Introduction

Borrowing the title of Simon Winchester's novel as the title of this introduction is quite appropriate. Not so much because it would approximately describe the division of roles between the two general editors. Or because this was the very volume that one of us randomly pulled out from the other's bookshelves at the time we tuned the first sketches of this volume. Rather, it is because we want to stress from the start that the making of this volume was not as difficult as the making of the *Oxford English Dictionary* at the end of the 19th century. James Murray had to face many obstacles we have been spared. Making a dictionary is probably easier today than it was just thirty years ago, and a major reason lies in the development of information technologies. We sometimes had an attack of vertigo when we thought about the energy and time that one had to spend during the postal age to invent entries, find contributors, follow up with hundreds of authors and liaise with an editing and publishing team. When we think of how web searches have been complementary to library work when establishing a list of entries or a list of possible contributors, and when we browse the 15,000 e-mails or so that have been generated just by the two of us during the development of this project, we realize how the ability to communicate quickly and cheaply with colleagues from across the globe has been crucial in shaping this endeavour. We also believe that it was an incentive to stretch our editorial suggestions. While you certainly hesitate to send a fourth manuscript or typed letter with editorial comments about a couple of sentences when it takes several weeks to travel back and forth, you do not hesitate to send an e-mail that asks for clarification about a single word or a comma. While you'd tire of chasing an overdue entry by phone at great expense, you now have the ability to swoop down on contributors using Voice over IP software. Somehow, this also makes the standards higher, and we hope to have lived up at least partially to the new claims that are laid on us academics by the possibilities of digital communication.

The use of these possibilities was part of the excitement and pleasure we had in developing this project. But there was something else, where we quite likely touched upon some of James Murray's and other encyclopedia makers' feelings when they worked out their projects. We were starting from scratch without a matrix, without a precedent. There were no 'obvious' entries or contributors that we had to enlist or do without, because of their presence in a previous attempt to do what we were doing. It was definitely not like working on just another edition in a long line of reference volumes on the history of one or another country, or any spin-off from a long series of formatted companions and dictionaries. This provided us with freedom and room for manoeuvre, invaluable possessions if you want to keep a high and even level of commitment and stamina during several years.

This does not mean that we considered we were inventing anything. In the world of knowledge, such a stance is bound to be exposed as a boast at one moment or another. Instead, as historians of the modern age, we simply faced the fact that more and more people were paying attention to the circulations

and connections between, above and beyond national polities and societies, from the 19th century to current times. While the history of the modern age had been, more than that of other periods in human history, written from a national perspective, the last twenty years have witnessed the mounting of an explicit challenge to this position, originating from the whole spectrum of the social sciences and the humanities. It was manifest in the growing number of forums, meetings, journals, courses and research projects which addressed the modern world by considering the entangled nature of the different national and local histories.

We saw this trend developing and were ourselves part of it in our fields and specialties. It had many labels, and more have developed since. Some distinguished historians such as Patrick Manning, Jerry Bentley, Chris Bayly and Anthony Hopkins prefer 'world history' to name their concern for cross-cultural and global comparisons and connections. Similarly, a number of people consider that 'international history' is an appropriate way to designate their interest. At the other end of the spectrum, other scholars have coined new terms: Sanjay Subrahmanyam uses the term 'connected histories', Shalini Randeria goes for 'entangled history', Michael Werner and Benedicte Zimmerman have sketched what an 'histoire croisée' would be, David Thelen and his US colleagues have popularized the term 'transnational history' with prompt support from Jürgen Kocka and a host of German colleagues, Bruce Mazlish and Akira Iriye have defended the idea of a 'new global history', while 'shared histories' has taken its cue from people studying the connections between the history of separate ethnic groups. More recently, William Gervase Clarence-Smith, Kenneth Pomeranz and Peer Vries have chosen 'global history' to name the new journal they have been co-editing since 2006. We would not spend a minute disputing the advantages and limits of these and other labels, for we feel those who use them share a similar interest in what moves between and across different polities and societies. Because of our idiosyncrasies, we just felt that 'transnational history' gave the most faithful indication of what we were trying to do. We are interested in links and flows, and want to track people, ideas, products, processes and patterns that operate over, across, through, beyond, above, under, or in-between polities and societies. Among the units that were thus crossed, consolidated or subverted in the modern age, first and foremost were the national ones, if only because our work addresses the moment, roughly from the middle of the 19th century until nowadays, when nations came to be seen and empowered as the main frames for the political, cultural, economic and social life of human beings.

Both in our research and in our classroom activities, we had the feeling that there did not exist a kind of reference volume that would provide facts and leads as to the shape, content, role and impact of these transnational circulations and connections. This was not available from the existing reference volumes, we thought. The flows of people, goods, ideas or processes that stretched over borders were sidelined or altogether neglected by national dictionaries. Area studies reference volumes also limited their perspective to the area that was studied. World history encyclopedias were mostly organized by national or regional categories, and focused on civilizations while rarely dealing with the relationship among contexts. The time range of world history is so large, from the Big Bang onwards, that the age of nations is just a very brief and recent moment seen from this point of view. Some biographical dictionaries had a wide range but were strictly limited to biographical entries, while the most relevant thematic reference volumes were of course limited by their thematic orientation. Our earliest sketches, and discussion of them with colleagues strengthened our idea that there was room and need for a reference volume that would document the

history of connections and circulations in the modern age, from about 1850 to the present.

It was very clear to us from the start that such a project had to be developed by a group of scholars who would share some common dispositions. Discipline or subdiscipline were not discriminating factors, as long as a potential author had a bent for grappling with time and the history of the last 160 years. We sought contributors not only in the discipline of history but also all around the social sciences and humanities rim, from anthropology to economics, theology, linguistics, geography or sociology and the whole range of interdisciplinary studies. But we also imagined that, if the *Dictionary* was to effectively address connections and circulations across polities and societies, it had to be edited and written by people who would be 'transnational' themselves, with regard to their linguistic abilities, their interests and connections with worldwide communities of researchers in their fields, their command of existing literature and, according to our hunch, their personal trajectories. This basic position has found its expression in the list of associate editors and of contributors. However, we were not in search of any politically correct balance of gender, race, ethnicity, countries or continents, and we certainly do not purport to have eliminated biases that are connected to 'wherefrom we write'. Conditions of personal availability, documentation facilities, visibility and command of the English language have also informed our search for contributors and the response of those we have approached. The inequalities of resources throughout the academic world have thus left their mark on this volume, because there are certainly some bright scholars we left aside because we simply did not know them, or because we felt it would be difficult for them to assemble the material from which to write wide-ranging pieces. Last but not least, we were also the complacent victims of our own networks and locations: there is no doubt that the list of

contributors, the headword list and the content of the entries would have been different if this *Dictionary* had been edited, say, by a Latin American historian born/living in China and a Middle Eastern scholar with some experience in Indian universities. We are the first to believe that our historical imagination needs to be enlarged to be able to write transnational history transnationally and we are just looking forward to another such dictionary or encyclopedia, or to a new edition of this one, to add other approaches to our own current attempts. We are pretty sure this will come quite soon as we consider the ongoing development of research and teaching endeavours that endorse a transnational perspective.

Indeed, it may be one of the most salient features of this specific volume that it emerges from a work in progress. Dictionaries and encyclopedias more usually pertain to well established disciplines, and claim to provide an ultimate state-of-the-art survey, whereas many of the entries written for this volume are exploratory to the point that we were tempted to name it the Tentative Dictionary of Transnational History. Inventing the list of entries, identifying possible contributors, was an exciting and difficult task for which we had no previous model or matrix. Accordingly, we established our list of headwords in an attempt to cover the widest possible range of themes for this first foray, leaving comprehensiveness's dreams to lie dormant for a while. We are aware of the gaps that others may recognize in this list: some have been caused by the lack of imagination, curiosity and expertise on our part, and others by the excess of the same at the moment when we trimmed our original list of 1,500 possible entries to establish the framework for a workable volume. We take the blame for both, and consider these flaws an incentive for future endeavours.

The unprecedented nature of this project is also reflected in the contents of the entries themselves. Some subjects may be riper than others, and the

content is more 'state of the art'. Other entries are venturing onto new ground, blazing trails that had not been explored as such: they are full of hunches, questions, possibilities, and they focus on the moments and places that are more familiar to their authors. Some other contributors chose the well rounded way, and came up with a piece that will satisfy readers in search of data, facts and figures. Last but not least, while most of the contributors have focused their attention on the development of historical processes, another group have ventured onto more theoretical ground and coped with concepts that have been used to understand such processes, to assess how they have been shaped, appropriated and disputed across borders. It has not been uncommon for entries to eventually take a direction that was not foreseen, and this has always been a pleasure for us as editors. In all these instances, the contributors to this *Dictionary* have been aware that they were just having a first try, and generously offered their insight with the bitter awareness that they could not harness the breadth of literature in various languages and from many disciplinary or subdisciplinary landscapes. Their willingness to expose the range and limits of their expertise has been very generous.

Because of all these limits, this volume is not intended to be canonical. There is no disciplinary brief included in its text, subtext or paratext. We think it is a tool that will be used by scholars to develop their own projects to study other circulations and connections, and to revise or update what has been written in this *Dictionary* about some of these. It is a step, a prop for further research to develop. On the other hand, we do not want to establish a new field or a new subdiscipline, and it is just for

the sake of clarity that we have adopted the name of *The Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History*. We believe the transnational approach to be an angle, a perspective that can be adopted by everyone who wants to address the entangled condition of the modern world and contribute answers to some very specific questions. To summarize, there are three prongs that this volume wants to contribute to. First, the historicization of interdependency and interconnection phenomena between national, regional or cultural spheres in the modern age, by charting the development of projects, designs and structures that have organized circulations and connections through and between them, in an uneven and non-linear way. Second, the advancement of knowledge on neglected or hazy regions of national and other self-contained territorial histories, by acknowledging foreign contributions to the design, discussion and implementation of patterns that are often seen as owing their features to domestic conditions. Third, the understanding of trends and protagonists that are often left on the periphery of national or comparative frameworks; and this leads us to the study of markets, trajectories, concepts, activities and organizations that thrived in-between and across the nations: international voluntary associations, loose transnational ideas networks, diasporas or commodities. Readers and users will be able to tell if this volume delivers on these fronts and on others. But for us, as editors, the contributors to *The Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History* have made our historical education more complete on all these frontiers. This volume is theirs.

AKIRA IRIYE
PIERRE-YVES SAUNIER

same time, a condition of possibility and a limitation of transnational communication and globalization.

<div align="right">Gustavo Sorà</div>

Bibliography

Bourdieu P. 2002 [1990]. 'Les conditions sociales de la circulation internationale des idées', *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales*, 145, 5, 3–8.

Casanova P. 2000. *La république mondiale des lettres*. Paris: Seuil.

Heilbron J. 1999. 'Toward a sociology of translation: book translation as a cultural world-system', *European Journal of Social Theory*, 2, 4, 429–44.

Sorá G. 2003. *Traducir el Brasil: una antropología de la circulación internacional de ideas*. Buenos Aires: Libros del Zorzal.

Venuti L. 2000. *The translation studies reader*. London, Routledge.

Related essays

anti-Catholicism; antisemitism; Bible; Braille code; comics; design; diasporas; ecology; economics; environmentalism; Esperanto; European civil servants; European institutions; gender and sex; kindergarten; Koran; language; language diplomacy; literature; marketing; organization models; Orientalism; philanthropy; psychoanalysis; publishing; Romanticism; sign languages; *The Wretched of the Earth*

Transnational

Every other article in this volume begins with a short sentence defining its headword. This will not be the case here, because the purpose of this entry is to capture the historical process of defining 'transnational', 'transnationalism' and other related words. It consequently advises against a preliminary definition. From their first known uses, they have evolved in an uneven and non-linear way into buzz-words that are now ubiquitous in academic and public discussion. Though we are not familiar with the different words that have been and are used in the many languages of this planet, it seems that the American English version is now in frequent use. On the wings of the success of its lexical root ('nation'), 'transnational' has been embarked in a number of languages with only minor adaptations: 'transnasional' in Bahasa Indonesia, 'transnazionale' in Italian, 'transnacional' in Spanish, 'transnational' in French and German. Some Chinese scholars would use 'kua guo' (跨国, 'straddling countries'), others rather have 'kua wenhua' (跨文化, 'straddling cultures') – but many go for 'transnational' and use the English term as an element of a social science lingua franca. Japanese translations offer 'ekkyo' 越境 'crossing borders') and 'kokka o koeta' (国(家)を超えた, 'going beyond, or transcending, states), but some scholars would use katakana (a phonetic alphabet for words borrowed from a foreign language) to approach the English structure; then it becomes 'toransunashonaru' (トランスナショナル). However, the idea and the word are far from ubiquitous: only if hard pressed would an English Hindi speaker suggest 'paardeshi' ('transcultural') as an equivalent, stressing it is scarcely used. It is then only one section of a developing lexicological trajectory in time, space, uses and meanings, which are the object of this entry.

Where to start from?

The search for firsts is a deceptive quest, especially when it is about words. Etymological dictionaries only rely on a limited corpus, and the growth of databases makes their findings obsolete. Until now, terms from the transnational family were said to have been coined by the American Randolph Bourne (1880–1918) in 1916. Though this entry certainly does not offer an ultimate view, it is nevertheless necessary to mention earlier uses of the terms.

The German linguist Georg Curtius (1820–95) can be mentioned provisionally as the first user of the adjective 'transnational'. In his 1862 inaugural lecture at Leipzig University, where he insisted that all national languages were connected to families of languages that extended beyond contemporary national frameworks, Curtius wrote that 'Eine jede Sprache ist ihrer Grundlage nach etwas transnationales' to point to this aspect of languages. The absence of inverted commas around transnationales suggests the term was not unfamiliar to German readers of his Philologie und Sprachwissenschaft. An anonymous author in the *Princeton Review* chose that very quote to support his views in 1868, and translated it as 'every language is fundamentally something transnational'. This is, provisionally, the first known appearance of the term in American English. Neither occurrence seems to have made much of an impression. But they firmly root the term in the 19th century, and within a mood that tried to

question an 'obvious' national characteristic such as language.

Similarly, it is not merely anecdotal that 'transnational' was used regularly in the early 20th century to name the highways that made it possible for automobiles to connect distant parts of the United States. The term was then a synonym for 'transcontinental'. When US newspapers mention 'trans-national highways' from the 1910s, they point us to one of the possible meanings of the term, that is the idea of going through the national space from one side to the other. However grammatically incorrect, since the Latin term 'trans' means 'beyond' and not 'through', this provides evidence that the word has been empowered with a capacity to signify the act of crossing. Its first landmark use was to take a different direction.

Randolph Bourne was a character on the New York City writing scene when his 'Trans-National America' appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly* in July 1916. The director of the journal was not very happy with Bourne's lack of allegiance to the 'Anglo-Saxon ideal', but did publish the piece. In reaction to the aspirations of and anxieties over the possible conduct of the diverse strands of 'hyphenated Americans' in the context of the European war, the article was an attack on the ideal of assimilation that Bourne presented as, by and large, the purpose of the American melting pot. Bourne's suggestion was that the United States had to accept its cosmopolitan nature and make the best of the communities of different national origins that had migrated to the Great Republic. To fulfil the chances offered by the fact of being 'a unique sociological fabric', 'a world federation in miniature' that it owed to the privilege of being a land of migrations, America had to become the first 'international nation' and to accept its 'cosmopolitanism', said Bourne. For all his insistence on the fact that this is an American problem, 'Project and destiny', the third section of Bourne's piece, focuses on explaining how such an American achievement would be the matrix for a wider cosmopolitan enterprise, that of building the citizen of the world. This is also where he seems to thrive in terminological 'trans' invention. The first step towards a cosmopolitan horizon is to be made in the very context of the European war, Bourne suggested. Because it is 'trans-national', America can neither let European nationalisms hold sway over its destiny,

nor take shelter in Americanization and the creation of a new nationalism that would oppress its 'trans-nationals'. It needs to create something completely different, for itself and for the world, 'a 'trans-nationalism of ours'. 'America is coming to be, not a nationality but a transnationality, a weaving back and forth, with the other lands, of many threads of all sizes and colors' (Bourne 1916, 96). In recent times, this has led to him being hailed or accused as a precursor of multiculturalism, though there is much more in Bourne than this: one can equally easily picture him as crusader with a belief that America has a mission to the world, that is to lead in the cosmopolitan enterprise. There are two things that are more interesting for us here. The first is that Bourne uses the preposition with its lexical meaning, which is 'beyond'. But Bourne's 'beyond' does not take place in a flat space: going beyond the national is not just stepping above it, dismissing it. Bourne's trans-national America is a transcendence of national characters and belongings, an osmosis, a further stage. Second, Bourne is putting all the current terminology on the table, its indeterminacy included. He uses 'trans-national' to describe the nature of the American population as being beyond simple national affiliation, 'trans-nationality/ transnationality' to qualify the resulting situation, 'transnationalism' to coin the sense of belonging that would go beyond existing nationalisms and amount to world citizenship, and 'trans-nationals' to indicate the people with a dual sense of belonging. But, whereas others were very keen to distinguish between the meanings of, for example, 'internationalism' and 'cosmopolitanism', or to invent new terms like 'mondialité' or 'mondialisme' (like the Belgian Paul Otlet), Bourne did not really care, and he used the former and their derivatives as interchangeable or convergent with his 'trans' terminology. While it might have been expected that his coining of a new term would be partly a way to make for a collapsed internationalism, this was not the case. At least, Bourne was not to elaborate further on these points because of an unexpected encounter with an unhyphenated migrant, Spanish influenza.

In the following years, the terms seem to have been used moderately and unsystematically until the early 1940s, as far as the existence of searchable databases allows us to see. But they were definitely applied to non-domestic

situations. 'Transnational/trans-national' was mostly used to qualify elements that developed across national boundaries. Casual use of the terms can be encountered in major regional or national US newspapers during the 1930s: one could use the terms to speak of a 'transnational trip' to advertise a university study tour (1931); of 'trans-national affairs' to situate the agenda of a session of the annual meeting of the Institute of International Relations (1931); of the 'trans-national' character of Christianity that German bishop Galen had called upon to reject Nazi principles (1934) or of 'transnational transports' to comment on war developments in the Balkans (1941). Such random use can also be identified within the academic world: one US political scientist mentioned a 'trans-national alignment' of fascist nations in 1937, pointing to the common views and shared plans of fascist states and groups, which crossed national limits and usually disjointed nationalisms.

However, there were some significant uses of the terms that bear witness to the fact that they began to be used to present the national variable as unsatisfactory or altogether irrelevant. Of major importance is their use by German law scholars who worked in the field of international law and arbitration. The Heidelberg law professor Max Gutzwiller seems to have been the first to have imported them into the juridical vocabulary (1931). He used the terms to point to new norms and situations that 'international law' was not able to capture in a developing field, connected to such new arenas as the mixed arbitration tribunals created by the Versailles Treaty. In Fruits of victory (1921), the English-American journalist and peace activist Norman Angell had also taken the terms into another sphere to make his case about prewar trade, industrial and financial entanglements. He pointed to the 'trans-national' economy that bound European countries together and with other areas through the world division of labour and the connections created by economic agents. Angell deemed it 'more correct' than 'international', and used the term and its spinoffs ('trans-nationalism', 'trans-nationally') several times in his book. A similar connotation is found in Living in a revolution (1944) by Julian Huxley. Huxley, who would be the first director of UNESCO, has an occasional use of the terms in situations which underline the idea that national geographical and political units are, can or ought to be superseded in the new age into which the world is being ushered. The 'transnational' industrial region of North Western Europe he describes, and the 'transnational' control of European heavy industry he hopes for, announce the forthcoming incursion of the term into the language of the political and economic world orders.

Searching for order in the postwar world

Despite its German users, despite the fact that some English writers used the terms in books initially published in England, 'transnational' does not seem to have been taken into public use in Europe. The successful career of the terms in the 1950s and 1960s mostly took place in the US. There, generic uses that have been sketched above were still operational. The phrase 'transnational highways' was used indiscriminately to name a highway that went from Austria to Greece, or the arteries planned by the federal highway programme within the US, while 'trans-national communications' or 'transnational transport' indicated that national spaces were crossed by flows that did not even stop therein. The notions of crossing and of transcendence were still both present. In addition to this, the terms gained momentum in three specific spheres.

On one hand, they were used to describe, follow and understand the economic integration of trade and of production. This does not seem to have come from the academic world. Economist Simon Kuznets' use of the term in a 1948 paper remained isolated. However, it was significant that Kuznets used the term 'trans-national economic relations' in his call to consider the study of the domestic US economy in a larger context that would include historical developments, non-material exchanges (population, policies, obligations) and the 'view of the world' of a given country: the idea was to carry economic analysis beyond the national frame. This appearance in academic economics was outpaced by success in the business world. One clue is the growing favour won by the terms in firm naming during the 1950s. As witnessed by advertising blocks and business news in several US newspapers from the west to the east coasts, the first to have caught the wave seem to have been transportation companies (Trans-National Airlines), together with trade firms (Trans-National Export Co.) or travel agencies (Trans National Air Coach Inc.). The 'trans' also enjoyed favour with firms in

insurance or electronics businesses, in spite of an apparent domestic orientation. But they were also deemed fit to emphasize overseas activities, as when the apparel and footwear company Genesco created a special outfit to handle its foreign operations, called Genesco Transnational Company (1964). This grass-roots success forms the background for the use of the term 'transnational corporation' that developed both in the academy and the press. From the late 1950s, it was for some a mere synonym of the phrase 'multinational corporation', a way to name a corporation that was internationally owned and controlled, while for others the 'transnational' firm was a further stage of integration, where capital, research and other aspects were managed without any regard for the company's home country interests. This use helped the terms to travel, though it remained less popular than 'multinational'. Politically, it became a minor but common cry of leftist activists to attack 'transnational capital' and 'the transnationals' in the 1970s; geographically, it acclimatized the term in the economic and political vocabulary abroad, as in Great Britain where it began to appear regularly in The Times from 1968, or later in France ('l'intégration capitaliste transnationale') and Germany ('Transnationale Monopole') where it began to be used to indict capitalism and its creatures.

The second sphere where 'transnational' got a grip was among those who tried to analyse and explain the world political order. During the 1950s, those who commented on the current and future world order spoke of 'transnational monopoly' to describe a business whose property should be given to the community (Committee for a World Federation 1948); 'transnational cooperation' to qualify the action of the UN and its agencies (Walter Lippmann 1949); 'transnational groups' to label the Soviet and American blocs (William McNeill 1954); or the establishment of 'trans-national communities' by scholars, scientists and others to achieve world peace (Robert Oppenheimer 1958). Law professor Myres S. McDougal used it to describe groups whose composition or activities stretched across national limits, and so did political scientist Arnold Wolfers when he called corporations 'transnational actors' in world politics (1959) and decided the meaning of the terms was still open-ended: they could be used as equivalent to 'supranational' or 'international', appended to the names of governmental, intergovernmental and civil society actors, used by those who proclaimed the end of the age of nations, or kept strictly descriptive.

The first prescriptive attempt to define what was 'transnational' in the new world order was made at the crossroads of economics and international relations. In February 1956, Philip Jessup, a professor of international law and diplomacy at Columbia University (USA) gave three lectures at Yale University Law School. A couple of months later, they were published under the title Transnational law. Though he did not acknowledge the use of the term by German-speaking law scholars in the 1930s, Jessup was capitalizing on the same kind of dissatisfaction. After having played an important role in the design and operation of several institutions of the new world order since 1943, especially in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, Jessup had left government service in 1953. From then on, his research work had focused on legal situations that had emerged in different fields, from United Nations law to global commons and the legal protection of foreign investments. His generic proposal, for a transnational law to include all law that regulates actions transcending national frontiers, was a conclusion of such forays. Jessup's suggestion was to handle 'transnational situations' with reference to a corpus that did not abide by the canonical categories of law such as national/ international or private/public. Prominent in his demonstrations of the need for such a reshuffling of legal norms to fit a 'complex interrelated world community', were cases dealing with the work of UN agencies, with the development of the European institutions, with business and trade overseas, and with non-governmental organization activities. Jessup's message was clear: there were more than relations between states in current world interactions, and many problems stretched across national borders and across the spatial and specialized categories of law. His move against the canon of international law was welcomed with a mixture of interest and resistance by law scholars, and the transformation of the Bulletin of the Columbia Society of International Law into the Columbia Journal Of Transnational Law in 1964 was one of the few immediate by-products of Jessup's suggestion. Yet he had opened a new era where the term 'transnational' would increasingly be the object of paradigmatic definitions by