

Featherstone, D. (2019) Special issue introduction: maritime networks and transnational spaces. *Global Networks*, 19(4), pp. 447-457.

(doi: [10.1111/glob.12264](https://doi.org/10.1111/glob.12264))

The material cannot be used for any other purpose without further permission of the publisher and is for private use only.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

Featherstone, D. (2019) Special issue introduction: maritime networks and transnational spaces. *Global Networks*, 19(4), pp. 447-457, which has been published in final form at: [10.1111/glob.12264](https://doi.org/10.1111/glob.12264)

This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with [Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving](#).

<https://eprints.gla.ac.uk/196890/>

Deposited on: 20 December 2019

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of  
Glasgow

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

**Special Issue Introduction: Maritime Networks and Transnational Spaces**

**Dr David Featherstone**  
**School of Geographical and Earth Sciences**  
**East Quadrangle**  
**University of Glasgow**  
**Glasgow**  
**G12 8QQ**

**David.Featherstone@glasgow.ac.uk**

## Special Issue Introduction: Maritime Networks and Transnational Spaces

In *The Common Wind: Afro-American Currents in the Age of the Haitian Revolution* Julius Scott writes of how ‘the tempest created by the black revolutionaries of Saint-Domingue’ swept ‘across linguistic, geographic, and imperial boundaries’ and were ‘communicated by mobile people in other slave societies would prove a major turning point in the history of the Americas’ (Scott, 2018: xvii). For Scott seafarers and runaway slaves and the subaltern maritime networks they shaped were not bystanders in the Haitian Revolution, but rather were integral to its hemispheric influence. He demonstrates how they shaped networks and circuits of exchange which shaped generative spatialities and diverse multi-ethnic spaces of politics. Based on a 1986 PhD thesis Scott’s work has itself long circulated through networks of radical maritime scholarship.

The publication of *The Common Wind* after over thirty years by Verso in 2018 was an important given it has long been a key text in shaping the turn to radicalised understandings of maritime work and spaces. Scott’s book prefigured some of the concerns of Paul Gilroy’s *Black Atlantic*, *The Common Wind* was a direct influence on Peter Linebaugh and Marcus Rediker’s *Many Headed Hydra* which developed a sustained challenge to the methodological nationalism that structured ‘histories from below’ (see Linebaugh and Rediker, 1990, Shilliam, 2015, Ulrich, 2013). Indeed there are strong affinities between Scott’s approach and Linebaugh and Rediker’s compelling argument that the ship was ‘not only the means of communication between continents, but also the first place where working people from those different continents communicated.’ They present the ship, or at least its lower deck, as a ‘great forcing house of internationalism’ and use it to re-conceptualise the ship as constitutive of transnational working class formation – in ways which signal multi-ethnic connections, exchanges and solidarities which unsettle the nation-centred accounts of radical politics that shaped ‘history from below’ (Linebaugh and Rediker, 2001).

The work of such maritime-inflected histories from below has had significant impacts on how the transnational spatialities of politics, resistance and regulation are conceptualized. A particular contribution of such work has been to break down the obviousness of the nation-state as a container of political activity. This special issue considers the contribution such work can make to understandings of transnational spaces through engaging in depth with the spatialities of maritime regulation and resistances. It arises from a workshop hosted in the Centre for Studies of Social Sciences in Kolkata in 2014 which was co-organised by the editors. Central to the special issue is an attempt to maintain an engagement with research from both the Atlantic and Indian Oceans, this is significant, for as Resani Mawani notes, oceans are often still paradoxically seen as contained spaces. She notes, for example, that while the Indian Ocean is ‘nestled between the Atlantic and Pacific, it is rarely connected to these oceans, either historically or analytically’ (Mawani, 2018: 19). The special issue contributes to work which has sought to move beyond a focus on the Atlantic as key oceanic space, to assert the importance of Indian Ocean spaces (Subramanian, 2014, Vink, 2007) and has engaged with the intersections and routes between different Oceanic spaces.

Through so doing it seeks to contribute to recent scholarship which has sought to explore the implications of taking the sea seriously for ways of thinking and conceptualising space (Steinberg and Peters, 2015). This introduction draws attention to three key thematics that the papers contribute to through exploring the relations between work on maritime networks and transnational spatial relations. These are a set of engagements between law, space and

maritime networks; a set of questions around maritime spaces, subaltern histories and transnational networks and finally a set of concerns around the forms of ‘geopolitical literacy’ articulated by maritime actors. Through drawing together these interlocking problematics the papers contribute to a broad agenda highlighting the productive intersection of work on maritime networks and transnational spaces. Further, they emphasise that such an agenda can offer new and distinctive angles on the histories and geographies of resistance and subaltern politics.

### **Maritime Spaces, Legal Pluralism and Multiple Trajectories**

In her influential work on the regulation of maritime spaces in the early modern period Lauren Benton has explored the contested inter-relations between maritime spaces, different constructions of law and practices of colonialism. This is a key constituent part of her broader project to engage with the ways in which such relations were shaped by what she terms ‘legal pluralism’ (Benton, 2012). She uses this term to conceptualise law as a ‘global and flexible set of institutional and cultural processes’ through a “multi-centric” approach ‘to capture the intersecting legal orders in early imperial worlds’ (Mawani, 2018: 14). Benton’s approach positions maritime spaces as far from smooth and unregulated, but rather as the sites of contested claims, practices and engagements, often between and within different imperial powers.

This approach helps to move beyond accounts which have positioned the relations between maritime networks and transnational spaces as smooth and undifferentiated. By contrast Benton argues that in ‘developing trade routes, merchants promoted the idea of sea space as divided into sea lanes. Politics meanwhile could and did claim jurisdiction in ocean corridors and the strategies of mariners often reinforced such claims by emphasising the ties of ships to sovereigns’ (Benton, 2010: 106). In this way Benton’s work has positioned maritime spaces and the transnational/ translocal connections they shaped as produced through particular ways of dividing, regulating producing maritime spaces. As Anita Rupprecht notes in her contribution here Benton’s account has been a central reference point in work that has ‘begun to map the complex and multiple ways in which these maritime and subaltern dynamics were contingently related to imperial, legal, national and commercial cross-cutting lines of power both regionally and internationally (Benton 2009; see also Subramanian 2016).

This is important in attending to some of the specific spatial practices and technologies through which maritime spaces were regulated. A key example here is the pass system in the Indian Ocean which was ‘introduced by the Portuguese’ and ‘forced traders to accept Portuguese passes (bought with protection money and an agreement to pay customs duties at designated Portuguese ports of call) and assured them the benefits of convoy against piracy on the high seas’ (Subramanian, 2014: 8, see also Benton, 123-5). Lakshmi Subramanian has written of the ‘pass system’ that maritime spaces rather than being ‘smooth spaces’ could be key spaces of contested regulation. She has also noted, however, that such regulation could also be evaded or ignored. Discussing the relation between piracy in the Indian littoral and ‘the pass’ she notes that while ‘instances of piracy demonstrated that they took neither the Company’s convoy nor its colours very seriously’ such ‘blatant and flagrant violation of English colours and passes could hardly be tolerated and constituted enough grounds for Company retaliation’ (Subramanian, 2016: 128).

Subramanian’s focus on such conflicts and the diverse forms of agency shaped through them offers a more contested set of relations than is envisioned through Benton’s work.

Rupprecht's paper for this special issue both draws on and contributes to this emerging body of work about oceanic regulation, legal spaces and resistance by engaging with the ways in which marine insurance was used to regulate both free and enslaved lives at sea. The focus of Rupprecht's paper is on the 'formation and operation of maritime networks of resistance and solidarity during the United States 'domestic' coastal slave trade'. Through an account of the mutiny aboard the *Creole* in 1841, when slaves took over the US brig as it was 'plying the American coastwise trade route from Richmond in Virginia to the New Orleans slave markets', and forced it to sail to Nassau in the Bahamas.

Her account of these events focuses on the 'formation and operation of maritime networks of resistance and solidarity during the United States 'domestic' coastal slave trade' contributes to understandings of the operation, and contestation, of such cross-cutting lines of power is through exploring the way marine insurance was used to underpin the networks of the coastal slave trade.' Through doing so she draws on an understanding of marine insurance not solely as a technical device, but rather as part of what she refers to as the 'legal infrastructure of Atlantic slavery'. She notes how such legal infrastructures were contested and engages with how the mutineers of the *Creole* were able to use the spaces and knowledge shaped by local maritime actors to assert their freedom. In this regard while Benton's work usefully addresses the contested articulations of law and its articulation with maritime spaces it is arguably less effective at engaging with the diverse forms of agency shaped by different non-colonial actors as they negotiated these processes.

To develop a sustained engagement with such agency Santanu Sen Gupta in his contribution to the special issue develops a detailed engagement with the strategies of Armenian merchants in the Indian Ocean world, particularly in Calcutta, at end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth century. Sen Gupta explores issues of 'maritime trade and space' from 'the vantage point of Armenian merchants' interactions with the colonial regime in the courts of law'. By drawing attention to the ways in which Armenian traders used such legal spaces he gives a vivid sense of the ways in which such spaces of regulation could be sites of contestation. Sen Gupta demonstrates how such interventions were used to produce forms of 'indigenous' agency. Thus he argues that the 'voice of the indigenous in the colonial courts successfully complicated the binary of the colonial and the indigenous even when the state's power and claim grew significantly'.

Sen Gupta also draws attention to the role of maritime legal disputes in the reconfiguration of the identity of the Armenian diaspora in ways which enhance understandings of 'the concept and operation of legal pluralism in the era of Company rule over the Indian ocean'. This signals the importance of engaging more squarely with diverse forms and spatialities of agency than Benton's account sometimes allows. Further, Sen Gupta's account emphasises that Oceanic spaces did not just combine 'coloniser' and 'colonised' in binary struggles. Rather it suggests how they were constituted through multiple trajectories which demand more diverse accounts of transnational spaces and who was active in shaping them and shaping strategic claims through them. The next section develops these concerns through considering the importance of attending to the relations between maritime spaces, subaltern histories and transnational relations.

### **Maritime Spaces, Subaltern Histories and Transnational Relations**

In an incisive discussion of the 'Subaltern Sea?' Sharad Chari has recently contrasted the different imaginaries that the *Annales* historian Fernand Braudel and the critic Edouard

Glissant brought to understanding oceanic spaces. Drawing on Jacques Rancière's critique of Braudel in *The Names of History* Chari positions Glissant as offering an important alternative to Braudel's 'expansive gaze on the Mediterranean as world-making, grounded and ungrounded as it were by sovereignty' (Chari, 2019: 192). He notes that while Braudel develops a 'sweeping account of the "collective destinies" of 'the Mediterranean world' with Glissant's account of the Caribbean as 'a sea that diffracts' (Chari, 2019: 192). By this Chari draws attention to the way that 'Glissant's geographical praxis is less about Caribbean difference than about speaking through this entangled, creole multilingualism to the world as a whole (Chari, 2019: 192).

The contrast Chari draws between Braudel and Glissant usefully emphasizes that approaches to maritime geographies can be informed by different ways of thinking about the relations between maritime spaces, transnational relations and geographical imaginaries. Indeed Chari's account of the Subaltern Sea 'cuts across nationed, territorial spatiality by focusing on the Indian Ocean and transoceanic space as a subaltern composition.' (Jazeel and Legg, 2019: 22, see also Kothari, 2012). This is an imaginary that destabilises foundational spatialities of the transnational for as Jazeel and Legg note in such work 'the very term "transnational" becomes inadequate as it retroactively and conceptually reinstates at least two autonomous spatial entities (nations) that dissimulate and fragment the wholeness of longer, more fluid, topological spatialities, the likes of which Paul Gilroy's "Black Atlantic" so vividly brings to mind' (Jazeel and Legg, 2019: 21-22).

This is significant for thinking about some of the often under-scrutinised assumptions that underpin constructions of the transnational. As Radhika Mongia has observed the very 'formulation of the *transnational* obliges if not shackles us to assumptions of space, state and subjectivity *already* conceived in *national* terms' (Mongia, 2019: 5, emphasis in original). To really explore articulations between transnational spaces and maritime networks and what might be at stake by bringing them in dialogue, then, it is necessary to explore how engaging with maritime spaces, might enable different approaches to understanding the construction of transnational relations and connections. Renasi Mawani's recent work, for example, has drawn on 'oceans and currents' as a 'guiding methodology' to 'trace the circulation of colonial law and Indian radicalism and to draw connections between the seemingly discrepant histories and geographies of the Pacific, Atlantic and Indian Oceans' (Mawani, 2018: 20).

Noting that currents 'exist in several registers at once' Mawani argues that they 'follow multiple trajectories, exhibit changing dimensions, and thus offer alternative metaphors and additional ways to chart the discrepant mobilities of colonial and imperial worlds' (Mawani, 2018: 21). Such interventions can offer different ways of engaging with the construction and experiences of transnational relations. The papers here suggest ways in which such approaches can offer new and distinctive angles on the histories and geographies of resistance and subaltern politics. Tracing maritime networks across ships and port cities offers ways of reconfiguring dominant accounts of the left and can help draw attention to what Andy Davies has referred to elsewhere as 'varieties of anti-colonialism' (Davies, 2020). By this term Davies draws attention to the diverse spaces of politics shaped by multiple anti-colonialisms not least through some of the distinctive anti-colonial projects shaped in relation to maritime worlds. Recent scholarship has also used such transnational approaches to re-envision the solidarities and articulations of anti-fascist lefts and in his contribution to the special issue Jonathan Hyslop makes a significant contribution to such work through a detailed account of the 'Antwerp Group' a group of German seafarers active in shaping anti-fascist left internationalism in the 1930s.

By conceptualizing the Antwerp Group as a maritime network Hyslop draws attention to the distinct forms of anti-fascism and internationalism constructed through this group of German anti-fascist seafarers. Thus he argues that the ‘unique character of ports as cities of ships as social spaces made it possible, through collaboration between the Antwerp Group and the ITF [International Transport Workers Federation], to construct maritime networks’ in the ‘highly unfavourable’ circumstance of ships in the German merchant fleet under the control of officers largely sympathetic to the Nazis. Hyslop demonstrates how a fine-grained approach to reconstructing these maritime networks and the varied left political trajectories that shaped them can help to draw attention to forms of political action and articulations that have been ignored by more nation-centred accounts of anti-fascisms. Further he notes how the particular ‘social worlds of international trade unionism and left-wing politics- portside pubs, boarding houses, the crew quarters aboard ship, all somewhat shielded from the direct exercise of state authority- provided a particularly generative environment for the development and defence of resistance politics’.

Andy Davies’s paper revisits the Royal Indian Naval Mutiny of 1946 through a perspective that is similarly alive to the forms of transnational connections and networks through which it was constituted. Through doing so Davies makes a number of key contributions. He challenges the ways in which Leila Gandhi’s reading of the events abstracts the mutiny from ‘the maritime and naval aspects of the sailors’ lives’. Reasserting the maritime context of these events helps Davies to draw attention to the ways the mutineers’ geography of democracy in the mutiny was shaped by international imaginaries and connections. Through doing so he ‘stretches the formation of Indian nationalist and democratic activity, and shifts it to become less ‘terracentric,’ with forms of nationalist identity being produced through long term movements and engagements overseas in a range of contexts’. Drawing on Ravi Ahuja’s arguments about the ‘corrosiveness of comparison’ between different colonial contexts Davies foregrounds the generative impacts of sailors questioning their role in the world, noting that ‘the exposure to struggles against tyranny and injustice overseas, for some of the sailors, was enough for them to argue that sticking to naval procedure was less important than the freedom of India from overseas rule’.

Davies’s account of the mutiny with its focus on racist conduct of officers, racialized divisions of labour and the tensioned negotiation of caste differences emphasizes that engagements between maritime networks and transnational spaces to be marked by, and imagined through practices of exclusion as well as solidarity. An important body of scholarship by maritime labour historians, however, has problematized constructions of maritime workers’ organising as inevitably shaped by internationalism and cosmopolitanism. Thus Jon Hyslop has drawn attention both to the forms of white labourism that shaped some seafarers’ trade unions, notably the National Union of Seamen (NUS) which was the main union organizing seafarers in Britain, as well as the routinized and regularized forms of much seafaring work especially those associated with liners (Hyslop, 2009, 2017, see also Ahuja, 2006, Bunnell, 2017). This stresses the importance of thinking about the situated trajectories and spatialities shaped through maritime labour- and seeing these spaces as products of struggle.

Contributing to such debates David Featherstone’s paper engages with the attempts of the National Union of Seamen in the 1930s to exclude seafarers of colour from the maritime labour market in British ports. Featherstone’s paper traces resistances articulated in relation to one strategic moment of the sustained exclusionary organizing produced by the NUS in the

inter-war period arguing that the ‘political trajectories, solidarities and spaces of organising constructed through these alliances shaped articulations of what Leslie James has referred to as ‘decolonisation from below’ (James, 2015). He argues that these ‘forms of organising exceeded the contained nationalisms of some anti-colonial struggles and shaped diverse spaces of politics which brought into contestation practices of labour organising which were unequally articulated with racialized hierarchies.’ Through tracing these alliances and forms of transnational opposition this paper contributes to debates at the intersection of maritime spaces and transnational labour geographies.

To do this Featherstone explores the importance of organisations such as the Colonial Seamen’s Association which brought together seafarers of many different ethnicities and was shaped by seafarers with both Atlantic and Indian Ocean trajectories. This organising work also directly challenged the unequal geographies which structured imaginations of transnational networks and relations. Thus the prominent Indian labour leader Jamnadas Mehta, who at that point was the president of the National Trade Union Federation of India, contested not just particular dynamics of exclusion but related this directly to the colonial imaginaries of transnational spaces which structured maritime labour. This emphasizes that the transnational spaces of politics mobilised here were not just functionalist or strategic, but rather were integral to challenging the relations between the production of maritime labour, racialized divisions and the uneven articulation of spatial relations. This contestation of transnational spaces is a necessary pre-condition for analyzing the conflictual political trajectories shaped through the spatial practices of maritime worlds (Massey, 2005). The political imaginaries shaped through such maritime networks and how they envisioned ‘transnational’ and ‘translocal’ spaces is the focus of the final section.

### **Maritime Actors, Geopolitical Literacy and Contested Transnational Knowledges**

In his recent comparative study of dockworkers in Durban and the San Francisco Bay Area Peter Cole has demonstrated how their organising in both ports combined ‘leftist and antiracist ideologies’. He traces how through their activism they ‘translated their beliefs in the need for and possibilities of solidarity into tangible actions: boycotting ships to protest apartheid and other forms of authoritarianism.’ Through doing so Cole locates understandings of such radical trade unionism in the dockers’ ‘transnational’ labour process demonstrating how their role in shifting trade- but also their knowledge of the cargoes they handled and the connections they made between places were integral to their political interventions and agency. He argues that arguably such boycotts ‘are even more possible now as a result of the ever-greater links created by global trade, “just in time” production methods, corporate desires to maintain low inventories, and transnational labor organisations like the ITF’ [International Transport Workers Federation] (Cole, 2018: 210).

Cole’s account of the activism of dockers in Durban and San Francisco speaks to a final theme of the set of papers in this issue. This is what Rupprecht refers to, drawing on Philip Troutman’s work, as ‘geopolitical literacy’. Troutman uses this term in a study of the [*Creole rebels*] to refer to the ways in which ‘enslaved African Americans worked to acquire, disseminate, and apply geographic and geopolitical knowledge and information’. Rupprecht’s paper mobilises this term to draw attention to the ‘translocal solidarities and local networks’ that the Creole rebels used to garner support for their freedom. As Rupprecht notes these solidarities shaped ‘a mobile and fluid transnational set of dynamic spatial and political practices that breached land and sea in a myriad of imagined and material ways’.

This is significant as assumptions that it is elites who possess knowledges and expertise about the transnational continue to structure dominant accounts of geopolitics and subaltern politics has often been explicitly defined against such transnational knowledges/ experience. Such oppositions have had important consequences for the epistemologies of the transnational, which are often structured around the knowledges of powerful, elite actors and experiences. There are resonances here with Julius Scott's attentiveness in *The Common Wind* to the ways in which subaltern maritime actors negotiated the different imperial powers that had a stake in the geopolitical struggles in relation to St Domingue/ Haiti. The papers here in different ways demonstrate how a focus on maritime networks and experience can offer different viewpoints on key aspects of transnational practices and how they are negotiated, articulated and experienced.

As Davies and Hyslop's contributions emphasise, the acquisition and circulation of such knowledges was often itself perilous and subject to repression. Hyslop's paper gives a vivid sense of the ways in which the Antwerp Group's knowledge of maritime networks was integral to their anti-fascist internationalism. There is also a sense of the spaces and practices through which they shaped such transnational knowledges: 'In the mess, the crew discussed the Spanish Civil War and they brought local newspapers in foreign harbours 'so that we could use the five months to discuss all questions, including our defeat in German.' While Hyslop draws attention to the spaces on the ship where 'geopolitically literate' discussions might take place Davies's paper demonstrates how the ship itself could bring together different groups with different experiences of colonialism in key ways. Thus he notes how a crucial impact on the Royal Indian Naval mutiny was the way that ships were being used to transport captives from the Indian National Army (INA), which had fought against the British in South East Asia in alliance with Japan, to stand trial in Delhi. Davies emphasises that 'the space of the ship itself became somewhere where radicalism could find a home, and the public nature of the space between the sailors of the lower deck meant that a degree of connection could take place, even with captured INA officers'.

These interventions in thinking about 'geopolitical literacy' suggest the potential of alternative ways of rendering the 'epistemologies' and knowledge of the transnational. In the introductory statement of their edited book *World Histories From Below* Antoinette Burton and Tony Ballantyne observe a disjuncture between the 'tradition of a materialist social history' which has 'generally operated within the analytical frame of the nation' and world's history focus on 'expansive geopolitical structures' which has often predominantly focused on 'powerful elites' (Burton and Ballantyne, 2016: 5, see also Anderson, 2012). The concerns with geopolitical literacy of seafarers and other maritime actors discussed in the papers in this special issue are animated by a commitment to finding ways of bridging the detailed fine grained concern with experience and agency associated with some of the most influential work in histories from below while using this to offer new and distinctive engagements with geopolitical structures- and internationalist articulations of left politics.

This is a set of engagements which have strong contemporary relevance. Nikolas Kosmatopoulos's work on the forms of 'terraqueous solidarity' constructed in relation to what he terms the 'maritime settler colonialism' of Gaza draws attention to the 'deployment of solidarities at sea has the potential of turning the logics and limits of extra-legal state expansion into the sea into a subject of public debate and political contestation' (Kosmatopoulos, 2019: 3, see also Campling and Colás, 2017). Through tracing the work of Greek dockworkers involved in re-fitting vessels for solidarity missions to Gaza and experiences of activists on board ships as they head 'to breach the Israeli embargo of the seaside

enclave' Kosmatopoulos draws attention to the ways in which maritime solidarities opening up productive forms of translocal political struggle and identities. Articulations of maritime spaces have, however, also been central to recent political struggles over different racialized populist imaginaries. Atul Bhardwaj's recent analysis of the successful exploitation of the 'masculinity associated with seafaring' in political projects such as Brexit attests that articulations between empire and maritime spaces can still be pressed into service by the political right in the current conjuncture (Bhardwaj, 2019: 10-11).

This suggests the importance of thinking about both the antagonisms shaped through different ways of articulating maritime spaces and the different forms of agency generated through such struggles. The papers here have sought to offer productive ways of accounting for an engaging such oppositional political agency (see also Frykman, et al, 2013). The terms on which the agency of maritime workers might be asserted or recovered has been usefully probed by Ravi Ahuja who cautions against accounts which 'abstract the experiences of (individual or collective) historical actors from larger, very concrete, but [...], often opaque historical processes' (Ahuja, 2012: 83). Ahuja notes that 'the 'results, when pertaining to transterritorial phenomena' tend 'to resonate curiously with those derived from apologetic globalization narratives'. He stresses by contrast the need to position the 'spatial and social confinement among steamship crews' not as a 'static backdrop, but a persistently embattled field, an increasingly important trait of a quickly transforming seafaring life and a key element of a ship's rigid social hierarchy' (Ahuja, 2012: 82).

By tracing constructions of geopolitical literacy which were often collective in form and refused to treat such shipboard spaces as a settled back drop the papers here offer ways of thinking beyond these tensions and suggest alternative ways of thinking about the 'epistemologies' through which transnational or translocal relations are constructed. They emphasise that here suggest a fine-grained approach to such geopolitical knowledges can be alive to particular experiences and trajectories without eliding a concern with broader and 'spatially extensive processes' or reducing them to a 'backdrop'. Further, they suggest the potentially productive character of the conversations between maritime networks and transnational spaces that we hope this special issue will help to foster.

## References

- Ahuja, R. (2012) 'Capital at Sea, Shaitan Below Decks? A Note on Global Narratives, Narrow Spaces, and the Limits of Experience' *Histories of the Present* 2: 1, 78-85.
- Ahuja, R. (2006) 'Mobility and Containment: the Voyages of South Asian Seamen, c. 1900-1960' *International Review of Social History*, 51, Supplement, 111-14.
- Anderson, C. (2012) *Subaltern Lives* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Balachandran, G. (2012) *Globalizing Labour? Indian Seafarers and World Shipping, c. 1870-1945*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Benton, L. A. (2012) *Search for Sovereignty: Law and Geography in European Empires, 1400-1900* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bhardwaj, A. (2019) 'Brexit and the Continental Fears of Maritime Britain' *Economic and Political Weekly*, 54: 17, 27<sup>th</sup> April, 2019, 10-11.

- Bunnell, T. (2017) *From World City to the World in One City: Liverpool Through Malay Lives* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Burton, A. and Ballantyne, T. (2016) 'Keywords: "World History", "Below", and "Dissent and Disruption"' in Burton, A. and Ballantyne, T. (ed.) *World Histories From Below: Disruption and Dissent, 1750 to the Present* London, Bloomsbury, 1-10.
- Campling, L. and Colás, A (2017) 'Capitalism and the sea: sovereignty, territory and appropriation in the global ocean' *Environment and Planning D*, 36: 4, 776-794.
- Chari, S. (2019) 'Subaltern Sea? Indian Ocean Errantry against subalternization' in Jazeel, T. and Legg, S. (ed) *Subaltern Geographies* Athens, Georgia: Georgia University Press, 191-209.
- Cole, P. (2018) *Dockworker Power: Race and Activism in Durban and the San Francisco Bay Area* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Davies, A.D. (2020) *Geographies of Anti-Colonialism: Political Networks Across and Beyond South India* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Frykman, N., Anderson, C., Heerma van Moss, L. and Rediker, M. (2013) 'Mutiny and Maritime Radicalism in the Age of Revolution' *International Review of Social History*, 58, Special Issue (2013), 1-14.
- Gilroy, P. (1993) *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* London: Verso.
- Hyslop, J. (2017) 'Southampton to Durban on the Union Castle Line: An Imperial Shipping Company and the limits of globality' *Journal of Transport History* 38: 2.
- Hyslop, J. (2009) 'Steamship Empire: Asian, African and British Sailors in the Merchant Marine c. 1880-1945' *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 44: 1, 49-67.
- Jazeel, T. and Legg, S. (2019) 'Subaltern Studies, Space and the Geographical Imagination' in Jazeel, T. and Legg, S. (ed) *Subaltern Geographies* Athens, Georgia: Georgia University Press, 1-35.
- James, L. (2015) *George Padmore and Decolonisation From Below: pan-Africanism, the Cold War and the End of Empire* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kothari, U. (2012) 'Contesting Colonial Rule: Politics of Exile in the Indian Ocean' *Geoforum*, 43: 4, 697-706.

- Kosmatopoulos, N. (2019) 'On the Shores of Politics: Sea, solidarity and the Ships to Gaza' *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 1-18.
- Linebaugh, P., and Rediker, M., (1990) 'The Many Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves and the Atlantic Working Class', *Journal of Historical Sociology* 3(3), 225-252.
- Linebaugh, P. and Rediker, M. (2001) *The Many Headed Hydra* London: Verso.
- Mawani, R. (2018) *Across Oceans of Law: the Komagata Maru and Jurisdiction in the Time of Empire* Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press.
- Mongia, R. (2019) *Indian Migration and Empire: A Colonial Genealogy of the Modern State* Raniket: Permanent Black.
- Rediker, M. (2014) *Outlaws of the Atlantic: Sailors, Pirates, and Motley Crews in the Age of Sail* London: Verso.
- Scott, J.S. (2018) *The Common Wind: Afro-American Currents in the Age of the Haitian Revolution* London: Verso.
- Shilliam, R. (2015) *Black Pacific: Anti-Colonial Struggles and Oceanic Connections* London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Steinberg, P.E. and Peters, K. (2015) 'Wet ontologies, fluid spaces: giving depth to volume through oceanic spaces' *Environment and Planning D* 33: 2, 247-264.
- Subramanian, L. (2014) *The Sovereign and the Pirate: Ordering Maritime Subjects in India's Western Littoral* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Troutman, P. (2005) 'Grapevine in the Slave Market: African American Geopolitical Literacy and the 1841 Creole Revolt' in Johnson, W. (ed) *The Chattel Principle: Internal Slave Trade in the Americas* Yale: Yale University Press.
- Ulrich, N. (2013) 'Internationalism Radicalism, Local Solidarities: the 1797 mutinies in Southern African waters' *International Review of Social History* 58: S21, 61-85.
- Vink, M. (2007) 'Indian Ocean Studies and the "New Thassology"' *Journal of Global History* 2, 42-62.