Traditionally the idea of centre and periphery had been confined by and large to the fields of politics and economics. However, in 1961 in a seminal paper the sociologist Edward Shils proposed the extension of the idea to various aspects of cultural history¹ and since then ‘centre and periphery’ have become ‘a very powerful heuristic set of concepts within archaeological, historical and other studies of society and ideology’.² Thus, in the grand project of revising the history of culture as a whole, the second edition of the Unesco *History of Humanity* promotes the idea of centre and periphery as a global ‘unifying theme’. Specifically, in the volume dealing with the formative early-modern period the centres and peripheries ‘which … receive most attention [are] those of … [the Western] sea-borne empires’ – the Portuguese, the Spanish, the French, the Dutch, and the British.

At the same time the Unesco editors insist that the
global comparison and contrast [between empires and their peripheries which] is the essence of the enterprise … requires to be based on specialised secondary works … [such as] histories of the book.³
The history of the book, then, has as a field of study ‘an unavoidable international and comparative
dimension’. Indeed, particularly in an age sensitive to the confrontation (whether or not of ‘clash’
between cultures which, though initially perceived by each other as exotic, are nevertheless
predominantly and in the widest sense all ‘text’-based, we historians of the book find ourselves
drawn towards the heart of the humanities, with their perennial mission ‘to divest the objective
world that stands opposed to us of its strangeness and … to find ourselves at home in it’ (Hegel’s
classic formulation of what one might call the project of total humanism).

I

For much of its history the British sea-borne empire can be distinguished from the Spanish and
French empires by its relative ‘informality’. The British Empire was propelled more by trade,
emigration, and evangelical mission than by formal étatisme controlled by the metropolis and its
hégémonie culturelle. This informality of the British Empire was particularly well suited to release
what the Unesco history terms ‘the creative role’ of the periphery vis-à-vis the centre: a creative role
which was mediated largely through the various modes of textuality and the dynamism of their
embodiment in printed and other materialities. It was these textual modes which supported the
‘empires in the mind’, and which might be said to underlie the new imperial history represented by
the Oxford History of the British Empire and its concern with ‘globalization and national cultures …
area studies, literary criticism and cultural studies’ and its aim ‘to understand the end of Empire in
relation to its beginning … as part of the larger and dynamic interaction of European and non-
Western societies’. The histories of the creative role of its peripheries enable us to think of a more
cohesive history of the book in the English-speaking world as a whole, and as a consequence enable
us to think in turn of a cohesive field of global English studies – and ‘global studies’ as a whole - which would be dependent *inter alia* on an ecumenically ranging historiography of the book.  

Meanwhile awareness of their text-led creativity is encouraging what were the former peripheries themselves to produce a number of independent histories of the book – by no means simple-mindedly nationalistic or exceptionalist, though most involve some form of state-cultural subsidy. Between 2004 and 2007 all three volumes of *History of the Book in Canada/Histoire du livre et de l’imprimé au Canada* appeared, engaging with two centres – Britain and France – in its pursuit of Canada’s bicultural historical narrative yet deriving, ultimately, from the national research agenda first proposed, with appropriate funding, in the Report of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences in 1951. The first volume of *A History of the Book in America* – significantly entitled *The Colonial Book in the Atlantic World* – was published in 2000. The first volume of *A History of the Book in Australia* to be completed – and entitled, likewise significantly, *A National Culture in a Colonised Market, 1890-1945* – appeared in 2001, followed in 2006 by the volume for 1946-2005, *Paper Empires*. By 1997 New Zealand had produced at remarkable speed a detailed survey of existing studies on aspects of its print culture. First steps have been taken for India and Southern Africa (though in both cases, given the amount of persisting, pre-imperial, cultural variety, formulating an appropriately hospitable national research agenda will be a complicated matter). This leaves the West Indies, the dependencies, and the British ‘informal empire’ in Latin America, China, the Middle East and elsewhere, for further urgent consideration. Finally as regards the former ‘home colonies’ of the now devolved British Isles, projects for Ireland and Scotland, complementary to and interacting with the *Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*,
are starting to appear, that for Wales having been published by the National Library of Wales as long ago as 1998.\textsuperscript{13}

As my colleague David McKitterick said ten years ago:

\begin{quote}
with projects afoot or talked of in Australia, South Africa, the United States and Britain … the need for collaboration and consultation is all the greater, so that a richer picture may emerge.\textsuperscript{14}
\end{quote}

My task here is to suggest how we might proceed to think of these projects together as a conceptually integrated whole or, in the words of the New Zealand Print Culture project, how we might provide a global account of print culture, [into which] New Zealand’s [or Canada’s, or Britain’s, or America’s] unique print history [can be] situate[d].\textsuperscript{15}

We might think of that anglophone global account as itself a unique, though not autonomous, component of a world history of the book: as one of the modern international book systems originating in Europe (others being the French and the German).\textsuperscript{16}

I have written ‘suggest’ advisedly. Given the inchoate state of the subject, what follows is of necessity provisional, deliberately speculative and schematic, and indebted to the work of others, much of it still in progress. I am particularly indebted to the prophetic thinking of the late Don McKenzie, recognized in his lifetime as \textit{forse il maggior bibliologo vivente},\textsuperscript{17} initiator of the \textit{Cambridge History of the Book in Britain}, and an influence on the organizers of many other histories of the book in the English-speaking world.
II

I begin with a brief preview of those volumes of the *Cambridge History of the Book in Britain* covering the periods of the rise and zenith of the British imperial centre.\(^\text{18}\) Our first published volume (Vol. III) deals with the period from 1400 to 1557. Britain was itself still largely an off-shore, cultural-political periphery of Western Christendom but, like the rest of Christendom, experienced the beginning of the transition from script to a predominantly print culture. The volume ends with a foreshadowing of the process by which, following the other new nation states and sea-borne empires, Britain itself becomes an imperial centre: a process in which book culture and print culture in general were to play an essentially interactive role. Initially it was

the large part played by imports of manuscripts [and] especially

of printed books from continental centres of culture and learning

and links with printers in other countries which were decisive

for the development of printing and publishing in Britain.

The volume concludes, pointedly:

In the eighty years since Caxton had introduced printing to

England the number of printers had increased dramatically …

[However] this was owing neither to improved technology,

nor to greater literacy, but to religious and political controversy …

[It was the] political acumen, and especially the centralized

nature, of English government [which] ensured that the

printed word continued to advance the Crown’s interest both
at home and in Europe. Over the following decades the same techniques of propaganda exercised by government would be deployed by new independent bodies, such as the Muscovy, East India and Virginia Companies, as they sought to encourage investment and, eventually, colonization further afield. The outward expansion of England’s empire was to be matched by the inward expansion of the book-trade.19

The next volume deals with the actual inauguration of the progress of Britain and its book trade from European periphery to imperial centre. I quote from the editorial Introduction:

… the history of the book in Britain from 1557 [the year of the incorporation of the Stationers’ Company by Queen Mary] to 1695 looks like … a … progress in which a dominant Protestant vernacular culture, and an emergent canon of English literature, were steadily created and successfully displaced an earlier Latinate and Catholic world looking towards Europe, a process which began in England and then expanded to Scotland, Wales and Ireland, and, later, to the new American colonies. By the late seventeenth century, the resolution of the Stuarts’ struggles with anti-monarchical, republican and dissenting traditions through the ‘Glorious Revolution’ of 1688, together with the subsequent final lapsing of the Licensing Act … [and the authority of the] chronically under-capitalized … conservative and inward looking cartel … of the
Stationers’ Company … in 1695, enabled English culture and literature, increasingly presenting itself as a ‘British’ polity after the Act of Union [with Scotland] in 1707, to develop its colonial markets, leading to the eventual worldwide dominance of the English language. … Both population and literacy increased … By 1695 book buying had long been a habit among middle and professional classes … and printed news and ballads fed into the culture of coffee houses and clubs, helping create public opinion as a recognizable force. … The book trade had become increasingly specialised and diverse, and entrepreneurial publishing by booksellers [exemplified by Tonson’s collaboration with Dryden] had relegated printers to the role of manufacturers. … [In particular] the publication of travel literature in the last years of the century shows the shift from a peripheral, if creative, position of cultural dependency [on the Continent] to the beginnings of a self-sustaining industry, one whose future development was intimately linked to the imperial project of which travel literature was an integral part … all backed up by a burgeoning consumer economy.20

The next volume21 will see the period from 1695 to 1830 in terms of the conspicuous commercial-cultural acceleration of the British Isles and of a British book trade which was to involve Edinburgh, Glasgow and Dublin as well as London as centres. It also involved the separation of entrepreneurial publishing from local bookselling as well as from printing, based on an informal cartel of ‘congers’ trading copyrights and succeeding the formal, state-supported cartel of the Stationers’ Company.22
This was exemplified by the rising importance of British book exports to the colonies and the establishing of publishing dynasties such as Longman (for general trade books), the Anglo-Scottish John Murray (travel books as well as poetry), and Arrowsmith (maps). In general, the volume sees the period in terms of the centrality and ‘dynamism of … print culture … vividly illustrat[ed by] the proliferation of newspapers’, periodicals and magazines, such as *The Spectator* and *The Gentleman’s Magazine*, new and capacious literary genres, such as the realistic and later (with Scott and others) the romance novel, travel literature, encyclopedias (*Chambers, the Britannica*), scientific and learned publishing societies, such as the Royal Society, subscription and circulating libraries, and – eccentrically from the European perspective – a national archival library/museum *omnium gatherum*, the British Museum. Print culture provided the main material support for the ‘public sphere’ characteristic of modernity. In particular its agencies promoted the general diffusion of knowledge which underlay British perceptions of the world in the Age of Enlightenment. Such agencies were essential for the cultural-political *prépondérance anglaise* and its characteristic coffee-house/club/’gentlemanly capitalist’ – as distinct from traditional European court – culture: a *préponderance* which, after the Seven Years’ War, succeeded those of Spain and France in Europe and, after 1815, in the rest of the world.

The penultimate volume will cover the zenith of the British Empire and its imperial print culture, from 1830 to 1914. We can talk here of an imperial book, periodical and library system. By the end of the nineteenth century the British book and periodical had become an industrial, mass-market product that was distributed over much of the globe. The overseas markets for texts were consolidated, for example by the expanding export of ‘colonial editions’ of books such as Murray’s, Bentley’s and Macmillan’s, and the syndication of newspaper features to North America, Australia,
India, and elsewhere throughout the British Empire. There was the creation of a more explicit ‘idea of Empire’ by means of print culture in the shape of school textbooks, popular fiction and newspapers, and new kinds of intellectual and administrative centralization represented by the encyclopedic ‘imperial archive’ of the British Museum Library, as reformed by Panizzi and based firmly on legal deposit, now more willingly supported by the increasingly imperially-minded book trade at large. All this contributed to, and was affected by, industrial, social and political change reflected in the general perception of mass literacy as an essential social tool, and in the more formal, increasingly media-driven, imperialism which took the stage at the end of the nineteenth century with the age of Joseph Chamberlain and his European contemporaries, accelerating towards the catastrophe of the First World War.

III

To approach the final Cambridge volume we have first to bring into view the creative role of textual agencies on the anglophone periphery and their interaction, on increasingly more equal terms, with the former imperial centre. What follows is even more provisional and schematic, in three phases.

First, we have the origins of empire in transoceanic navigation, trade, exploration, and initial settlement; and their textual ‘tools’. There are at least five modes of textuality to consider here: maps; travel literature; newspapers, pamphlets, and almanacs; colonial official printing; and overseas missionary printing. It is important to note that though these modes were highly visible in this first phase they persist as major structural factors influencing subsequent developments.
So far as maps are concerned it is obvious that they were essential tools for navigation, exploration and initial settlement. However recent cartographical thinking suggests a far-reaching historical revisionism: that maps are by no means transparent and that the distinctively graphic and, so to speak, non-dialectical and dogmatic nature of map discourse ‘gave its imperial users an arbitrary power that was easily divorced from the social responsibilities and consequences of its exercise’.32 For example as regards the comparatively blank spaces on early maps of Australia it can be said that

there was no readily available iconography which could indicate [prior] nomadic inhabitance … there is the expectation … that … the ‘enterprise and ambition’ [of the explorer and settler] will take the course of an energetic emplacement of civilization. … A blank … intimates that there has been no previous history.33

More specifically one might say that it was the relative emptiness of the 1802 Arrowsmith map of North America – ‘the single most important source of cartographical information available to [Thomas] Jefferson’34 when conceiving the Lewis and Clark expedition – that induced a subliminal imperialism of which Jefferson was perhaps only barely aware. (Through the example of Jefferson’s use of them, Arrowsmith’s maps in part determined Governor Macquarie’s and John Oxley’s planning of their expeditions in New South Wales.35). Further, where previous history was already thick on the ground, as in the case of India, such thinking has led some to see the ‘imperial significance’ of George Everest’s Great Trigonometrical Survey, which replaced Arrowsmith’s more conventional *Atlas of South India* and was modeled on the methodologically more sophisticated and empowering, cadastral ‘home colonial’ Ordnance Survey of Ireland, as
depend[ent] in part on … [its] configuration of the British rule of South Asia as being scientific, rational, and liberal, in active opposition to Asian rule, which it stereotyped as being mystical, irrational, and despotic.\textsuperscript{36}

Similarly with travel literature. If at the imperial centre such literature ‘engaged metropolitan reading publics with expansionist enterprises’,\textsuperscript{37} on the periphery ‘explorer texts … [though still largely imported from the centre] shaped … experience and identity’.\textsuperscript{38} For example, in the Australian colonies Oxley’s \textit{Journals of Two Expeditions to the Interior of New South Wales} of 1820 and Louisa Ann Meredith’s \textit{Notes and Sketches of New South Wales} of 1844, both published in London by John Murray, helped shape what became ‘the almost standard reaction’ to the Australian ambience as one of ‘monotony and sombre melancholy’.\textsuperscript{39} Again, in Sir John Barrow’s \textit{An Account of Travels into the Interior of Southern Africa}, first published by Murray in 1801, or William Burchell’s \textit{Travels in the Interior of Southern Africa} (1822/24), ‘people in the landscape are homogenised into icons or scapegoats … assurance is given to the colonising power that the frontier can be stabilized’. In fact,

\begin{quote}
Barrow [as] second secretary of the Admiralty and John Murray II, who became the official publisher for the Royal Navy during Barrow’s long tenure (1804-6, 1807-45) … and remained a close friend [were] the chief figures in the publication of early nineteenth-century exploration narratives and represent a significant partnership of imperial navy, imperial strategic thinking, and imperial book system. The consequent genre of ‘travel-settlement’ literature, for example Susanna Moodie’s \textit{Roughing it in the Bush}, represents a seminal negotiation between publishing on the periphery – Moodie’s original sketches appearing in the Montreal Literary Garland in 1847 – and another pillar
\end{quote}
of the imperial book centre – Richard Bentley, publishing in 1852 the complete book which in subsequent Canadian reprints has become canonised as an expression of characteristic Canadian ‘garrison’, or ‘survival’, mentality.  

In this phase of exploration and initial settlement the prime function of the commercial newspaper across both centre and periphery was to help develop a global trading system based on the London City companies. But in addition, on the peripheral frontiers themselves, the material visibility as well as the content of the newspaper, together with the pamphlet and almanac, helped hold together essentially new communities in which the newspaper (and pamphlet and almanac) reader was ‘continually reassured that the [still largely] imagined world’ of colonial enterprise was nevertheless ‘visibly rooted in everyday life’. In this respect Benjamin Franklin, as a successful newspaper, pamphlet and almanac publisher, was something of an archetypal cultural-political entrepreneur on the early periphery.  

It is true that many if not most of the first colonial newspapers, however commercial in interest, were at least sponsored if not owned by the local political authority; for example, The New-York Gazette, The Jamaica Royal Gazette, The Halifax Gazette, The Sydney Gazette, The Quebec Gazette, The Cape Town Gazette and African Advertiser, and The New Zealand Advertiser and Bay Islands Gazette. They were thus an integral part of the whole project of ‘an artificially imposed order in the wilderness’ mediated likewise through the local printing of official proclamations, declarations and notices. Official patronage as well as collateral missionary enterprise (as we shall note later) may have been the sine qua non of introducing and establishing printing on the periphery. Yet the interaction of official printing with the local newspaper resulted in a distinctive
colonial culture of print, with an autonomous and creative – McKenzie would have said
‘commercially and culturally promiscuous’ – dynamic which was implicit in the ‘generative’ nature of printed textuality.\textsuperscript{44} This dynamism and the distinctively aggressive rhetoric it promoted had politically self-directing implications, expressed in growing localized, creole opposition to the imperial centre and its colonial representatives. For example, in the internal colony of Ireland we have Charles Lucas’s \textit{The Censor} versus the Dublin Corporation; in the American colonies, Isaiah Thomas’s \textit{Massachusetts Spy} versus Governor Hutchinson; in Bengal, \textit{Hicky’s Bengal Gazette} versus Warren Hastings; in Australia, William Charles Wentworth’s \textit{The Australian} versus Governor Darling; in Canada, William Lyon Mackenzie’s \textit{Colonial Advocate} versus the Upper Canadian Family Compact; in New Zealand, S. M. D. Martin’s \textit{Southern Cross} versus Governor Hobson; in South Africa, Thomas Pringle, John Fairbairn, George Greig and \textit{The South African Commercial Advertiser} versus Governor Somerset; and in the African Gold Coast, ‘James Hutton Brew … the father of mass-produced newspapers which served as a forum for literary protest … [for] future leaders of political opinion in the country, such as J E Casely Hayford and J Mensah Sarbah’. \textsuperscript{45} Such volatility – ‘revolutionary fanaticism’ in the American colonial case – a somewhat surprising but powerful later witness on the official side, William Tecumseh Sherman, was to characterize, feelingly, in terms of ‘the usual newspaper war … too common to new countries’. \textsuperscript{46} In short, on the early periphery, official printing and the colonial newspaper failed, by themselves, to convert local communities into effective confederation, either politically or culturally. We might see this anomalous state of affairs epitomized in Thomas Jefferson’s course in political self-direction through colonial and post-colonial print culture: \textsuperscript{47} from the pamphlet \textit{A Summary View of the Rights of British America}, through the ‘official’ Declaration of Independence, to his failure, as Third President of the United States, to establish a ‘national republican newspaper’\textsuperscript{48} in the face of a
newspaper press anarchy which remained endemic on the periphery. (Later, in Africa, such a long-term secular trend might be said to have produced the composite figure of the indigenous, mission-trained, yet oppositional ‘author-politician-journalist’ -and eventual President - represented by Nelson Mandela.49)

Indeed we might say that even more pregnant with the future was overseas missionary printing and publishing. The original intent of missionary enterprise in ‘translating the message’ may have been to override and to delocalize native oral cultures with European, inner-directed ‘civilization’ in North America, Australasia and, later, Africa; or to ‘modernize’ the classical textual cultures of India and China.50 Yet indigenous Americans, Australasians and Africans from ‘the other side of the frontier’51 adapted the dynamism of printing to their own purpose of self-determination: what McKenzie, in connection with the Treaty of Waitangi, called ‘the continuing reciprocities of speech and print’.52 In the case of Africa, in addition to citing hymn-books as ‘a performance genre rapidly assimilated into African Christian life’, Isabel Hofmeyr identifies ‘magical practices around books, [for example] the idea of “miraculous literacy”, [as] a recurring motif in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century African Christianity’.53 At the same time, especially in Africa, translations of Bunyan’s Pilgrim’s Progress were a key influence in the development by natives of self-fashioning vernacular literatures.54 Well into the twentieth century the more entrepreneurial missionary presses, such as the Glasgow Missionary Society’s Lovedale Press,55 in order to survive and expand, collaborated with mission-trained authors in publishing indigenous texts common to the ‘mission empire’ as a whole;56 as did the more self-consciously post-imperial Colonial Office literature bureaux and the commercial presses which succeeded the bureaux after independence. For example, the first novel in English by a black South African, Sol T. Plaatje’s Mhudi, was (substantially)
edited and published by the Revd R. H. W. Shepherd at Lovedale in 1930 and was then projected (in its original form) onto the international market and canonized by Heinemann Educational and its *African Writers Series* in 1978. In Australia the early stories of David Unaipon, the first aboriginal man of letters (and much else), were published by the Aborigines Friends’ Association at their Point McLeay mission, Unaipon’s educational and then professional base. We might even hazard the speculation, following a remark of Northrop Frye’s, that there is just something of a structural analogy here with the Methodist Book and Publishing House of Toronto. Started in 1829 in a ‘less developed’ country (if we compare Canada with its American neighbour), the House, later the Ryerson Press, became one of the country’s main ‘cultural publishers’ of a distinctively Canadian literature, in part dependent on government and authorial subsidy. Its two pre-eminent publishers and editors, the Revds William Briggs and Lorne Pierce, were possessed of a generalized, one might say quasi-secularized, missionary drive – envisaging, in Pierce’s words, ‘a great new republic of readers’ – which was in principle not altogether unlike (though far better circumstanced than) Shepherd’s mission at Lovedale.

**IV**

Following the volatile dynamism of settlement print culture our second phase concerns the attempt to consolidate effective ‘authority’ on the periphery. Consolidation of authority was as much a cultural as a political matter. It has been thought of in terms of the *mission civilatrice* of ‘anglicization’ – continuing, in the case of the American colonies, even after the American Revolution/War of Independence of 1776. To put it in the wider context of the cultural
expansion of Europe as a whole, anglicization has been thought of in terms of ‘moral enlightenment’63 – what Sir George Grey, a notable proconsul of the Empire, termed in a characteristically Jeffersonian phrase the ‘supremacy – not of tyranny, but of intellect’.64

In the light of its eighteenth-century origins we can see anglicization as an extension of the gentrified coffee-house and club culture of the nascent British imperial centre.65 The Jefferson family has been characterized as ‘frontier gentry’ and Jefferson himself as ‘essentially a man of the eighteenth century, a very intelligent and bookish slaveholding southern planter … [with a] desire to become … the most enlightened gentleman in all of America’.66 Even ‘the delegates who attend[ed] the Federal Convention [of 1787] conceive[d] of themselves as eighteenth-century gentlemen of letters’. We can say the same of, later, the Wentworths, the Charles Nicholsons, the Redmond Barrys and the early Australian élite, or the Thomas Pringles in early Cape Town, or the Upper Canadian Family Compact, or the eighteenth-century Irish Ascendancy (‘an echo of colonial Virginia’).67 We have the learned societies, magazines and subscription libraries modelled on the Royal Society, The Spectator and The Gentleman’s Magazine, and the like. After the Dublin Philosophical Society and The Dublin Weekly Journal we have, for example – and again archetypally – Benjamin Franklin and his American Philosophical Society, his Library Company of Philadelphia, and his General Magazine and Historical Chronicle. In the politically more stable British Empire of the next century we see initiatives in cultural consolidation by colonial governments. In bald summary we may cite Governor Dalhousie’s Literary and Historical Society of Quebec, Dalhousie College, and his protegé David Chisholme’s Canadian Review and Literary and Historical Journal; Governor Darling’s Australian Subscription Library, the Philosophical Society of Australasia and The South-Asian Register; Governor La Trobe, Sir Redmond Barry, and
the Melbourne Public Library; Governor Somerset’s South African Library and The South African Journal of Thomas Pringle and John Fairbairn (‘the Franklins of the Kaap’, in Fairbairn’s words);68 Governor Grey, the reconstituted South African Library, and Auckland Public Library, the New Zealand Society and Chapman’s New Zealand Magazine; the Asiatic Society of Bengal, its Asiatick Researches, and Governor Elphinstone’s Institute in Bombay; and – indecisively – in the British West Indies with their often absentee, ‘reluctant’ Creole plantocracy, The Jamaican Quarterly Journal and Literary Gazette, Conducted by a Society of Gentlemen (1818-19) 69. Despite these efforts at cultural gentrification – and unlike French colonials and their acceptance of Parisian hégémonie culturelle – the home-colonial Irish speak, bleakly and subversively, of ‘a chronic condition of cultural and intellectual dependence on English metropolitan ideas and fashions’,70 as the Australians have spoken, laconically and memorably, of the ‘cultural cringe’, and the Canadians, soberly, of the ‘colonial mentality’.71

In this context we might say that the local colonial print culture was embodied in a textual archive that underpinned the higher, more self-conscious element in the ‘creative role’ of the periphery vis-à-vis the centre. The archive was constituted by private as well as by institutional libraries and was fed inter alia by an expanding reprint book trade (typically the novels of Sir Walter Scott).72 It secured, in Grey’s (again) Jeffersonian words:

outposts on the frontier of civilization … not only by military force, but by museums, libraries, and schools for civilizing the people … planting posts of an Anglo-Saxon fence which shall prevent the development of the New World from being interfered with [not by the natives but] by the Old World.73
The textual archive formed a central agency of what has been seen, as the peripheral ‘counterfrontier’, aiming
not only to help man grow … or kill his living but also to put this man in communication with the traditions of his kind and thereby secure to his descendants the benefits of the free mind.74

Such was the case with Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson planned to give the Congress of the new United States first refusal of his collection after his death75 (one thinks of the intention of Sir Joseph Banks, his semi-private collection, and the imperial archive of the new British Museum). Likewise we have, as already noted, the collections built up and then presented to the public in the Cape Colony and in New Zealand by Sir George Grey.76 In Australia we have Sir Charles Nicholson, the first great book collector and co-founder of the University of Sydney and its library. We have Sir Redmond Barry, founder of the Melbourne Public Library on the lines of the British Museum, and then the influence of ‘the British Museum and Melbourne model of a fixed and separate State reference library’77 on the State Library of South Australia and elsewhere. These pioneers on the counterfrontier were followed by a second generation of more bibliophilic (though still public-spirited) book collectors: new city rentiers (though still gentlemen) such as, conspicuously, John Jacob Astor and James Lenox in New York, then David Scott Mitchell in Sydney, and Alexander Turnbull in Wellington. In this the colonies and dominions of the Empire were, as has been said of Australia, ‘not creating anything distinctive, but simply following in the footsteps of the archetypal new society, the United States’.78
The archetypal newness of society and culture represented by Jefferson and the United States was distinctly ambivalent in its effect. In the short term it was Jefferson’s belief in the inevitable progress of the human spirit as embodied in print:

the light which has been shed on mankind by the art of printing has eminently changed the condition of the world … and, while printing is preserved [that light] can no more recede than the sun return on his course.

and this gave his politics, like those of his philosophe contemporaries, such as Condorcet, their ‘abstract and literary quality’ (in Tocqueville’s phrase). This quality led to the considerable frustrations of Jefferson’s presidency; and we might say there are analogies with Grey in this respect. In the longer term, however, it is the autonomous dynamic of print, particularly when archived and hence assimilable, in perspective, by the ‘free mind’ on the counterfrontier, which enabled that mind to resist what Henry James called ‘a superstitious valuation of Europe’. The liability to cultural cringe, self-confessedly always present (say) in Australia, could be resisted on the basis of the archive, for example by Marcus Clarke and Christopher Brennan, associated with the Public Libraries of Melbourne and Sydney respectively, or in Ireland, for example by James Joyce, associated with the National Library of Ireland. Such is an aspect of ‘the complex fate’, as Henry James termed it, not only ‘of being an American’ but also of being on the periphery in general. It was confronting this complexity that proved central to the creative role of the periphery in beginning to shift the balance of cultural power away from the centre; and as the periphery ‘wrote back’, in part on the basis of its developing archive, complexity itself developed into text-led ‘hybridity’: a deep process exemplified in the case of India. This brings us to our third phase.
The leading role of the post-Civil War United States in the shift in the balance of cultural power within the English-speaking world was already emerging by the 1850s, with ‘the tremendous growth in book production, of which a large and increasing proportion was works by Americans … [The] situation had altered radically’ 85 The United States assumed the character of a second centre vis-à-vis the remaining white peripheries, particularly in the case of Canada.

The ground of this expansion was not only the systematic, constantly increasing emigration from the British Isles (and Europe), following the Napoleonic Wars and ‘a self-conscious age of improvement’. In the United States it was also the creation of an effective continental market, heralded by the start on the Erie Canal in 1817 and consolidated by an innovatory transcontinental railroad complex completed in 1869 which, although more than somewhat buccaneering, was nevertheless the cradle of modern corporate business management.86 Within this matrix ‘emerg[ed] … a national book trade system’ with ‘new [printing] machinery – much of it invented, designed, or manufactured in the United States’.87 The managerial and technological dynamism of the periphery was to be a major factor in the subsequent history of print culture.

Moreover, although ‘English texts, and even imported books, continued to be an important part of the American book trade’88 they answered less than before to the needs of the free mind on the counterfrontier. Thus Walt Whitman, in retrospect:

Lying by one rainy day in Missouri to rest … I … pondered the
thought of a poetry that should in due time express and supply the teeming region I was in the midst of. … One’s mind needs but a moment’s deliberation … to see clearly enough that all the prevalent book and library poets, either as imported from Great Britain, or follow’d and doppel-ganged here, are foreign to our States, copiously as they are read by us all. … Will the day ever come … when those models and lay-figures from the British islands … will be reminiscences, studies only? The pure breath, primitiveness, boundless prodigality and amplitude … of these prairies … will they ever appear in, and in some sort form a standard for our poetry and art?89

The resulting quest for a national literature,90 as distinct from a quantity of ‘works by Americans’, was largely a matter of attempting to come out from under ‘the long shadow of Sir Walter Scott’ (and of Byron, Dickens and Thackeray), as much in the remaining British territories, including India, as in the United States with its importers and reprinters exploiting the absence of effective transatlantic copyright: all became volatile elements of ‘a great world-wide cultural [as distinct from political] empire’.91 The quest was undertaken by local authors in collaboration with a new generation of culturally enterprising local publishers and bookmen. In the United States, after the generation of Washington Irving and James Fenimore Cooper ‘gravitating toward Scott’ and ‘making their reputations in England’,92 we have Nathaniel Hawthorne, the new Boston publishers Ticknor and Fields, literary promoters and anthologists like Evert Duyckinck, a new, high-cultural magazine (The Atlantic Monthly), and the ‘manufacturing’ of Hawthorne ‘into a Personage’. These were factors essential for an ‘American Renaissance’ that was at least structurally, if loosely, comparable to the contemporary ‘Bengal Renaissance’, with its high-cultural authors, publishers
and magazines (thus Bankim Chandra Chatterjee – reacting to Scott – and Bankim’s journal *Bangadarshan*).  

Even so, the American literary renaissance was prevented from fully establishing itself nationally, in part due to the problem of distributing general trade books through orthodox retail outlets in a relatively new, culturally and socially, as well as geographically, ‘distended society’.  

In this context it was the textbook that moved towards the centre of book publishing and distribution initiative - and this globally so: that is to say, in the now more democratically imperial centres, most notably with Hachette in France, and Longman, Macmillan, and others in Britain, as well as in the more thoroughgoing Jacksonian democracy of the United States which so fascinated Tocqueville.  

In the United States, texts ranged from the elementary McGuffey Readers, of which seven million copies were sold between 1836 and 1850, to the college textbook, and this ‘enormous and lucrative trade in text books and other educational works … was handled by special agents rather than the retail book trade’.  

Given the problems of access to a national audience in its ‘prodigality and amplitude’, creative authorship involved what Henry James called ‘friction with the market’: friction between the role of the ‘high-cultural’ book-based author in the metropolitan European tradition and that of the vernacular ‘magazinist’, the writer for popular magazines as successors to the original nation-building frontier newspapers (for example, American Realists like Jack London). This conflict of roles was exemplified *par excellence* in the case of James himself and the complexities of being both ‘author’ and ‘magazinist’.  

We have seen that on the early periphery the newspaper failed by itself to convert sectional community into national federation, culturally as well as politically. In
this sense the newspaper remained regionally centred while, at least to begin with, inhibiting the growth of the less politically energetic, but soon more broadly focused and gendered, magazine as the vehicle of ‘domestic [as distinct from] literary culture’.  

With the transcontinental surge in wealth-creating immigration and managerial and technological élan after the Civil War, it was the mass-produced and mass-marketed popular magazine, heavily illustrated with artwork and commercial advertising (typically, the Curtis Corporation’s significantly titled *Ladies Home Journal* and *The Saturday Evening Post* – publisher of Jack London’s *The Call of the Wild* – and *McClure’s Magazine* – publisher of Ida Tarbell’s *History of Standard Oil*) which, distributed across the continent through newsstands and department stores rather than traditional bookshops, established itself as both ‘reflector’ and ‘interpreter’ of national life in the distended society. This substantial if not epoch-making development was repeated, though on a smaller scale, in Canada, despite the American proximity and penetration: for example, *Maclean’s*, formerly *The Busy Man’s Magazine*), in Australia (*The Australian Journal*, the distinctively populist Sydney *Bulletin*, publisher of Lawson, Furphy and Brennan, and the [Ladies] *Australian Home Journal*), and in New Zealand (*The New Zealand Graphic and Ladies Journal, The New Zealand Illustrated Magazine*).

As a final element in the creative role of the periphery in this phase, the Library of Congress led by Herbert Putnam (himself backed by a vigorous President, Theodore Roosevelt) came out from under the shadow of the British Museum Library to develop the first of a new type of national library, no longer only archiving the printed heritage autarkically, in-house, but also outreaching to other research libraries and (with a firm boost from another Rooseveltian pragmatic idealist, Andrew Carnegie) to public libraries, all dispersed across the by now continent-wide
'counterfrontier’. In a new, unprecedentedly majestic building, the Library of Congress embodied the cultural aspect of the post-Civil War ‘Age of Energy’ (as it has been called), symbolizing the emergence of the United States and its book trade as a great power in the English-speaking world.

Meanwhile in the British centre, given the growing cultural as well as political stability and business élan of the Victorian Empire and the effect of its new overseas communication technology (steamship, telegraph, etc.) in ‘mitigat[ing] “the tyranny of distance”’, the British book trade was able to retain its presence vis-à-vis American and local competition in the other former colonial peripheries, such as Australia, and even eventually to some extent (particularly with the establishment of local branches mentioned below) Canada, despite the latter’s contiguity with the ‘energetic’ United States. This was so even as the peripheries sought and obtained a degree of federation (Canada in 1867; Australia, 1901) and of cultural self-determination – though with a much smaller demographic and entrepreneurial base than the United States. By the latter part of the nineteenth century, with the greater formality of Empire and economic dependence on its centre, the British book trade and its authors had developed into the imperial textbook, trade book, reference book, and magazine system noted earlier (in magazines, most famously The Illustrated London News, Blackwoods and Punch), as well as reprinting increasingly popular American titles, whether authorized or unauthorized. Thus was constituted ‘an imperial space … served … dominated and defended by London publishers’, and, significantly, by local colonial booksellers ‘collud[ing] to maintain … [the] dominance of … London-based companies [against any attempts at independence by local publishers] in English-language settler societies including Canada, South Africa … New Zealand … Australia’.
This steady development was followed by the imperial system setting up its own local distributing agencies and, later, formal branches - to begin with largely concentrating on textbooks (see below) and in due course themselves publishing a significant proportion of local authors.\textsuperscript{112} Indeed, as an aspect of the lengthy transition from an ‘Imperial’ to a ‘Commonwealth’ mentality, publishers in London began to liberalize their hegemony and give nationalist writers emerging on the periphery full access to the anglophone \textit{ecumene}: for example, the collaboration between Edward Garnett, editor at T. Fisher Unwin, and Henry Lawson, a key figure in Australian literary nationalism, and that between Garnett and William Butler Yeats, leader of the Irish literary revival. In the twentieth century we might think of Charles Whibley at Macmillan and his collaboration with Rabrindanath Tagore (who then won the Nobel Prize), the later Yeats, ‘and a brilliant Irish succession’.\textsuperscript{113} At the same time, on the imperial periphery itself there was the long march of local, largely textbook-based publishers and printers towards ‘a national culture in a colonised market’, \textit{l'édition ... entre l'autonomie culturelle et les logiques marchandes}.\textsuperscript{114} This again was common to Canada, New Zealand, South Africa, and even Ireland, as well as Australia. Examples were Angus and Robertson and the literary promoters J. J. Archibald and A. G. Stephens at the Sydney \textit{Bulletin};\textsuperscript{115} in anglophone Canada, Ryerson Press and several new publishers, who had learned the trade at the Methodist Book and Publishing House, such as McClelland and Stewart; in Quebec, Lévesque, Pelletier and others;\textsuperscript{116} in New Zealand, Whitcombe and Tombs;\textsuperscript{117} in South Africa, Juta and, after the trauma of the Boer War, Maskew Miller and Afrikaans publishers such as Nasionale Pers (‘building a nation from words’);\textsuperscript{118} and in Ireland, Maunsell and the Irish literary revival.\textsuperscript{119} Nevertheless, in addition to the continuing export from Britain of the colonial editions and ‘libraries’ of metropolitan texts mentioned earlier – conspicuously those of Murray, Bentley and Macmillan\textsuperscript{120} – the cultural empire was sustained even more effectively by the export of
metropolitan textbooks – Nelson, Longman and Macmillan (again), together with the ‘Irish National readers’, Cassell, and later the Oxford University Press and Heinemann. Such textbooks introduced British public/grammar-school curricula into the prestigious schools of the late-Victorian imperial periphery: for example, Melbourne Grammar School, Aitchison College, Lahore, Ferguson College, Pune, Trinity College, Kandy, Auckland Grammar School, Diocesan College in South Africa, Wolmer’s, Kingston, and the Raffles Institution, Singapore. However, though aiming to produce ‘facsimiles … of public school culture’ among the local élites, such textbooks in fact helped to create the highly literate and volatile professional classes which eventually formed the leadership of the multi-racial Commonwealth as successor to the late-Victorian Empire.

Turning to the archive we may see that the comparative stability of the later British Empire actually inhibited the development of national libraries on the post-colonial, outreach pattern of the Library of Congress. On the counterfrontier of the Empire, the development of the archive remained within the distinctly and enduringly decentralized regional structure of spatial expansion: for example, the prominence of the Public Libraries of Victoria in Melbourne and of New South Wales in Sydney, the South African Library, and the Auckland Public Library, still ‘inspired by the British Museum Library’. Here national libraries on the model of the Library of Congress were only set up with the final supersession of the British Empire and Commonwealth by American cultural-political leadership after 1945, although this leadership had been anticipated by various American Carnegie Foundation Reports on the local library systems in the 1920s and 1930s: in Canada (Ridington), Southern Africa (Pitt/Ferguson), in Australia (Munn/Pitt), and in New Zealand (Munn/Barr). The National Library of Canada was not established until 1953, Australia’s not until 1960, New Zealand’s not until 1966, and South Africa’s not until 1999. Relations between these new Library
of Congress-style national libraries and the by then mature British Museum-style regional/state libraries have been inevitably somewhat problematic.

Finally, the sheer textual voracity characteristic of the populist press and magazine following the American Civil War was in part fed by new, transatlantic instrumentalities such as the literary agent, the newspaper syndicate, and the American lecture-tour agent.126 These instrumentalities brought authors from all over the English-speaking world (many now forgotten as well as such as Wells and Hardy) into a complex of increasingly interactive book trades which had been characteristically under-capitalized, family- or partner-based, and dependent on their back-lists, but which around the turn of the twentieth century found themselves forced, at centre as well as periphery, to rely more and more on an aggressively marketed front-list of likewise populist ‘best sellers’, the celebrity aspect of which might be said to have been signalled by the international reception of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* (1852). Such was in the first instance principally the case in the United States and its book trade which was steered, as were other energetic yet ‘distended’ areas of business and industry, by the burgeoning London/New York financial market, led by the ‘gentlemanly capitalist’ J. Pierpont Morgan. Morgan’s corporate restructuring in 1896-99 of the classic family firm Harper Brothers, then facing bankruptcy, and Harpers’ subsequent systematic publishing of best-sellers like Zane Grey, can be seen in retrospect as a paradigmatic turning-point, involving more defensive manoeuvres to strengthen publishers’ capital base in ownership of copyrights such as cartelization, represented in Britain by the Net Book Agreement (1990) of the new Publishers Association, Booksellers Association, and Society of Authors, and the more formal stabilizing of transatlantic copyright, following the global ordering of intellectual property rights through the Berne Convention of 1887.127
This interactivity confirmed the rise of the American trade to substantial and recognized parity with the British imperial book and periodical system. We have, for example, a London/New York axis represented by Macmillan’s New York office,\textsuperscript{128} and Harpers’ London office,\textsuperscript{129} as well as the transatlantic operations of the leading newspaper syndicates and literary agents.\textsuperscript{130} The emergence of the United States and its book and magazine trade to parity also reinforced changes in literacy and marketing in late-Victorian Britain. It assisted, and was assisted by, the ‘prodigious expansion of the periodical press … [and] consolidation of the popular publishing industry’\textsuperscript{131} associated with the first British press baron, Lord Northcliffe, and the brave new world of mass-communication businesses that was to be characteristic of the post-imperial centre as well as of what was to be no longer the periphery. Northcliffe was in many ways ‘an importer of American methods’.\textsuperscript{132}

VI

This interactivity brings us to the final volume of \textit{The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain} (still at the planning stage). The volume will cover the decline and eventual fall, cultural as well as political, of the British Empire after 1914 and the final replacement of the traditional centre-and-periphery system. However, in the long view, the system was replaced not so much by any American takeover of the centre as by what we might think of as a polycentred, largely anglophone (in India and Africa also deeply polylingual) cosmopolis. Here Northcliffe-style Australian and Canadian, as well as American and British, ‘media moguls’—for example, Rupert Murdoch and Roy Thomson—have played a major role, now followed by European multinationals such as
Bertelsmann and Hachette. Further, arising from the revolution in media technology we see "le livre concurrencé" or, as McKenzie put it,

the renewed dominance of the visual image as a communal possession, the new icons of television and film, the renewed complementary role of sound as the commonest communal medium for imparting and receiving information.

The hegemony of print culture begins to merge into that of an engulfing multimedia culture. It would seem we have had three sub-phases.

First, by the earlier years of the twentieth century friction with a relentlessly enlarging mass market had led to a degree of alienation of a ‘Modernist’ élite from popular reading and publishing, dramatized retrospectively as a conflict between ‘mass civilization’ and ‘minority culture’ (culture de masse and culture savante). Such alienation we might see more as a fragmenting of the former relatively coherent public sphere (fragmentierte Teilöffentlichkeiten), a ‘stratification of reading publics … as never before’ into highbrow, lowbrow and middlebrow, reinforced by the paralysing aftermath of the First World War and the Depression. At the highbrow level, the mediation of the Modernist attack, however elitist, had to be through ‘the realities of cultural production within complex modern societies’. It was led by transatlantic minority magazines, such as The Little Review: A magazine of the arts. Making no compromise with the public taste, and was sustained largely under the leadership of New York cosmopolitan, ‘so-called Jewish publishing houses’, such as Liveright, Huebsch, Seltzer, Knopf, and Bennett Cerf and Donald Klopfer at Random House. These New York houses seem to have been stronger than the Modernist houses in London such as Leonard and Virginia Woolf’s Hogarth Press (publisher of T. S. Eliot’s Poems of
1919 in an edition of ‘fewer than 250 copies’). Seltzer ‘between 1922 and 1924 … made Lawrence more money than he had ever earned before’, and it was Random House that published the first general trade edition of Joyce’s *Ulysses* in 1933, only later issued in London by Allen Lane and his brothers at the Bodley Head (in opposition to the other partners). In Canada we have the McGill Fortnightly Review and the Graphic Press in Ottawa. On the more distant former peripheries we have the more isolated minority magazines and presses, such as: in Australia, Norman and Jack Lindsay’s *Vision*, and P. R. Stephensen and Norman Lindsay’s Endeavour Press; in South Africa, Roy Campbell and William Plomer’s *Vorslaag*; in New Zealand, *Phoenix* and the Caxton Press; in India, the *Kallool* circle in Calcutta; and across the West Indies agents of modern cultural nationalism such as *Kyk-over-al* (Guyana), *Focus* (Jamaica), *Bim* (Barbados) At the middlebrow level, during the ‘long weekend’ between the two World Wars the conservatism – or ‘sloth’? – of mainline publishers, maintained largely by the Net Book Agreement, sought further market consolidation by large-scale discount practices, such as the Public Library Agreement of 1925 and the Book Society founded in 1929 (following the trail of the mail-order American Book of the Month Club), with its selection committee including self-consciously middlebrow authors such as Hugh Walpole and J. B. Priestley. At the same time however there emerged from the earlier partial liberalizing of the imperial book system ‘a healthy array of … more adventurously “modern” publishers’ in established as well as new firms, and endowed with a distinct editorial rather than marketing drive. They ranged from (as we have noted) Charles Whibley as reader at Macmillan, Edward Garnett (now reader with the new company of Jonathan Cape) and Charles Prentice at Chatto & Windus, to Eliot himself, joining the new firm of Faber & Faber in 1925 as a sign of the growing convergence of middlebrow and highbrow and in 1939 publishing *Finnegans Wake* with Huebsch (now at the Viking Press) in New York. At the lowbrow level, popular publishing was
now even more aggressively commercialized by book and periodical houses such as Mills & Boon and D. C. Thomson, marketing highly formulaic genres, such as romance and crime, for sale to the proliferating cheap commercial libraries and, as regards style and content, gravitating towards the newer mass media such as the Hollywood film.142

Second, emerging from the Depression and established during the Second World War143 there was the grand enterprise of synthesizing mass civilization and minority culture to produce a ‘culture for democracy’,144 which involved synthesizing print and the other media. After benefiting greatly from the marketing constraints of the Second World War – inhibiting ‘promiscuous’ commercial competition – as well as from serious wartime mass-cultural aspirations the new wave eventually spread throughout the English-speaking world and beyond, producing fundamental changes in the professional and financial structure of the book trade which, we might say, realized the agenda set by Morgan before the interruption of the First World War and the Depression.145 If in the media the grand enterprise began with Reith and the privileged monopoly position of the BBC, in the book trade it had begun with the paperback marketing ‘revolution’ of Penguin Books, launched in 1935 by Allen Lane and his brothers as they distanced themselves from the by then ailing as well as conservative Bodley Head founded by their uncle, John Lane.146 In the wake of the classic American practice of mass distribution through department and drug stores and newsstands as well as bookstores,147 Penguin Books successfully marketed its paperbacks not only in traditional bookshops but also in the suburban high-street chain store relatively new to Britain (initially, Woolworths). Critically, when compared with traditional reprinting, Penguin mass-marketed not only reprints of élite and middle-brow writing but also, through its Pelican and Penguin Special series, original non-fiction writing of catholic yet topically relevant range and moving eventually
into original hardback publishing under the Allen Lane/The Penguin Press imprint, thereby extending its copyright base. In addition to the favourable wartime and immediate postwar cultural and political climate much depended on an unprecedentedly effective marketing brand image, the Penguin logo, and distinctive typographical house-style (based on Morisonian doctrine) that incarnated a virtual sub-culture,\textsuperscript{148} a ‘vast modern university’, in effect re-establishing a relatively coherent public sphere.\textsuperscript{149} The effectiveness of the initiative, commercially as well as culturally, provoked a steady vertical integration of paperback with traditional hard-cover publishing across the trade, beginning in 1946 with the Pan consortium of Macmillan, Collins and Heinemann exploiting their in-copyright back-lists.\textsuperscript{150} Books thereby regained a more central, and profitable, role in the volatile multimedia culture not only in Britain and in the United States, where the paperback revolution had been taken up, and magnified, by Pocket Books, the wartime Armed Services Editions, Bantam Books, and the like);\textsuperscript{151} but also – and not least through Penguin’s powerful, logo-based, branch-distribution system – in Australia, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa and India.\textsuperscript{152}

However, and thirdly, such intensified penetration of the anglophone mass market required up-front capital which (as we have noted) the traditional under-capitalized, family- and partnership-based book trade, depending on its slowly, even if steadily, moving back-lists, could not by itself provide. But the newly reconstructed world financial markets of the 1960s could and did so provide – initially Wall Street and powerful corporate interests in the ‘communications industry’ such as the Radio Corporation of America (RCA) and Raytheon. These interests were motivated to buy-out hard-pressed publishers, and their copyrights, considering the copyrights to be, by stock-market standards, amateurishly under-exploited and undervalued assets, yet potentially secure investments which offered notional (though as it soon proved factitious) ‘synergy’ with the other
elements in the industry. Thus for example RCA took over Random House, though briefly and not happily. After a number of hectic, high-profile ‘bidding wars’ on Wall Street, and with the patently ‘unbridgeable … gulf in management styles between broadcasting executives and hardware manufacturers on the one hand and the creators of intellectual properties on the other’, the initiative in taking over traditional publishing houses passed into the hands of those better-focused, but nevertheless new and highly capitalized, transnational corporations (increasingly, with the globalizing of the financial world, from outside the United States) which had grouped themselves, in part, from within the traditional book trade itself. Penguin was taken over by what had become Pearson Longman, as was Maskew Miller in South Africa. Harper in the USA and Collins in Britain were taken over by Rupert Murdoch’s News International, as was Angus & Robertson in Australia; Nelson by the Canadian Thomson Organization; Ryerson by the American McGraw-Hill; and members of the former élite core of British publishing, such as the Bodley Head, Jonathan Cape and Chatto & Windus, were taken over by Random House. Further, and significantly, given the pressures from global finance to secure home-market share in the new, largely anglophone, cosmopolis (for example, the market in Germany for books in English), some major sectors of the traditional anglophone book world have been taken over by non-anglophone, yet likewise well-focused, transnational groups. Such have been Hachette (taking over Grolier, the Orion Group of Weidenfeld, Cassells, Dent, and now Hodder Headline and Time Warner Books, making Hachette the largest publisher in Britain); Elsevier (Butterworth, Octopus, and Harcourt); Holtzbrinck (Macmillan and Farrar Straus); and Bertelsmann (Bantam Books, Transworld, and even Random House itself, as well as several British imprints brought from Elsevier, such as Heinemann and Secker & Warburg).
In general, under the relentless pressure from the global stock market and shareholders to maximize turnover and profit, there has been palpable change in the general culture of the book trade – no longer ‘an occupation for gentlemen’ protected from the realities of the market-place by such domestic practices as the Net Book Agreement (removed in 1995) ‘Publishers’ have become ‘chief executive officers’, and often move from one group to another as well as within the particular transnational empire. In the case of Penguin, Peter Mayer moved from Bantam to become chief executive, and David Davidar moved from Penguin India to Penguin Canada. The marketing, accounting, and personnel ‘management’ functions have gained in power vis-à-vis the classic editorial function. A steady flow of senior editors leave established houses to join literary agencies, where they exercise their editorial talents by identifying and selling new as well as established authors to publishers. Even so, given the book-trade origins of the transnational groups themselves, local editing and marketing enjoy substantial day-to-day autonomy: thus Random House UK within the Bertelsmann group, and Orion within Hachette. However, like the global financial market itself, the state of the book-trade merger – and de-merger – market is highly, and uncomfortably, unstable: the instability of mergers being due in large part to the inability of book publishing, even on a multinational basis, to sustain an annual return of over 15% on the original investment in copyright – the high initial market value of intellectual property notwithstanding.  

Nevertheless a modus vivendi of sorts seems now under way not only at the corporate level nationally and internationally but also between transnational groups and the often equally new, often subsidized, niche publishers specializing in what are now, in the first instance, marginal genres such as poetry and minority or local-interest fiction. We have, for example, the Fremantle Arts Centre Press licensing to Penguin the hardback as well as the paperback rights of the
outstanding Australian ‘original’ of the 1980s, A. B. Facey’s *A Fortunate Life*, which had by 1988 become Penguin’s best-selling Australian title.\(^{155}\)

Likewise, mass-marketing pressures and opportunities have led to the correlative corporatization of bookselling, typically in the form of chains and supermarket stores, such as Borders, Barnes & Noble, Wal-Mart (USA), Indigo Books and Music Inc (Canada), and Waterstones, Wal-Mart/ASDA (and, in Europe, FNAC, Meyer and Hugendubel). Indeed, common financial and marketing pressures and opportunities have even led to a degree of ‘editorial’ feedback from corporatized bookselling into the publishing process, thus reversing a trend dating from the early nineteenth century. The most recent and revealing manifestation of the convergence of interest, and power, between corporatized publisher, bookseller and so to speak reader, let alone author and agent has been, on the one hand, offering readers in Britain ‘a choice of around 600,000 books in print, with up to 100,000 new titles added annually by British publishers alone’ and, on the other hand, the virtually instantaneous issue world-wide of millions of copies of the *Harry Potter* books and *The Da Vinci Code*.\(^{156}\)

Lastly, the cognate pressure for the mass-marketing of, or at least mass access to, the textual archive has led to the final replacement of national, state-financed, library autarky by cosmopolitan research- and public-library distributive networking, hopefully on a cost-recovery basis: a revision of the archetypal idea of the *bibliotheca universalis* in the new, mixed, high-tech global economy, with far-reaching implications for the further advancement of learning.\(^{157}\)
To conclude. The essentially polycentric configuration of the new cosmopolis\(^{158}\) of the transnational book trade groups is perhaps best illustrated by the leading case (again) of Penguin Books. Within the Pearson group and its fundamental interest in capitalizing on the Penguin ‘consumer brand’ globally, Penguin has encouraged its branches in the former peripheries to pursue serious editorial independence, riding on their profitable general reprint business: a reincarnation of the classic creative role of the periphery, we might say. Thus the expansion of the Penguin list in Australia has been ‘the most dramatic example of an overseas-owned company's commitment to local writing’. Similar developments in India have been no less evident, most recently and significantly the expansion of Penguin India into publishing in Hindi (and soon Marathi and Malayalam).\(^{159}\) Such polycentrism not only increases the opportunities for ‘local’ indigenous authors to gain national and international recognition through book prizes, literary festivals, reading clubs, media tie-ins, and so on (typically, agent- and editor-driven): a recognition to which as serious professionals, in this age of obsession with the common reader/consumer in the global market, they have to aspire.\(^{160}\) It also leads them ‘beyond hybridity’ to ‘the new vernacular cosmopolis’\(^{161}\) with, however, a complementary reverse trend being the book-trade version of the general marketing strategy of ‘glocalisation’: for example, the Canadian transnational, Harlequin Enterprises (which owns both Mills & Boon and Silhouette), and its locally edited and translated variants, - ranging from Swedish to Mandarin Chinese - of the original English texts of its otherwise strictly formulaic romance fiction.\(^{162}\)
And yet, taking the long view we might reflect that while this newest surge in the corporate management and technology of text production has led at last to a full and deep cultural globalization ‘touch[ing] every corner of the world’, such a globalized public sphere can in practice be claustrophobic, indeed frenetic: a matter of authorship and publishing that is hyperactive, of ‘jostle and buzz’ and ‘celebrity’, lacking a truly still centre. We might even speak of a ‘massive degradation … [of] the public sphere … a media universe of endless factitious fashion’ - of the ‘far more disquieting global order of the present day’ than at any time in the past

Be that as it may. To live freely and autonomously within our textual condition – ‘to find ourselves at home in it’, with peace of mind – will require the perspective, and the discipline, of historically informed media literacy. Whether as academics, as communicators, or simply as citizens such perspective and discipline, with appropriate support, will enable us to have ‘more realistic dealings with the media’, and will have to be integrated as a public service into the public culture of the new century.

At a more cloistered level such perspective and discipline will be essential for the field of global English Studies now before us.
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A revised version of an article first published in Publishing History no 59, 2006
In world systems theory, the periphery countries (sometimes referred to as just the periphery) are those that are less developed than the semi-periphery and core countries. These countries usually receive a disproportionately small share of global wealth. They have weak state institutions and are dependent on according to some, exploited by more developed countries. These countries are usually behind because of obstacles such as lack of technology, unstable government, and poor education and