Transnational Britain: Local and Global Connections in History

Rebekah Naomi Hodgkinson*

Abstract

Transnationalism is often cited as a recent development, relating to the modern globalisation of economies and widespread movement of peoples, but historians have long-acknowledged that national entities are extremely young themselves. Suggesting that national borders are being increasingly transgressed is to ignore that regions shared languages, traditions, foods and goods prior to the development of modern nation-states. British history is characterised by invasions, immigrations and imports which question any cohesive narrative of a national history, despite popular claims to one now being stronger than ever. Britain is an example of the paradoxical notion that a nation can itself be transnational, referring both to a multicultural nation and to a culture which, particularly in the period of Empire, existed across varied spaces and combined global heritages. Where cultural transnationalism is often understood in terms of separate national cultures interacting, this essay proposes that they are transcendent. Concentrating on food culture, this essay demonstrates how Britain's transnational identity expanded through its imperial pursuits from the Age of Discovery onwards. I focus on India as the home of the East India Company, one of the first conglomerates, from its initial attraction through the wealth attached to its spices to curry's consolidation in British consumption from the eighteenth-century on.

Keywords: Multiculturalism, Empire, Food History, Global, Transnational.

Over the last few decades, national histories have declined in popularity within the historical academe, particularly in the West.[1] This is broadly due to the rise of cultural and social histories which place individual identities at the centre of their stories, and more recently the development of Global History as its own field. Even if not specifically identified as global historians, many scholars increasingly take an explicitly regional approach or direct readers to the transnational and global connections and consequences of their areas of study.[2] Studies of empire and postcolonial approaches in particular have also contributed to the highlighted importance of the transnational, recognizing that the ongoing relationships between former imperial powers and colonies can only be understood through a recognition of their shared histories. Moreover, there has been a growing acknowledgement that studying empire and culture in terms of separate nations affecting each other - i.e. metropole influencing a colony's culture or vice versa – does not accurately describe these exchanges, which were taking place at the early stages of modern globalization.[3] It does not make sense to talk about a national history in isolation when the experiences of that nation's people do not reach and are not limited to state lines. Historians have long-acknowledged that this tangential influence of the nation is partly due to the historical nature of nation-states themselves.

This article will demonstrate the contingent status of the nation in order to provide insight into transnationalism's historicity. Anglo-Indian culture formed during the periods of informal and formal (1857-1947) British colonial rule in South Asia, will be used as a case study, running from the seventeenth century onwards. Food culture will be used to relate scholarship on colonial cultures and relationships to the bigger theme of transnationalism. This approach supports well-established theories about colonies influencing "metropoles" as much as the other way around; colonial relationships should be understood as two-way, despite the ingrained power structures which shape them. At the same time, emphasis will be placed on the contingency of even the categories of metropole and colony. The article is divided into broad sections.

[1] P. M. Kennedy, 'The Decline of Nationalistic history in the West, 1900-1970,' *Journal of Contemporary History*, 8:1 (1973), 87-88.

[2] Sebastian Conrad, *What is Global History?*, (Princeton University Press, 2016), 17.

[3] Daniel E. White, *From Little London to Little Bengal: Religion, Print, and Modernity in Early British India, 1793-1835*, (John Hopkins University Press, 2013), p. 145.

Firstly, the nature and status of transnationalism will be explored, emphasizing the youth of nation-states and the resulting paradoxical nature of transnationalism for the historian. The second section will then focus in on modern Britain's imperial history as a context in which transnational cultures were formed. Due to the size of this article, a focus will be provided through examples which illustrate the cultural transnationalism of curry, and most attention will be paid to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as the periods which saw the creation and consolidation of Anglo-Indian cuisine.

Transnationalism is a term usually associated with late modern and contemporary developments around the world and in social contexts is often linked to migration. In 1992, Schiller, Basch and Blanc-Szanton proposed that a new type of migrant had emerged: 'transmigrants'. They refer to transnationalism as 'the processes by which immigrants build social fields that link together their country of origin and their country of settlement' and define transmigrants as those who 'develop and maintain multiple relations- familial, economic, social, organizational, religious, and political that span borders'.[4] The distinctive feature of the transmigrant is that their actions, decisions, concerns and identities connect them with multiple societies at the same time.[5] When reading about Europeans who lived in settler colonies for significant periods of time during the modern period of European empires, there are clearly cases which fit this broad definition. It is vital to remain constantly aware when studying these contexts that these settlers were colonisers first and foremost. They migrated – usually temporarily – in order to make money out of the colonized and to seek adventure and potentially status. Living in European settlements, their lives were privileged over indigenous communities. However, this does not mean that there was no level of assimilation or shared culture between coloniser and colonised. Explored further below is the way in which Britons appropriated and incorporated Indian food culture into their own eating habits, as just one example of the transnational identities which were formed among colonisers that in fact live on today.

The recent focus on global studies has moved away from the foregrounding of nations implicit within international studies, suggesting

[4]Nina Glick Schiller, Linda Basch and Cristina Banc-Szanton, 'Transnationalism: A New Analytic Framework for Understanding Migration,' *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 645:1 (1992), 1.

[5]Ibid., 2.

an approach which is arguably transnational in that it considers experiences which transcend, rather than link, individuals across borders. Under this understanding, transnationalism paradoxically predates nationalism. This has been acknowledged and dealt with elsewhere and so will not be over-emphasized here, but it is essential to bear in mind in discussions about transnationalism. Versovec states that transnationalism in the form of long-distance networks predates the formation of nations but that today it has a different character.[6] He emphasizes cultural reproduction, the gain of capital, political engagement and the reconstruction of locality as key aspects of modern transnationalism.[7] Going back to the concept of the "transmigrant", there does seem to be a longer and more complex history to the transnationalism which is perceived to be taking place at present. Although European colonisers separated themselves from other British subjects in the colonies, their experiences did involve more assimilation than is often assumed and their experiences broadly fit Versovec's categories. These concepts are useful in articulating the makeup of the contemporary world, but if used without a historical contextualization they may be misleading.

In popular discussions of British politics, society and culture, multiculturalism is a well-worn term, used primarily to communicate the narrative that Britain has an ethnically and culturally diverse population which coexists but with distinct cultures. It is frequently used to praise or condemn immigration, often implicitly seeing global migration to Britain as an almost-solely twentieth-century phenomenon. Yet we know that Africans were present in the UK under Roman rule, that there were black Tudors, that in the eighteenth century there were an estimated ten thousand black individuals living in Britain, and that across all these periods the countries which make up the British Isles had no one cohesive and joined population or culture.[8] It is often questioned how far a shared English or British history can really be traced back, and global considerations probe these ideas further. Scholarship on the Middle Ages is 'increasingly embracing a global context, seeking historical connections between different parts of the world that have long

[6]Steven Versovec, 'Conceiving and Researching Transnationalism,' *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22:2 (1999), 447.

[7]Ibid., 447.

[8]Joan Liversidge, *Britain in the Roman Empire*, (Routledge, 1968); Miranda Kaufmann, *Black Tudors: The Untold Story*, (Oneworld, 2017); Peter Fryer, *Staying Power: The History of Black People in Britain*, (Pluto Press,1984).

been obscured by the constricting boundaries of nation and period', the most evident being the Muslim presence on the Iberian Peninsula for over eight hundred years.[9] This has worked in combination with modern colonial and postcolonial studies, contexts which are always better understood by looking back to at least the sixteenth century and arguably the medieval period, during which European nation-states consolidated themselves in ways which were similar to colonial expansion.[10]

Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities* helped to change the way in which historians thought about nationhood and identity by repositioning nations as cultural (as well as political) phenomena. Although Anderson's work emphasized the power of imagined national communities – they can unite people living across huge distances who will never meet – it also complicated definitions of nations.[11] A core aspect of nationalism is often a claim to deep historical roots as a form of legitimacy for the strength of a national community, which is commonly refuted with the fact that nations are relatively young and difficult to define exactly at any given moment. This debate can often centre on ethnic or "biological" myths and on spiritual ones.[12] The historicity of transnationalism makes these kinds of claims very difficult to uphold.

The difficulty which comes with trying to conceive of a British nation is an issue which relates heavily to transnationalism.[13] The context of empire complicates Britain's national history as British "subjects" were created who – whether in self-governing dominions or colonies – were citizens. The British Empire existed as a global multinational state, creating complex identities and transnational cultures. In this context it is fitting that Britain's predecessor in India, the Dutch East India Company, is often cited as the world's first transnational corporation, further linking the history of transnationalism to the history of

[9]Lisa Lampert-Weissig, *Medieval Literature and Postcolonial Studies*, (Edinburgh University Press, 2010), x-xi.

[10]Robert Bartlett, *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization, and Cultural Change, 950-1350*, (Princeton University Press, 1993).

[11]Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, (New York: Verso, 1983), 6.

[12]Anthony D. Smith, 'National Identity and Myths of Ethnic Descent,' in (ed.) John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, *Nationalism: Critical Concepts in Political Science, vol 1*, (Psychology Press, 2000), 1395.

[13]Krishan Kumar, *The Making of English National Identity*, (Cambridge University Press, 2003).

empire. It also provides an immediate link to food, as the European drive to enter India was widely driven by the coveted spice trade. As Lizzie Collingham has proposed, the British Empire was driven by a hunger for food.[14]

Food is a useful way to study historic forms of transnational culture because it is something which is often thought to belong to different national "types" and yet cuisines are generally defined more regionally with foodstuffs that have global lives. Fusion cuisine creates a sort of food-based transnationalism, as it refers to dishes which combine different culinary cultures. It is often seen as a very recent development, even as specifically postmodern.[15] Although this way of designing new dishes has grown in prominence as a self-conscious effort to create new and exciting dishes, it is misleading to imagine this is a new phenomenon. Immigrant communities around the world pioneered fusion foods before they were conceived of.

Although Britain's global connections reach back into ancient history, it is most vital to understand the modern period through this context because of the Empire. British multiculturalism is generally understood in relation to twentieth-century immigration, but many of the tropes associated with it, such as Britain's love for chicken tikka masala, actually evidence a transnational culture which dates back to at least the Age of Discovery. Throughout the world, European empires spread norms, consumer goods, materials and technologies, extending transnational relations between colonies as well as taking these cultures home with them. Globalisation as it is generally known is a direct product of empire. Beyond a direct exchange of goods, European colonialism, as was the case in other empires throughout history, saw a merging of all aspects of cultures. The British adoption of Indian flavours into its cuisine is just one example of this. Anglo-Indian food has been referred to as the first pan-Asian cuisine, incorporating influences from across the Subcontinent as well as particular elements of Portuguese and British food.[16] This is of course a history which has been told from

[14]Lizzie Collingham, *The Hungry Empire: How Britain's Quest for Food Shaped the Modern World*, (Penguin, 2017).

[15]Rosario Scarpato and Roberto Daniele, 'New Global Cuisine: Tourism, Authenticity and Sense of Place in Postmodern Gastronomy,' in (ed.) C. Michael Hall et al., *Food Tourism Around the World: Development, Management and Markets* (Routledge, 2003).

[16]Colleen Taylor Sen, *Feasts and Fasts: A History of Food in India*, (Reaktion Books, 2014), 225; Lizzie Collingham, *Curry: A Tale of Cooks and Conquerors*,

an elite perspective. The early days of British imperialism were characterized by the aristocracy, becoming an increasingly middle-class pursuit in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. However, it is unavoidable to note that this was not a scenario in which Europeans went travelling around the world, cherry-picking their favourite ingredients and adding them to existing dishes. This was a contested process of exchange between various groups, leading to the creation of entirely new foods which cannot really be defined as belonging to any one nation or even region. Cecilia Leong-Salobir has emphasized the role of Indian domestic servants, who were the ones actually inventing and adapting the dishes which were consumed by the Anglo-Indian community, describing colonial cuisine as 'fundamentally hybrid'.[17]

The Indian subcontinent's food 'does not divide into different culinary styles and dishes along these relatively new national boundaries so much as along older regional boundaries'.[18] The new national boundaries Collingham refers to here are of India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh, but the subject of her book, a 'biography' of curry, tells the reader that the Indian food as it is usually imagined today was not solely a creation of this region either. From the sixteenth-century onwards, European influences on Indian food are evident. The Portuguese – present in India from he sixteenth century until the twentieth - introduced ingredients to India such as potatoes, chilies, okra, cashews, peanuts, pineapples, papayas and maize, some of which have essential associations with Indian food today.[19] Many of these foodstuffs were coming from the Americas, cementing the globalized nature of this exchange. Foods already being used in India were also incorporated into Portuguese cooking, particularly in the form of spices.[20] Vindaloo, one of Britain's most famous favourite curries, originates from a Goan take on a Portuguese dish which was first introduced to the British in 1797. Taking Goan cooks with them when they moved on in 1813, the British transported vindaloo around British India and later to Europe.[21]

The Dutch and French East India Companies also had roles in shap-

(Vintage, 2006), 118.

[17]Cecilia Leong-Salbir, *Food Culture in Colonial Asia: A Taste of Empire*, (London: Routledge, 2011), 12.

[18]Collingham, *Curry*, 3.

[19]Taylor Sen, *Feasts and Fasts*, 212.

[20]Ibid., 215.

[21]Collingham, *Curry*, 68.

ing the globalised quality of Indian food. When the Dutch transported Indian and Indonesian slaves to South Africa, they used them in their kitchens, introducing their respective cuisines to another continent. Frikkadels (meatballs) and various Dutch sweets are also still found in Sri Lanka.[22] The French East India Company, not founded until 1664, had far fewer settlements in the Indian subcontinent, but Pudicherry (previously known as Pondicherry) 'has a French flavour' with certain dishes, such as Pondicherry cake, having evident influences but Indian cooking has had little influence on French cuisine at large.[23]

The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were the period in which a distinctly Anglo-Indian, hybrid culture was formed, and so perhaps provide some of the richest examples of transnationalism as culture in British India. As this was the period which preceded formal British imperialism in India, it was characterized by open social relations between European merchants and (particularly wealthy) Indians. Most British people in India at this time were men because they were there to trade, and in this period, many had relationships and marriages with Indian women. In relative terms, many of these Britons assimilated, adopting Indian dress styles (pyjamas); engaging in Asian leisure/recreational activities (smoking hookah and drinking arrack); and, of course, eating their food (hiring Indian cooks), as the Portuguese had already been doing.[24] The British and Indians made a cultural exchange which went beyond trade in individual materials, products and ingredients. East India merchants' lives were characterized by a mixture of Mughal and British habits, made 'evident at their dining tables'.[25] Although, it is notable that at this time Indian cuisine had much more overlap with British food than it came to by the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. British food still incorporated heavy use of spices such as cumin, ginger, pepper, cinnamon, cloves and nutmeg and forks were not yet in common use, so many English people ate with their hands and used breads as spoons, as was standard in India.[26]

Anglo-Indian food culture arguably had more of an impact on Britain than it did the Indian subcontinent. Whilst the British in India 'trans-

[22]Taylor Sen, *Feasts and Fasts*, 215.
[23]Ibid., 216.
[24]Ibid., 218.
[25]Collingham, *Curry*, 89.
[26]David Burton, *The Raj at the Table: A Culinary History of the British in India*, (London: 1993), 3-4.

formed into hybrid figures' through their enthusiastic consumption of Indian culture, they had a limited influence on Indian cooking.[27] Although they spread particular ingredients from region to region, the specific hybrid dishes which were created were consumed solely by Anglo-Indians and so did not form part of a national Indian cuisine.[28] Indeed, the very concept of curry is a European one, coined by the British as an anglicized version of "kari", the Tamil word for sauce, used to refer to a variety of Indian dishes in the way the Portuguese had already been doing.[29] In India, different dishes had particular names; it was the European merchants who began using "curry" as a catchall term. This is in part explained by the way they consumed it, as it was eaten like a relish or pickle alongside more westernized foods, namely large quantities of roasted and boiled meats as the Anglo-Indians were famous for favouring.[30] In order to suit their preferences, Indian food was homogenized and simplified when prepared for Britons. This resulted in a hybrid cuisine because it combined 'British concepts of how food should be presented (as soups or stews, etc.) and Indian recipes'.[31]

The beginnings of British imperialism in India saw an immediate influence on Britons' own cultures and habits. Even in more remote British military cantonments in the countryside, Anglo-Indians' 'little Englands', famously fashioned to recreate Britain abroad, 'were always fragile, as India insinuated itself into every aspect of daily life'.[32] Despite an increasing desire to create distinctions between European and Asian individuals in the subcontinent, Britons living in India inevitably found themselves adapting what they knew to suit their environment, using what was available to them. This also reflects a colonial desire to pick and choose what they felt was culturally acceptable or worthy within a colony; as the British became increasingly hostile to "native" habits and customs in many forms, they continued to consume Indian food.

At the same time, Indian culture had begun to influence British consumption at Home. The first cookery book in Britain to contain a recipe for curry was written by Hannah Glasse and published in 1747.[33] In-

[27]Collingham, *Curry*, 110-111.
[28]Ibid., 125.
[29]Taylor Sen, *Feasts and Fasts*, 223.
[30]Collingham, *Curry*, 115.
[31]Ibid., 120.
[32]Ibid., 110.
[33]Hannah Glasse, *The Art of Cookery*, Made Plain and Easy, originally published

dians began moving to Britain in the late-seventeenth century, usually as servants or as wives of Company men and "Little Bengal" began emerging in Marylebone and Mayfair.[34] This was the area where many Anglo-Indians settled upon their return to Britain, where they 'tried to recapture something of their life in India after returning home', in the same way they had attempted to recreate Britain in India.[35] This is where Indian dishes were served in a British eatery for the first time at the Norris Street Coffee House in 1733, followed almost a century later by the first 'purely Indian' restaurant in 1809, the Hindoostane Coffee House.[36] Prejudice was already present in Britain, with the Anglo-Indian community mocked for their "nabobery": perceived Indian habits and customs. The complex reality was that 'Little Bengal was every bit as much and as little Indianized as Little London was Anglicized, and at work in each was a struggle between communities, tastes, ideologies, and ways of life'.[37]

In the nineteenth century, Anglo-Indian relations began to change, with the 1857 Rebellion – titled a mutiny by the British at the time – acting as the trigger for formal British colonial rule to be put in place, with Queen Victoria officially crowned Empress of India in 1876. As British imperialism became more cemented on a global scale, a conscious effort to avoid mixing with colonized peoples was made. In India, this saw Company employees forbidden from wearing Indian dress or taking part in local ceremonies and festivals, and any children born of mixed-race parentage could not be employed by the Company.[38] Growing numbers of British women began moving to India as Company wives, often with very little prior knowledge of India and mixed levels of interest in getting to know their new home outside of the European settlements.[39] Following London's fashions became a priority for the Anglo-Indian community. Indian food became less typical in the taverns and punch houses frequented by the British and was no longer 'acceptable' at dinner parties, although curries, kedgeree and mulligatawny soup were still eaten for breakfasts and lunches and continued to be into the

in London, 1747.

[34]Taylor Sen, *Feasts and Fasts*, 306.

[35]Ibid.

[36]Taylor Sen, *Feasts and Fasts*, 306.

[37]White, *From Little London to Little Bengal*, 144.

[38]Taylor Sen, *Feasts and Fasts*, 220.

[39]Margaret MacMillan, *Women of the Raj: The Mothers, Wives and Daughters of the British Empire in India*, (Thames and Hudson, 1988), 46.

twentieth century.[40] Victoria never physically visited India, although she was transported to it in some form through her Durbar Room.[41] She was fascinated by Indian culture and developed a close friendship with Abdul Karim, her Munshi, who taught her Hindustani. In the last decade of her rule, she ate curry for lunch every day. Yet at the same time, 'bland English food' – avoiding most ingredients other than plain roasted vegetables and boiled and roasted meat – supposedly became the norm in British circles in India.[42] This contradictory and confusing food culture reflected the complex relationship of coloniser and colonized, abstracted best by Zlotnick: 'Victorian Britain, in which national identity struggled with imperial ambition, contained a dialectical tension always in play between eating and the fear of being eaten.'[43] Eating what was perceived to be more British or European food was desirable for the ruling elite because it distinguished them.

Unlike in the early days of British India, European tastes had now become more familiar to what is often now thought of as traditional European cuisine. Heat derived from spice was actively considered unhealthy by some, and choice vegetables became much less diverse.[44] Yet at the same time, Anglo-Indian cuisine was still gaining popular appeal in Britain. Anglo-Indian or British curries such as korma formed from existing Indian ones, adapted to suit English tastes.[45] In 1824, the Oriental Club was founded in the West End, as a meeting place for ex-Company men. Originally it served French food but in 1839 began serving curry, as it still does today.[46] It was also during this period that Worcestershire sauce and Piccalilli emerged in the forms we now know them, as adaptations of existing Indian recipes.[47] Britons who lived in India would send recipes to relatives and friends who were interested in their lives there and would want to continue eating curry when they moved back home. As a result, more recipes for curry began appear-

[40]Taylor Sen, *Feasts and Fasts*, 220.
[41]Shrabani Basu, *Victoria and Abdul: The True Story of the Queen's Closest Con[U+FB01]dant*, (New York: Vintage Books, 2017), 24-25.
[42]Taylor Sen, *Feasts and Fasts*, 220.
[43]Susan Zlotnick, 'Domesticating Imperialism: Curry and Cookbooks in Victorian England,' *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 16:2/3 (1996), 56.
[44]Collingham, *Curry*, 134.
[45]Collingham, *Curry*, 116.
[46]Taylor Sen, *Feasts and Fasts*, 306.
[47]Taylor Sen, *Feasts and Fasts*, 223.

ing in British books.[48] Vegetables brought over from Europe for British consumption such as cauliflower, orange carrots, cabbage and spinach were incorporated into Indian cuisine as well.[49] Famously, Britain also introduced tea-drinking culture to India, in order to complete its triangular trade with China, as well as beer. Some foods were transported as a result of colonial violence as well, as the indentured labour system took Indians to the New World colonies. As a result, in Trinidad and Tobago curry is a common main course.[50] Similarly, Britons took Indian food to colonies in South-East Asia and to South and East Africa.

Despite nineteenth-century colonialism's distancing of the metropole and colony, Anglo-Indian food was clearly well-established by the turn of the century. It is since then that curry and other Anglo-Indian cuisine began to become mainstream in British consumption, particularly in the latter half of the twentieth century when more South Asian migration to Britain occurred. There was a gap in this process, the 'era of plain fare' which characterized the first three quarters of the twentieth century, broadly contextualized by the World Wars and economic depression.[51] This perhaps makes it somewhat understandable that foods which appeared distinct from typical British cuisine, such as curries, may have initially appeared alien to some Britons when curry was becoming more mainstream in the last few decades of the twentieth century. However, in 1998 English football fans at the World Cup chanting about symbols of Englishness listed vindaloo alongside cups of tea, Cheddar cheese and knitting.[52] By 2001, chicken tikka masala was famously proclaimed a 'true British national dish', evidencing Britain's ability to absorb and adapt 'external influences'.[53] This speaks to the longer history marked out above, but also negates the colonial context in which Britain first began "absorbing" South Asian food. Rather than taking in pre-developed cuisines from abroad, the British presence in India had led Indian people to transform their own culinary habits, us-

[48]Collingham, *Curry*, 133-134.

[49]Taylor Sen, *Feasts and Fasts*, 224.

[50]Taylor Sen, *Feasts and Fasts*, 294.

[51]Derek J. Oddy, *From Plain Fare to Fusion Food: British Diet from the 1890s to the 1990s*, (Boydell Press, 2003), 225.

[52]Collingham, *Curry*, 68.

[53]Rachel Syvester, 'Cook Argues for Immigration into "Tikka Masala Britain," *The Telegraph* (online), originally published April 19, 2001, accessed March 3, 2019, https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1316537/Cook-argues-for-immigration-into-tikka-massala-Britain.html.

ing elements of British cooking, to appeal to the colonisers' tastes.

Broadening out from Anglo-Indian contexts, contemporary food culture in Britain is global in its influences and creation. In 2012, Chinese-style stir fry replaced chicken tikka masala as the nation's favourite dish, highlighting the fact that Britons cook their own versions of cuisines from around the world as much as they do "traditional" British meat and two veg. Within restaurant culture, most big cities in the UK are associated with particular cuisines based on their historical immigrant populations. A 2015 YouGov poll was used to create an infographic in the form of a map of London, showcasing residents' favoured cuisines in each area. South London favours Indian food, Central: Japanese, West: Italian, East: Chinese and North: British.[54] The benefit of transnationalism in this context is that where these cuisines are less "authentic" or more British, a more accurate description can be given to them. Restaurants such as Mowgli which offer new forms of fusion food playing with typically Indian and British flavours (a "chip butty" rethought with turmeric fries, pickle and relish in a roti and "Himalayan Cheese Toast" using cheddar cheese with coriander, green chili dressing and Indian pickle) speak to this question of hybridity.[55] These dishes feel like a twenty-first century adaptation of what has come before, although granted with much greater interest in introducing Britons to flavours that Indian people themselves really do eat, 'a million miles away from the curry stereotype'.[56]

Transnationalism is a part of life for most of the world's population, but it in many ways it has been for centuries. When thinking about transnational cultures, the fluidity of culture is what is most prominent. Anglo-Indian cuisine and its equivalents may often be thought about similarly to multiculturalism – coexisting, sometimes collaborating – but when we look at the process through which it developed, it is clearly more than this. Curry does not quite belong to Britain or India; it belongs to them both, as a product of Britain's colonial rule there. More-

[54]Will Dahlgreen, 'London's Food Tastes – Mapped,' *YouGov*, uploaded October 13, 2015, accessed March 10, 2019, https://yougov.co.uk/topics/politics/articles-reports/2015/10/13/mapped-londons-food-tastes.

[55]"Food Menu," *Mowgli Street Food*, accessed March 10, 2019, https://www.mowglistreetfood.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Mowgli-Food-Menu.pdf.

[56]"An Indian Home Kitchen", *Mowgli Street Food*, accessed March 10, 2019, https://www.mowglistreetfood.com/.

over, as discussed above, the Portuguese, Dutch and French, among other Europeans, were a part of this process too, and the "India" referred to throughout this article is one which encompassed what are now set of distinct countries. In order to reconcile this, a historical awareness is necessary when making claims about transnationalism's new forms. This article has given an overview of the context in which Anglo-Indian food emerged and been consolidated into British culture, relating this history to "big questions" about how hybrid or transnational cultures can be defined.

Bibliography

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, New York: Verso, 1983.

Bartlett, Robert. *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization, and Cultural Change, 950-1350*. Princeton University Press, 1993.

Burton, David. *The Raj at the Table: A Culinary History of the British in India*. London: 1993.

Collingham, *Lizzie. Curry: A Tale of Cooks and Conquerors*. Vintage, 2006.

Collingham, Lizzie. *The Hungry Empire: How Britain's Quest for Food Shaped the Modern World*. Penguin, 2017.

Dahlgreen, Will. 'London's Food Tastes – Mapped.' YouGov. Politics and Current Affairs. Uploaded October 13, 2015. https://yougov.co.uk/topic
/politics/articles-reports/2015/10/13/mapped-londons
-food-tastes. (Accessed March 10, 2019).

Fryer, Peter. *Staying Power: The History of Black People in Britain*. Pluto Press, 1984.

Glasse, Hannah. *The Art of Cookery, Made Plain and Easy*. Originally published in London, 1747.

Glick Schiller, Nina, Basch, Linda and Banc-Szanton, Cristina. 'Transnationalism: A New Analytic Framework for Understanding Migration.' *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*. 645:1 (1992): 1-24.

Hall, C. Michael, Sharples, Liz, Mitchell, Richard, Macionis, Niki and Cambourne, Brock. *Food Tourism Around the World: Development, Management and Markets*. Routledge, 2003.

Kaufmann, Miranda. *Black Tudors: The Untold Story*. Oneworld, 2017.

Kennedy, P. M. 'The Decline of Nationalistic history in the West, 1900-1970.' *Journal of Contemporary History*. 8:1 (1973): 77-100.

Kumar, Krishan. *The Making of English National Identity*. Cambridge

University Press, 2003.

Lampert-Weissig, Lisa. *Medieval Literature and Postcolonial Studies*. Edinburgh University Press, 2010.

Leong-Salbir, Cecilia. *Food Culture in Colonial Asia: A Taste of Empire*. London: Routledge, 2011.

Liversidge, Joan. *Britain in the Roman Empire*. Routledge, 1968.

MacMillan, Margaret. *Women of the Raj: The Mothers, Wives and Daughters of the British Empire in India*. Thames and Hudson, 1988.

Mowgli Street Food. "About: An Indian Home Kitchen." https://www.mowglistreetfood.com/. (Accessed March 10, 2019).

Mowgli Street Food. "Menus: Food Menu." https://www.mowglistreet-food.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Mowgli-Food-Menu.pdf. (Accessed March 10, 2019).

Oddy, Derek J. *From Plain Fare to Fusion Food: British Diet from the 1890s to the 1990s*. Boydell Press, 2003.

Smith, Anthony D. 'National Identity and Myths of Ethnic Descent,' in (ed.) John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, *Nationalism: Critical Concepts in Political Science, vol 1*, Psychology Press, 2000.

Syvester, Rachel. 'Cook Argues for Immigration into "Tikka Masala Britain." *The Telegraph* (online). Originally published April 19, 2001. https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1316537/Cook-argues-for-imm
igration-into-tikka-massala-Britain.html. (Accessed March 3, 2019).

Taylor Sen, Colleen. *Feasts and Fasts: A History of Food in India*. Reaktion Books, 2014.

Versovec, Steven. 'Conceiving and Researching Transnationalism.' *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. 22:2 (1999).

White, Daniel E. *From Little London to Little Bengal: Religion, Print, and Modernity in Early British India, 1793-1835*. John Hopkins University Press, 2013.

Zlotnick, Susan. 'Domesticating Imperialism: Curry and Cookbooks in Victorian England.' *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* 16:2/3 (1996): 51-68.