimed racial integration between Māori and Pākehā (white) soldiers, unlike South African forces, which had explicit racial segregation. In the West Indies, questions about ethnic and class difference chafed against white British leaders' anxieties about Black militarism. Maguire observes that "Meeting people of different ethnicities, nationalities, religions or cultures did not universally challenge the racist modes of thought which many inhabited and had learnt by growing up in the British Empire" (4). In fact, Black and Māori servicemen often recounted experiences of exclusion and racism, which white servicemen saw as opportunities to perform their own inclusivity. These dynamics contributed to interpersonal and institutionalized racial violence, such as the tendency to give white soldiers, but not their Black or Māori counterparts, access to prophylactics.

The greatest strength of the work comes in Maguire's nuanced depiction of women's encounters with soldiers. Unsurprisingly, fears of miscegenation led both officers and white civilian workers to police segregated spaces and boundaries. Sometimes intimacy provided reprieve from embedded hierarchies and everyday discrimination. When soldiers billeted in women's homes, some women became mothering figures to soldiers who craved intimacy. White nurses likewise provided intimate care for servicemen across racial hierarchies, even if these encounters rarely existed beyond the hospital. This suggests that medical and military institutions facilitated contact but also imposed rules and established norms that hardened race, disability, gender, and class hierarchies. More could have been said about same-sex eroticization, particularly in white soldiers' frequent accounts of Black men bathing or swimming nude.

Maguire's discussion of sex with women shows how soldiers' perceptions of prostitution and so-called vice differed in various contexts. Some servicemen married the European women that they encountered. This was true not just for white soldiers, but also for some Māori and Black West Indian servicemen. Although officers discouraged or even banned