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Migration, Colonization, and Histories of the Nineteenth-Century World(1)

Adele Perry

A great deal of historical writing about the nineteenth-century world concerns histories that we might think of either as migration or of colonialism. Read in the most literal of terms, the two phenomena are in no small part about the same material history, namely the movement of people and the results of arrivals and departures. For the most part, historians have tended to approach these as distinct histories deserving of their own analytics and historiographies.(2) Here I echo a point made by historian of Australia Ann Curthoys, who writes from a national context that shares important commonalities Canada, the one I work primarily within.(3)

This essay argues that historians of empire might speak to and learn from histories of migration. In my 2015 monograph, Colonial Relations: The Douglas-Connolly Family and the Nineteenth-Century Imperial World, I use the story of one family and their history in the Caribbean, North America and the United Kingdom, especially Scotland, to re-read the history of the British Empire. There are many migration stories here, all of them also ones of empire. Three stand out and demand attention: one of men travelling from Great Britain to the colonial world, and more particularly the Caribbean and North America; one of men and women leaving these places for the United Kingdom, and one of women and men, moving around the Caribbean and northern North America. Sometimes these narratives overlap and intersect. Always they remind us of the circuitous, intersecting imperial world, and the ways that gender and family were remade by it.

(1) I would like to thanks Yoko Namikawa, Mami Yoshiura-Morimoto for their support of this essay. Some of this work has been published in very different form in Adele Perry, Colonial Relations: The Douglas-Connolly Family and the Nineteenth-Century Imperial World (London, Cambridge University Press, 2015) and I thank Cambridge for permission to use that material here.

(2) There are exceptions, including work like James Belich, Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the Rise of the Anglo World, 1783-1939 (London, Oxford University Press, 2009) and Marjory Harper and Stephen Constantine, eds., Migration and Empire (London, Oxford University Press, 2010), and work focusing on assisted migration like Lisa Chilton’s, Agents of Empire: British Female Migration to Canada and Australia, 1860-1930 (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 2007).

(3) Ann Curthoys, “We’ve Just Started Making National Histories, and You Want Us to Stop Already?” in Antoinette Burton, ed., After the Imperial Turn: Thinking With and Through the Nation (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: Duke, 2003), especially 86. I thank Professor Takao Fujikawa for reminding me of this point.
The first migration story here is one well known to both historians of migration and of empire, one upon which the enterprises of empire clearly depended: young men leaving the metropolitan societies of Great Britain for the colonial world, sometimes for a spell and sometimes permanently. James Douglas’ father was named John, and he was born in 1772 in Scotland and in the early years of the nineteenth-century he circulated in and around Georgetown, Demerara, and what is now post-colonial Guyana. John Douglas did so as part of a wider family, one not unlike those studied in a growing literature on Scotland and empire.

For men like John Douglas, the Caribbean offered opportunities that were sometimes permanent, but they more often temporary and associated with a particular phase of life. Men who were passing through found work as managers, agents, or merchants in a plantation economy premised on absentee ownership. They also often developed relationships with local women. Patterns of empire and of migration meant that that few of these were white. In 1811, white adult men outnumbered adult white women in Demerara and Essequibo by a ratio of about three to one. As in the Jamaican context studied by Christer Petley, White men were to a greater or lesser extent transient and disconnected from usual networks of sociability and domesticity. This was presumably the kind of relationship formed by John Douglas and Martha Ann Telfer, a free woman of colour who historian Charlotte Girard identifies as James Douglas’ likely mother. Telfer and Douglas had at least three children, and the pattern of their births speak to the kind of transatlantic movement that marked their time together: two boys, Alexander and James born in 1801 and 1803, and a daughter Cecilia, born in 1812. In 1809 John Douglas married a Scottish woman, and seems to have returned to Scotland, more or less permanently, a few years later.

It was John Douglas’ Scottish family that was recognized in law and with property, but the

---

Caribbean shaped John Douglas' life long after he returned to Scotland. His death certificate named him as a “West India Merchant.”(10) His fortunes remained tied to the Caribbean and more particularly to slavery. In 1834, John Douglas was awarded £12,407 compensation for 236 slaves under the legislation that accompanied the final abolition of slavery in the British Empire. Nicholas Draper’s remarkable research allows us to see that the Douglas family is as good an example as any of the economic and political work performed by slavery and slave compensation in nineteenth-century Britain. (11) This provides a material example of the intervention made by Catherine Hall, Antoinette Burton, and others: empire produced the metropole and its histories. (12)

The line that differentiated what historians David Lambert and Allen Lester have called “imperial careering” and what historians of migration have usually called sojourning was in part one of class. (13) But it is also a matter of the relative weight we give to categories and identities of migration and empire in explaining their histories. John Douglas had no significant career with the colonial state. His story fits the broad patterns described by Alan Karras in his examination of educated, mobile Scots who went to Jamaica and south-eastern British North America “to earn a fortune as quickly as possible and return home with it.”(14)

John Douglas’ Caribbean-born sons would also move from metropole to colony, but their particular location within family and imperial circuits ensured that this was a different kind of move. Both sons were formally educated in Scotland, and it was from there that they migrated to a very different colonial place: northern North America. James Douglas “left England” in May 1819. (15) He travelled to Montreal and entered the fur-trade as a clerk for the North West Company. (16) Historian Norma Hall shows us how the fur-trade was one node in a global labour market. (17) Douglas’ first post was Fort William, an entrepot that tied northwestern North America to a wider maritime world. A man who passed through in 1816 called it “a metropolitan post” with men from “England, Ireland, Scotland, France, Germany, Italy,

Denmark, Sweden, Holland, Switzerland, United States of America, the Gold Coast of Africa, the sandwich Islands, Bengal, Canada, with various tribes of Indians, and a mixed progeny of Creoles, or half-breeds.” (18) Douglas was one small part of this plural world. His indenture contract described him as “of Scotland,” but HBC employment records registered him as “West Indian.” (19)

James Douglas move from the metropole to the colonial world a more or less permanent one. The legal, political, and social infrastructure of settler colonialism that would come to define much of North America and the Antipodes were not constructed in the territories where Douglas lived until the last half of the nineteenth-century. Still Douglas entered Indigenous territory as a colonizer, and one who ended up staying, establishing enduring ties of family and kinship, and eventually gaining enormous political authority. He considered being a sojourner and rejected that path. After eight years in the fur-trade Douglas was ready to move on. “Mr. James Douglas is bent on leaving the Country,” explained a fur-trade colleague. “I am very sorry for it.” (20) In his mid-twenties, and with eight years of wage-labour behind him and considerable savings, Douglas would have been in a good position to establish himself in a middling occupation elsewhere. But Douglas stayed. In 1828 he was working as a clerk at Fort St. James, a Hudson’s Bay Company post, and he married Amelia Connolly, the teenaged daughter of post’s Irish-Canadian Chief Factor and his Cree wife. (21) This was a fur-trade marriage, which, as a rich historical scholarship explains, was a well-developed if flexible tradition based on Indigenous and, to a lesser extent, European custom and nurtured by the particular cultural space of the trade. (22)

Douglas rose up the fur-trade ranks and the family he and Amelia created was raised within fur-trade, British North America. As Anne Hyde was shown, the routes travelled by families like the Douglas’ map the complicated territorial history of the North American west in revealing ways. (23) At Chief Trader at Fort Vancouver, the Hudson’s Bay Company’s major Pacific post, Douglas and Connolly Douglas would reconfirm their relationship according to

---

(20) George McDougall to John McLeod, 8 March 1828, McLeod Correspondence, BCA, MS 2715, A 1636. Also see “Servants Characters & Staff Records,” HBCA, A 34/1, 82.
(21) James Douglas, “Private Account” BCA, Add Ms B/90/1, 1 June 1827.
Anglican ceremony and British law. They would have thirteen children and raise six. In Victoria, the capital city of British colony of Vancouver Island and, after the two colonies were merged in 1866, British Columbia, the Douglas family was part of a numerically small but socially significant cadre of elite fur-traders who married Indigenous women and raised large families, and retired among clusters of like families that dotted northern North America. In 1842, a colleague explained that most of these men “have married native Women, I dare say find it more congenial to their feelings to remain there, rather than drag their families through the Continent to a new Country and new connections where the chances are they would be less happy than in their former residences.” Douglas would remain North America for the rest of his life, making only one substantial and one shorter trip to away from the continent. As a major figure in the far-western fur-trade and then, more critically, as governor of two colonies, Douglas made a decisive mark on the history of north-western North America. The contrast between James and John Douglas’ migration stories reminds us of the different routes that imperial lives could and did travel, and the different things that migration could and did mean.

II

What has become known as the “new imperial history” has shown us that empire stories are often circuitous rather than linear. Tony Ballantyne’s chosen metaphor is of empire as a web: bisected by horizontal as well as vertical lines of authority and communication. Others have stressed the enormous mobility of empire, emphasizing the lives and laws that circulated around the imperial world and not simply from metropole to colony. Historians of migration have made what is in substance the same argument, calling attention to the complicated paths people travelled, ones that defied nation states and complicate national historiographies. So the second migration story in this empire history is a set of travels from colonial spaces in the Caribbean and North American to Britain, journeys from colony to metropole. Some of these were temporary, and intentionally so, while others of these migrations were more permanent, whether by chance or intention. Taken as a group, these migrations remind us of the circulatory character of empire and of migration, and
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how they might be better understood together.

Individuals and families travelled not only from the metropole to peripheries, but from peripheries to metropole. But a period of formal education in Britain was a critical bridge that allowed boys of colour in early nineteenth-century Guyana to access a bourgeois identity and a certain kind of Whiteness. Formal schooling, especially in Britain, was critical. “If a young progeny of coloured children is brought forth, these are emancipated, and mostly sent by those fathers who can afford it, at the age of three or four years, to be educated in England” wrote one Caribbean observer. (30) Daniel Livesay points out that the migration of mixed-race children to Britain was designed to “validate and advance” Caribbean children, and historians of the fur-trade have found strikingly similar patterns (31).

This was the kind of work that a metropolitan education performed for James Douglas. He and his brother may have accompanied their father to Scotland in 1812. At the Lanark Grammar school Douglas received the kind of practical, middling education that gave so many Scots the cultural capital to parlay into the daily administration of empire and a critical toehold into identities of whiteness. As an adult, Douglas was routinely described as well-educated. (32) Douglas’ Scottish education made him upwardly mobile within the imperial world, and offered him useable histories through which to understand and present his own location in an imperial world. Douglas’ years at Lanark were critical to the identity he made as a Scottish man, first in the fur-trade and then in settler British Columbia.

Both the tangible and more amorphous opportunities that colonial children gained through their years of metropolitan schooling had some steep costs. Most obvious was early separation from their mothers, maternal kin, and, often enough, the place of their birth and early childhood. It is unlikely that Douglas ever saw his mother or Demerara after he left for Scotland at around eight years old. The movement of bourgeois children of colour from the colony to the metropole ruptured the ties between young men and the families, communities, and places of early childhood. It was surely designed to do so, to produce a man who identified with the metropole and his paternal kin rather than local colonial space, his mother and her people. Henry Dalton, a Georgetown physician, thought that separation from their parents early in life consigned men of colour to a complicated and essentially toxic relationship to their families, the societies of their birth, and ultimately themselves. They returned home with

---

“excellent education and polished manners,” only to find their expectations thwarted by racial thinking and hierarchy. “They found to their dismay that, in spite of high connexions, and the refinements they had acquired; they were still excluded from what was considered the ‘first society,’ and thus doomed to solitary seclusion, or to descent to inferior intercourse.”

For colonial elites like these, migrations from colonial space to the United Kingdom could be re-enacted, generation after generation. James Douglas and Amelia Connolly Douglas’ children were raised in fur-trade forts and in the small settler city of Victoria, in a context of local privilege. Douglas rose from Chief Factor to Chief Factor of the Hudson’s Bay Company. In 1851, he was made Governor of the newly created British colony of Vancouver Island. In 1858, he was also made governor of the adjacent colony of British Columbia. Upon his retirement in 1863-4, Douglas was made Knight Commander of the Order of the Bath, and he and Amelia became Sir and Lady Douglas. They were located at the upper echelons of a local elite, first of the fur-trade, and then of the colonial society over which their father was governor, and then widely acknowledged and celebrated man of authority, influence, and wealth.

Douglas and Connolly Douglas’ eldest girls were educated close to home in small schools run by settler women and later, missionary churches. It was a sign of the family’s growing prosperity and the changing politics of race and empire that their two youngest children were instead sent to England. Sending children to the metropole was a longstanding practice of colonial elites in northern North America, the Caribbean, and beyond, and in both Douglas and Connolly Douglas’ families in particular. But it was still a difficult and divisive choice, especially for Amelia Connolly Douglas. James William was eleven when he travelled from Vancouver Island to England, a small boy with a large hat. Connolly Douglas was heartbroken and Douglas worried. “The anxiety which I naturally feel about the little fellows welfare, is, as you may well imagine, very great, and I shall be much relieved when I hear of his safe arrival at home,” Douglas explained. Upon landing, care was transferred to metropolitan kin and relations. Caring for colonial children in the metropole for schooling was a heavy and often complicated task, and here it fell to the eldest Douglas daughter and in-laws. Jane Douglas Dallas and her husband became the sometimes doting and sometimes exasperated guardians and go-betweens for her two youngest siblings. Douglas took special comfort in this, glad that his son, “alone in a far country,” had kin nearby.

This was a costly kind of empire migration, one arranged in an effort to ensure children’s location in the transimperial elite that could span both metropole and colony. Douglas wanted for his son to establish elite metropolitan credentials – attend university and read law – and then

---

return to assume his fathers’ role as landowner and legislator in British Columbia. “I had one main object in sending him to England,” Douglas wrote, “to give him a sound and good education, that he might, in after life be qualified, through his own exertions to occupy a respectable position in society, and perhaps take a distinguished part, in the legislation of his Native country.” Here metropolitan education is sought as preparation for a career in what Douglas clearly situates as his son’s “Native country.” The ironies were not lost on Douglas. “It is very distressing to have children scattered over the world, abandoned to the care of strangers, who may utterly neglect their moral and mental training,” he explained. “[A]nd what are Colonists to do, who have no facilities for educating their sons at home? They must send them to other countries, where these advantages are found, and their boys have the benefit [sic] of a liberal education.”

The lived experience of metropolitan education could produce results different from those intended, imagined, and planned for. James William struggled at two small boarding schools, and then at a public school in Lancashire. “In his letters to me he complains of ‘ennui’!!!,” his father reported, deeming this “a strange expression for a school boy to use.” Douglas’ letters to James William offer occasional praise and more routine criticism. Douglas felt the disappointment of his son’s performance keenly. “I have made many sacrifices to give you a good sound education,” Douglas explained, adding that “I wish my Father had been as kind to me.” Douglas urged his son to study and postpone heterosexual entanglements, explaining that “It will be time enough for you, in 8 or 10 years hence, to think of marrying, when you have finished your education and made your mark in the world and have wherewith to support a wife in comfort.” The goal here was to produce a man fit for local colonial rule. When James William wanted to join the army Douglas demanded that he “dismiss the idea of being a soldier, and qualify himself for a political career in his native country.”

James William returned to Victoria in 1870, almost nineteen, in poor health, and with no apparent occupation. His brother-in-law quipped that “It is very difficult to know what to make of him, unless he puts in for the vacant Spanish throne.” Gender guaranteed that Martha’s metropolitan education would mean something very different. At the relatively mature age of eighteen Martha was sent to England for “the benefit of finishing her education” at what her father hoped would be a “proper finishing school.” What Douglas wanted for his daughter were metropolitan commodities: “larger & broader views of life, and that expansion of the mind, which may be called the education of the eye, and cannot be acquired out here.”

(36) James Douglas to Alexander Grant Dallas, 23 July 1867; James Douglas to Alexander Grant Dallas, 28 July 1868, both in Private Letter Book.
(38) Alexander Grant Dallas to John Sebastian Helmcken, 5 November 1870, John Sebastian Helmcken Papers, Add Mss 505, Volume 1.
Douglas had particular ambitions for his clever youngest daughter, and by the 1870s, the family’s financial resources were considerable and their metropolitan connections solid. Maintaining elite status was harder and harder for Métis elite, and fur-trade daughters who received British educations might have seemed particularly able to weather the storms of a changing North America that increasingly penalized people of Indigenous descent. The image of the ‘new woman’ was travelling around the imperial world, recalibrating womanhood with youth, mobility, and independence in ways that offered particular opportunities for colonial women who moved around metropolitan space.\(^{40}\)

Martha spent two years as a “parlour boarder” at the Miss Turks’ ladies school near Wimbledon. A decade later the school would promote its ability to provide young women with a suitable moral and physical environment, a set of specific bourgeois social graces, and enough but not too much formal education.\(^{41}\) Douglas was pleased with what the Turk sisters provided. He told Martha that the sisters were “every thing you could wish as kind and experienced Teachers,” and their school “in all respects admirably adapted to promote healthy development [sic] of the body and mind.” He encouraged Martha to be a careful observer of metropolitan society and its cherished symbols of empire: the houses of Parliament in session, the British Museum and Kew Gardens. Douglas was happy to report that Martha had shaken off what he called the “cobwebs of colonial training.” Connolly Douglas wanted her daughter home, but Douglas declared that Martha should not remain “a half learned lady all your life.”\(^{42}\)

The kind of migration that Martha undertook challenged familial languages of race, identity, and home. Douglas was alert to how his daughter might be seen and understood. He instructed Martha to keep quiet that it was her mother who gave her Indigenous knowledge. “I have no objection to your telling the old stories about ‘Hyass,’” he explained, “But pray do not tell the world that they are Mammmas.” Douglas was concerned about how Martha presented herself, and also about whether access to metropolitan resources and wealth would undermine Martha’s connection to the colonial place he considered her home. Douglas wondered if her experience of difference might foster Martha’s affect rather than unseat it. Douglas asked if “Home will appear dull to you after these exciting travels” or that “dear Victoria, your native land, be cherished as much as ever.”\(^{43}\) Here the usual distinction between ‘home’ and ‘away’ is reversed, but the colonial home, however real and however dear, is still presumed lesser.


\(^{43}\) James Douglas to Martha Douglas, 6 May 1873 and James Douglas to Martha Douglas, 9 June 1873, both in Letters to Martha.
James William and Martha’s journeys to the metropole were ultimately sorts of sojourns, temporary reconnaissance in search of specific resources rather than lasting relocations. In England they joined clusters of mobile, elite Indigenous people who passed through the metropole in search of resources, connections, and skills and maintained ties to home through the particular medium of the letter.(44) Both James William and Martha returned to Victoria, married, and lived out their lives there. They were the only siblings who did so. By the time of Amelia Connolly Douglas’ death in 1890, two of her surviving children lived in California, one in Britain, and only Martha remained in Victoria.\(^{45}\) Whether from Guyana to Scotland or British Columbia to England, the migration of imperial children in this family demonstrates the complicated directions that empire migration cut and did take in the nineteenth-century.

III

The third kind of migration story raised by this family history is of migrations within colonial spaces, in this case the eastern Caribbean and parts of northern North America that would later be territorialized as Canada and others as the United States. As Dirk Hoerder and Nora Faires argue, framing questions of migration within continents frames histories of movement differently.\(^{46}\) Seeing these kinds of histories as sorts of imperial migration especially allows us to see and evaluate some of the specifically women’s histories that can too easily be missed when we focus only on transoceanic movement. It was a while ago that Merry Wiesner-Hanks noted the extent to which the analytics of world history and women’s history continue to run separate tracks.\(^{47}\) One way we might begin to bring them into dialogue is by mapping some of the ways that migration and imperialism were often lived by women on different terms. Putting movement within colonial spaces into our field of historical vision helps us see women, and more especially local women, in clearer light.

The women in this family story did rarely travelled on the scale of Elizabeth Marsh, the subject of Linda Colley’s biography,\(^{48}\) but they too were subjects of world history. Within this family and many others, women made different types of journeys than men. But their lives were hardly fixed or strictly local. Girard suggests that Douglas grandmother was likely Rebecca Richie. Richie was a free woman of colour who moved at least a few times around the eastern Caribbean, and continued to have economic and presumably social connections

\(^{(44)}\) See, on this, Cecilia Morgan, ““Write me, Write Me.”” Native and Métis Letter-Writing Across the British Empire, 1800-1870,” in Fiona Paisley and Kristy Reid, eds., Critical Perspectives on Colonialism: Writing the Empire from Below (London, Routledge, 2014) 146-156.  
in Demerara, Berbice, and Barbados, including slaves she owned in each of those colonies. (49) Historian Melanie Newton’s study shows us that movement between these parts of the eastern Caribbean was familiar for free people of colour in the early nineteenth-century. (50)

Amelia Connolly and her female kin had their own distinct kinds of mobility. These were movements associated with longstanding Indigenous North America and the fur-trade. Connolly’s parents met in western Cree territory in what is now Northern Alberta early in the nineteenth-century. She was born in 1812 a long way east of there, at Fort Churchill or Assiniboia. (51) A decade later she was living west of the Rocky Mountains, and it was there that she married Douglas. In 1830 Connolly Douglas and her father make the 1400 kilometer journey with the fur-trade brigade to her husbands’ new post at Fort Vancouver. They moved with the fur-trade brigade but as elites within it. Amelia wore embroidered leggings and moccasins “stiff with the most costly beads,” “Indian boys” packing goods behind them, and a cook accompanying them. (52)

In the middle of the nineteenth-century European and settler observers were routinely impressed with Métis women’s capacity for travel and movement in environments they found difficult or inappropriate. Visitors to Fort Vancouver were struck by Métis women’s skill and mobility as horsewomen, on their ability to move confidently through space in ways denied by bourgeois European women. A missionary described a woman riding “gentlemen fashion” and noted that this was “the universal custom of Indian women.” (53) An American teacher who visited Fort Vancouver recalled that he only saw little of the women but that “As riders they excelled.” (54) In the 1860s Douglas and Connolly Douglas’ son-in-law was appointed Governor of Red River. Alexander Grant Dallas was proud that presumptions of bourgeois White women’s incapacity for travel through Indigenous North America did not apply to his wife. He explained that Jane could manage the long trip from Canada to Red River: “She is young, strong & a capital rider & her father sees no difficulty whatever.” (55)

(52) N. de Bertrand Lugrin, The Pioneer Women of Vancouver Island, 1843-1866 (Victoria, the Women’s Canadian Club, 1928) 14.
(54) Kate N.B. Powers, “Across the Continent Seventy Years Ago: Extracts from the journal of John Ball of his Trip Across the Rocky Mountains and his life in Oregon, compiled by his daughter,” Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society, 3:2 (March 1902) 100.
(55) Alexander Grant Dallas to [Joseph] Berens, 6 March [1862], quoted in “Miscellaneous Information Relating To Alexander Grant Dallas,” BCA, W/Dt6, 3.
Connolly Douglas’s kin were mobile, spread across North American and beyond. They were also indigenous. The Connolly’s were part of historic Métis communities and all of its most enduring markers: the territories north-west of the Great Lakes, the Roman Catholic Church, French, Michif and Cree languages, the fur-trade. But their late nineteenth-century lives were not contained within that geography, cultural reference points, or economy. Correspondence maintained kinship ties across geographical space as it did in the imperial families studied by Laura Ishiguro and Jane Errington. (56) In 1858 Amelia’s sister Marguerite was a nun with the Soeur Gris in the largely Métis community of Red River, or modern day Winnipeg. Marguerite wrote in 1858 offering news of a widely scattered set of relations. Their brother John was in Montreal, James was in Peru, and Henry was with the HBC at Esquimaux Bay. (57) A decade later a nephew was in San Francisco, working as a wine merchant. (58)

In the nineteenth-century transoceanic migration was gendered, and sharply so. Its general patterns put mobile men in contact with local women. But those ‘local’ women were also mobile within the geographies of continents and regions. These kinds of migrations also mattered to men. As an older man Douglas recalled having been a “wanderer” for forty years. (59) Wandering from Guyana to Britain, from Britain to North America, or crossing the continent region were for them both acts of empire and of migrations. These movements wove individual lives and family histories into wider histories of trade, dispossession, exploitation, and rule.

***

Like many nineteenth-century families, the family of James Douglas and Amelia Connolly moved, and tracking their movements suggests some of the ways that we might think of empire and migration simultaneously. The movement of men from Britain to the colonial societies in the Caribbean and North America, the movement of men and women, including children, from those colonial societies to the metropole, and movement of men and especially women around the Americas were shaped by the insurgencies of empire and by the quotidian histories of migration. Each of these three stories reminds us that empire, like migration, was circuitous and multi-layered. And it was through these layers and complicated routes that empire was made and remade in Britain and the places it ruled, sent people to, and received them from.

---

(56) See Laura Ishiguro, “Settling Complaints: Discontent and Place in Late-Nineteenth-Century British Columbia,” in Karen Dubinsky, Adele Perry, and Henry Yu, eds., Within and Without the Nation: Canadian History as Transnational History (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, in press); Jane Errington, Emigrant Worlds and Transatlantic Communities: Migration to Upper Canada in the First Half of the Nineteenth-Century (Montreal, McGill-Queen’s, 2007).


(58) James Douglas to Edward [Connolly], 29 December 1869, Private Letter Book.