

**UCLA**

**UCLA Previously Published Works**

**Title**

Selling Empire: India in the Making of Britain and America, 1600–1830

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5055t516>

**Journal**

Journal of American History, 104(1)

**ISSN**

0021-8723

**Author**

Lal, Vinay

**Publication Date**

2017-06-01

**DOI**

10.1093/jahist/jax024

Peer reviewed

tant, but the relational publication in which Coosaponakeesa engaged also played a crucial role in sustaining bonds and Creek authority.

Mary Kelley  
*University of Michigan*  
*Ann Arbor, Michigan*

doi: 10.1093/jahist/jax022

*Empire, Religion, and Revolution in Early Virginia, 1607–1786.* By James B. Bell. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. xvi, 268 pp. \$100.00.)

James B. Bell has authored two recent books on colonial religion and compiled an online biographical dictionary (accessible by paid subscription at [www.jamesbell.com](http://www.jamesbell.com)) of 1,281 men who ministered to the Church of England in the continental colonies. One might therefore expect to find new evidence, or old evidence newly digested, on the 534 men who served the English church in Virginia during the colonial and revolutionary eras. A good deal of that exists here, including useful tables of names, parishes served, dates of tenure, and (mainly English) universities attended, along with a discussion of two seventeenth-century clerical libraries—one never used in Virginia because its owner died on his voyage out. Otherwise *Empire, Religion, and Revolution in Early Virginia* tells a familiar story using familiarly sparse evidence.

Since the Anglican Church of Virginia left little documentation of its activities, what can historians say about it? Bell tells us that Virginia's Anglican Church was not like the Church of England in Ireland, but this potentially interesting comparison is not developed (beyond repetition of its institutional contrasts). Also left hanging are contrasts with the Church of England itself, back home, and with the much more vigorous Congregational cultures of the New England colonies (which, of course, left too much evidence). With relatively little direct evidence, more thought might have been given to functional (rather than merely institutional) comparisons with churches elsewhere in the Anglophone Atlantic, or Bell might have established new contexts in Virginia, following (for instance) the provocative and rewarding

example of Rhys Isaac's *The Transformation of Virginia* (1982). But Bell curiously sees Isaac's work as "focus[ed] without perspective" on religious issues and thus lacking in "true understanding" (pp. 4–5). This odd judgment perhaps derives from Bell's insistence on studying the English churches in Virginia as the Church establishment, as a whole entity that can and should be compared to other religious establishments in more settled places. Once those parameters are established, not much can be said, for "the church" in Virginia was unsuccessful at doing not very much, and the Englishness it managed to embody harmed it during and after 1776. Conversely, as Isaac and others have made clear, Virginia's churches, acting as congregations or, more accurately, as parish vestries, did play a coherent part in shaping the Old Dominion—as welfare agencies, as purveyors of values, standards, and styles, as meeting places, and as agents of Anglicization. As such, they were embraced by some and rejected by others, engendering several interesting narratives. Here we learn only, and once again, and repeatedly, that "the church" in Virginia was not a success.

Robert M. Bliss  
*University of Missouri—St. Louis*  
*St. Louis, Missouri*

doi: 10.1093/jahist/jax023

*Selling Empire: India in the Making of Britain and America, 1600–1830.* By Jonathan Eacott. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016. xvi, 455 pp. \$45.00.)

The terrain covered by Jonathan Eacott in the meticulously detailed *Selling Empire* enhances our understanding of how India was configured in the American imagination and economy, though he also seeks to place India within the global British imperial system. The backdrop to his book is furnished by a more enhanced conception of the Atlantic world and a newfound interest in Indian Ocean studies, in addition to the stimulus of what are called "interconnected histories." Scholars of Britain's possessions in America have seldom been concerned with the second British Empire, of which India, in the clichéd phrase, was the

crown jewel; likewise, studies of British India have generally been written with indifference to what was transpiring in Britain's empire in North America. Curiously, the two figures who have on occasion surfaced in attempts to write an integrated narrative are missing from Eacott's study: Elihu Yale, who amassed a fortune as the governor of Madras (1684–1692) before he was dismissed on charges of venality and went on to become the benefactor of a college that would eventually take his name; and Lord Cornwallis, who, putting it cynically, seems to have been rewarded for his surrender to George Washington at Yorktown (1781) with the governor-generalship of India (1786–1793).

Eacott's history might be described as revolving around two axes. The questions for traders, mercantilists, and financiers in Britain at the outset were: Could America be a new India? In what manner could one conceive of a triangular trade between India, Britain, and the American colonies in North America? Eacott lavishes much attention on the trade in calicoes, and not just because of their immense popularity. Britain expected that eventually consumers in the Americas would support the East India Company and thus support the British Empire and the metropole (London) through which everything was funneled. However, Eacott by no means confines himself to this terrain of cotton, chintzes, calicoes, silk, and woolens; tea and spices were much in demand both in Britain and North America, but, quite unexpectedly, so were umbrellas and the Indian hookah.

It is, however, Eacott's discussion of the anxieties generated by ideas of the despotic and effeminate Orient that forms the most arresting part of his book. Baron de Montesquieu is commonly seen as the origin of European notions of "Oriental despotism," but the satirical play *Eastward Ho* (1605) gave considerable expression to the idea of Asia, "with its great wealth," as a "place of emasculating luxury" (p. 23). India's manufactures, an essay in the *American Magazine and Historical Chronicle* in 1744 proclaimed, displayed a "gaudy pride" and needed the sobering restraint of Protestant Britain (p. 165). On both sides of the Atlantic Ocean, Eacott notes, reports of company servants strutting around on horseback and accu-

mulating fortunes "by every method of rapacity" circulated widely (p. 305).

In his unusual attentiveness to questions of political economy and of the politics of representation, Eacott opens for historians new possibilities of linking Britain's first empire to the British raj.

Vinay Lal

*University of California, Los Angeles*  
*Los Angeles, California*

doi: 10.1093/jahist/jax024

*Community without Consent: New Perspectives on the Stamp Act.* Ed. by Zachary McLeod Hutchins. (Hanover: Dartmouth College Press, 2016. xxii, 242 pp. Cloth, \$85.00. Paper, \$40.00.)

The 250th anniversary of George Grenville's ill-fated Stamp Act has been marked in various and interesting ways. The tax has been discussed in Supreme Court decisions, and, somewhat ironically, been issued in replica as a U.S. Postal Service stamp. (Apparently this levy has been paid by the remaining Americans who communicate without relying on electronics.) For scholars of the Stamp Act crisis (1765–1766) the most valuable commemoration is the publication of *Community without Consent*.

Defly organized and edited by Zachary McLeod Hutchins, the eight essays in this fine collection are uniformly thoroughly and ingeniously researched, forcefully and persuasively argued, and lucidly written. The footnotes are marvels: clear, comprehensive, and, when required, include thoughtful discussions of scholarship and issues in contention. Both text and notes bristle with striking insights. Three examples dealing with the contested question of what constituted a British subject must suffice. To Molly Perry, historians'

accounts of the mobs containing sailors and slaves . . . tend to describe a radical interracial moment rather than a multi-ethnic event. From my research I believe these crowd scenes were often profoundly exclusionary and far less about demonstrating common economic position than about claiming and clamoring for a com-