

Imperial Cooperation and Transfer,
1870–1930

Empires and Encounters

Edited by Volker Barth
and Roland Cvetkovski

Bloomsbury Academic
An imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

B L O O M S B U R Y
LONDON • NEW DELHI • NEW YORK • SYDNEY



Bloomsbury Academic

An imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

50 Bedford Square
London
WC1B 3DP
UK

1385 Broadway
New York
NY 10018
USA

www.bloomsbury.com

BLOOMSBURY and the Diana logo are trademarks of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

First published 2015

© Volker Barth, Roland Cvetkovski and Contributors, 2015

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publishers.

No responsibility for loss caused to any individual or organization acting on or refraining from action as a result of the material in this publication can be accepted by Bloomsbury or the authors.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN: HB: 978-1-4725-9213-2
ePDF: 978-1-4725-9214-9
ePub: 978-1-4725-9215-6

Library of Congress Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

Typeset by RefineCatch Ltd, Bungay, Suffolk
Printed and bound in Great Britain



Contents

List of Illustrations	vii
Notes on Contributors	viii
Acknowledgments	xi
Part 1 Conceptual Horizons	
Introduction – Encounters of Empires: Methodological Approaches <i>Volker Barth and Roland Cvetkovski</i>	3
1 European Imperialism: A Zone of Cooperation Rather than Competition? <i>John M. MacKenzie</i>	35
Part 2 Connecting Colonialisms	
2 New Forms of Knowledge Exchange Between Imperial Powers: The Development of the Institut Colonial International (ICI) Since the End of the Nineteenth Century <i>Ulrike Lindner</i>	57
3 Private Colonialism and International Cooperation in Europe, 1870–1914 <i>Florian Wagner</i>	79
Part 3 Law Transfers	
4 Riparian Rights in Lower Canada and Canada East: Inter-imperial Legal Influences <i>David Schorr</i>	107
5 Creating a ‘Colonial <i>Shari‘a</i> for Russian Turkestan: Count Pahlen, the <i>Hidaya</i> and Anglo-Muhammadan Law <i>Alexander Morrison</i>	127
Part 4 Adaptation and Counterbalance	
6 Same Race, Same Fate? Theories of Asian Commonality and the Shift of Regional Hegemony in East Asia After the First Sino-Japanese War (1894/5) <i>Torsten Weber</i>	153



7	The Origins of Trans-imperial Policing: British-French Government Cooperation in the Surveillance of Anti-colonialists in Europe, 1905–25	<i>Daniel Brückenhaus</i>	171
Part 5 Military and Violence			
8	Cooperation Between German and French Troops During the Boxer War in China, 1900/1: The Punitive Expedition to Baoding	<i>Susanne Kuss</i>	197
9	Deadly Learning? Concentration Camps in Colonial Wars Around 1900	<i>Jonas Kreienbaum</i>	219
	Index		237





New Forms of Knowledge Exchange Between Imperial Powers: The Development of the Institut Colonial International (ICI) Since the End of the Nineteenth Century

Ulrike Lindner

I. Introduction

In 1912, forty delegates from different imperial powers met in Brussels for three days to discuss a wide variety of colonial topics such as the regulation of labour, the acclimatization of the white race in tropical countries as well as colonial monetary policy. They came together as members of the Institut Colonial International (ICI) that was founded in 1894 and has held regular international meetings since then. At the session in 1912, there were French, German, British, Belgian, Dutch, Italian and Portuguese delegates present, but the institute also had members from Russia, the USA and Latin American countries.¹ Among other topics the delegates discussed problems of tropical hygiene, debated how forms of colonial administration could be decentralized and how indigenous leaders could be included. They also deliberated about how imports from the colonies could be increased. Solutions from different colonies of different empires were discussed in detail.² One would assume these discussions to have taken place within the administration of a *single* imperial power and not in an international meeting attended by high-profile members of the administrations of several empires. After all, many of the participating states saw themselves as major rivals in Europe and overseas in 1912, two years before the outbreak of World War I. This self-perception is shared by the established historiography on the pre-war period. Still, the amicable exchange on colonial matters seemed to be a matter of course in 1912. Recent research on colonial empires during the period of high imperialism has confirmed that forms of cooperation between imperial powers in the colonial world were rather frequent and common.³ However, the discussions in the ICI seem to have reached a surprising level of institutionalized exchange.

Certainly, the ICI and its meetings have to be considered in the context of growing internationalization since the 1870s. Numerous international institutions had emerged



since then, often residing in cities of small European states, as in Geneva, Gent or Brussels. The Institut de Droit International (IDI) founded in Belgium in 1873 or the International Institute of Statistics established in Brussels in 1885, for example, brought together new experts in newly created or newly reorganized fields.⁴ In the world of colonies and empires, strategies of internationalization became important features, with the ICI being the most prominent organisation.⁵ Strangely, the ICI, with its secretariat in Brussels, its annual or biannual meetings and its huge reservoir of publications is not well researched in the history of empire and colonialism. During the last twenty years only a few articles have addressed some aspects of the history of the institute.⁶

This chapter will first address how actual forms of cooperation and knowledge transfer evolved between imperial powers at the end of the nineteenth century and by what factors these developments were shaped. It will also engage with the question of how new groups of colonial experts were involved in transimperial knowledge transfer. In the next section, the chapter will focus on the institutionalization of imperial knowledge exchange between colonial powers within the ICI and examine the foundation and the main principles of the institute. It will survey some of the topics and themes discussed until the end of the 1920s and examine whether forms of collective imperial knowledge existed in the sphere of the ICI.⁷ The ICI was an institutionalized space that allowed a rather free exchange of expert knowledge. However, there were quite obvious boundaries and limits that formed those exchange processes and these have to be addressed as well. The chapter will shed some light on these developments and ask whether and how the institute served as a nodal point in colonial knowledge networks. I will use the term ‘colonial knowledge’ to identify certain reservoirs of knowledge being connected with colonial expansion and colonial rule. I thus follow the research of Helen Tilley who has argued convincingly against the term ‘colonial science’, as it would suggest that Western science and colonial science existed as distinct phenomena, a highly problematic concept overlooking the intertwining of colonial and metropolitan contexts.

II. Evolving forms of knowledge exchange between imperial powers

Convergence of imperial knowledge

During the long nineteenth century the development and advancement of sciences was strongly linked with the expansion of empires, as many scholars have argued for the British Empire.⁸ The exploration of new territories was made possible by colonial expansion or by imperial strategies and became likewise one of the instruments of colonial growth. Colonial and imperial knowledge could be developed by groups of experts working in the colonies of one imperial power or travelling between colonial territories of several European powers. Local knowledge influenced the collection of colonial knowledge significantly, as research during the last decades has convincingly shown, even if this was ignored in the history of science for a long time.⁹ Unsurprisingly,

old colonial powers such as Great Britain had developed quite elaborate and practiced ways of generating knowledge on colonial topics. National institutions such as the Royal Geographical Society became important motors of imperial exploration.¹⁰ France, having lost most of its colonies during the Napoleonic era, had built up a huge empire once again since the 1830s. France reinvented itself as a 'modern' colonial power, particularly with its colonial expansion in West Africa from the 1880s onwards.¹¹ At the end of the nineteenth century, countries such as Germany and Italy as well as the Belgian King Leopold II entered the colonial realm and took over new territories, mainly in sub-Saharan Africa.¹² Experts from the new colonial powers took experienced empires like Britain and France as an example when they started their colonial endeavours.¹³ However, inter-imperial observation and learning became a more general trend at the turn of the century. Colonial knowledge started to wander and to be exchanged on a much broader scale.

Several aspects stimulated these changes. First, one has to look at general developments in the sciences and at the application of science and scientific methods to colonial government, environment and society. During the last decades of the nineteenth century, scientific institutions not only became dominant around the world but were strongly connected with the growing worldwide expansion of Europe.¹⁴ In most European empires, methods such as statistical surveys, cartographical surveys or legal codification processes gained enormous influence, being always connected with international debates.¹⁵ Explorers and scientists who added their part to colonial knowledge reservoirs often worked internationally and were supported by different European or Western states.¹⁶ They substantially contributed to the exchange between colonial empires. The exchange of knowledge was also strongly advanced by the development of certain fields in science. From the mid-nineteenth century a growing body of experts in all European countries dealt with different aspects of colonialism. They came from newly-developed disciplines such as anthropology and ethnology or from fields like tropical agriculture, tropical medicine, forestry, language studies, geography and colonial economics. International science congresses flourished at the end of the nineteenth century, also addressing colonial topics.¹⁷ These experts exchanged their knowledge over national borders quite freely and scientists certainly furthered the interest in a more intense exchange in the semi-political fields of colonial economy and colonial administration.¹⁸

A second development which furthered knowledge exchange between empires was the structural change through economic and technical globalization at the end of the nineteenth century. The acceleration of information exchange and its growing density made distant territories more accessible.¹⁹ The years between the 1880s and the beginning of World War I resulted in a world which was interconnected in many ways. In particular, the speed at which information travelled changed. Globalization reached the colonies as well. European powers cooperated on technical matters such as laying telegraph lines and establishing steamer connections.²⁰ Connections between the motherland and the colony as well as between colonies of different European empires became closer.²¹ The various aspects of technical and economic globalization made it possible for the European powers and their colonies to take a close interest in each other. On the other hand, the perceived risks of a globalized and more comparable

world made the institutionalization of comparison, knowledge transfer and cooperation highly necessary.

As a third factor, new colonial acquisitions by colonial empires at the end of the nineteenth century posed similar problems to different colonizers. Italy, Germany and King Leopold of Belgium occupied their first colonial territories, mostly in Africa. There was a general imperial expansion, also by the older colonial powers. The main sub-Saharan French African possessions were occupied from the 1870s onwards. Great Britain added Botswana, Egypt, Kenya, Nyasaland, the Gold Coast and other regions to its colonial territories.²² For all the European powers, the process of establishing colonial rule in the new African territories was full of tensions. The colonizers faced similar logistic, administrative and economic problems. The self-definition as colonial ruler in the new colonial environment was first and foremost connected with a concept of white, European superiority over the indigenous population. This again created and reinforced commonalities between the European colonizers.²³

Fourth, racist and social Darwinist theories became highly influential in all European nations during the second half of the nineteenth century and had a huge impact on colonial policies as well as on the relations between Europeans and non-Europeans.²⁴ In such a setting, the inferiority of the indigenous populations and the right to rule over them was taken as a given fact and was backed up ideologically no longer mainly by a civilizing mission, but also by justifications from various racist theories, mixing in varying forms of cultural racism.²⁵ Even in the French Empire, where administrators and theorists upheld a strong notion of a *mission civilisatrice*, universalistic concepts had their narrow limits. As in other empires, French colonial policy was dominated by racialized notions of society.²⁶ Against this ideological background and despite ongoing rivalries in Europe it was quite self-evident for administrators, experts and politicians from different European empires and colonies that they should develop forms of cooperation and exchange, as one can observe in the meetings of the ICI. Until World War I, their central aim remained to uphold white superiority over the colonized population. In the contemporary perception this goal could only be reached by the exchange of knowledge and skills.²⁷

As a fifth point, one should mention that economic colonial policies of various European powers began to aim more strongly at making the colonies effective through employing a so-called modern, scientific form of colonialism. Not only the exploitation of natural resources but also the exploitation of indigenous labour and more generally the utilization of colonial people was now at the centre of colonial discussions. During the last decade of the nineteenth century and the first decade of the twentieth these concepts gained prominence.²⁸ Indigenous labour was no longer debated only in connection with cheap labour for plantations but also in terms of the local production of cash crops that would yield a stronger surplus for the metropole. Generally, the colonies were supposed to bring more profit by using indigenous labour more systematically, as the publications of the ICI during the 1890s show convincingly.²⁹ In France the term *mise en valeur* became prominent in colonial discussions around 1900.³⁰ In Germany, a similar concept of *Inwertsetzung der Kolonien* was developed after 1900, particularly under colonial secretary Bernhard Dernburg and the governor of German East Africa, Albert von Rechenberg.³¹ In turn, Dernburg referred to British

forms of colonial economy as role model for his plans. In British African tropical colonies the concept of indirect rule became prominent, often connected with a system of peasant crop production for export.³²

Taking these different factors and aspects together, one can observe a substantial convergence of colonial knowledge reservoirs in various fields, making the foundation of an international institute quite likely.

Colonial experts and exchange between expert groups

At the end of the nineteenth century, colonial experts might be colonial politicians or administrators who often tried to apply scientific methods to their administrative and political tasks. They might be scientists who were interested in colonial medicine, agriculture, economy and law, or in the new fields of anthropology and ethnology. Sometimes the political and scientific fields overlapped significantly. Colonial politicians became part of the scientific exploration of the colonies. They often qualified themselves as experts through scientific expeditions and publications. In these fields of so-called 'scientific colonialism' an understanding between colonial experts of different empires could be more successful than in the political sphere.³³ Furthermore, new groups of experts emerged from the new technical occupations, particularly from the field of engineering. Engineers might be considered to be the most important international expert group of the twentieth century.³⁴ People tried to follow careers in the new fields. They created new groups, edited new publications and founded institutions that were interested in knowledge exchange between colonial empires. Many of these experts were members of national colonial associations of their own countries, as Florian Wagner shows in his chapter in this volume, but they also started to work transnationally.

When looking at the group of colonial administrators and politicians we can observe a growing tendency towards exchange between people from different motherlands at the end of the nineteenth century, particularly on the side of the new colonizing nations. This is quite obvious when we look at German colonies and their personnel. In Germany we find endless articles in colonial journals and countless publications on British colonialism as a role model. Paul Rohrbach was a typical colonial expert, being a successful publicist on colonial matters and a colonial administrator in German South-West Africa for some years (1903–6). He addressed the British Empire as the exemplary concept for German colonization in most of his publications.³⁵ The German officials in the colonial administration in Berlin translated and studied many official British government publications on colonial questions, particularly the organization of indigenous and local labour.³⁶ British positions were regularly analysed before Germany developed its own concepts, for example in the case of the management of indigenous labour.³⁷

It is less known that the exchange with other colonizers became an important factor for experienced colonizers as well. In France, being itself an old colonial power, Dutch and English colonies became a role model during the last decades of the nineteenth century. The French colonial expert Joseph Chailly-Bert, lawyer and lecturer at the *Ecole Libre des Sciences Politiques* and one of the founders of the ICI saw British and

Dutch forms of colonialism in South-East Asia as important role models for French colonialism. He published on Dutch Java and British Indochina and always stressed the importance of comparative approaches in his own articles and books.³⁸

On the British side, one would find colonial experts and publicists such as Louis Hamilton, who wrote programmatically in an article for the journal *United Empire* in 1912 that British colonizers should not only focus on their own empire but also learn from other colonial experiences, particularly from the German side.³⁹ Cooperation and knowledge transfer also became recurring themes for the experienced British colonizers.⁴⁰ The British *Journal of the African Society* started to translate articles from non-British colonial journals and offered knowledge on these colonies to a British expert audience.⁴¹ As a further example, *The Times* widely covered the German colonial congresses in 1902, 1905 and 1910 with their expert talks on many features of colonialism, from agriculture to linguistics to colonial law.⁴²

In the Netherlands, a long-established colonial power with economically very successful colonies in South-East Asia there was also a growing tendency towards transnational exchange. Pieter van der Lith (1844–1901), professor of colonial law at the University of Leiden, founded the *Revue coloniale internationale* in 1884 that, despite its relatively brief life would publish in different languages and address colonial problems in a comparative perspective.⁴³ He became one of the co-founders of the ICI and published quite substantially on the British colonial empire in India.⁴⁴

Not only experts in the metropole, but also administrators in the colonies became more interested in neighbouring colonies of other imperial powers. As an example one can look at the lawyer Robert Asmis, who worked as colonial administrator in the German colonies Cameroon and Togo between 1906 and 1902 and was also a scholar and publicist. He tried to join the British Colonial Service in his younger years, however, he failed. After his doctoral degree he made a career in the German Colonial Service and later in the Consular Service of the German Foreign Office. He became an expert in colonial law and travelled in the British colonies of the Gold Coast and Nigeria.⁴⁵ He published articles on his research on British and German colonies in the journal *Koloniale Rundschau* and translated versions of these articles were soon published in British colonial journals.⁴⁶

For scientists in the colonial realm, tropical medicine was certainly the most important transnational and transcolonial project around 1900, particularly after the turn to experimental medicine and bacteriology at the end of the nineteenth century.⁴⁷ Robert Koch is remembered in the colonial context for exploring sleeping sickness in East Africa with redoubtable human experiments. His expedition was itself a transnational undertaking. He worked with German scientists but his main experiments took place in British Uganda on the Sese Islands of Lake Victoria. In 1900, there was a large epidemic in British Uganda, killing more than 100,000 people. All colonizers of the region feared for their working populations. Therefore, in April 1906, the German government sent a team under Robert Koch to East Africa to combat the disease. They studied all aspects of the disease from symptomatology to laboratory diagnosis and prevention. Therapeutic trials of atoxyl indicated that large doses were effective against sleeping sickness, but of 1,633 patients treated, twenty-three became permanently blind from optic atrophy. Atoxyl was by no means as successful as the scientists had

hoped for.⁴⁸ Earlier, Koch had worked with various teams in other British colonies. He undertook studies of cholera in Alexandria and Calcutta in 1883/4 and also worked in the Indian veterinary institute between 1897 and 1898.⁴⁹ Such cooperations and expeditions show the impact of international science on knowledge exchange and on transnational expert careers in the colonial realm. These topics were also taken up in institutions such as the ICI. Many sessions dealt with the problems of tropical medicine, often addressed as the precondition of European rule in tropical countries.⁵⁰

There were also new groups of technical experts. The railway projects in most of the European colonies in Africa and South Asia became meeting points for engineers from many different empires and nations. Dirk van Laak has pointed at the growing significance of engineers as a worldwide expert group for the twentieth century.⁵¹ However, this was already a phenomenon around 1900 when many colonies supported huge infrastructural railway projects. As an example, the British engineer and geographer Clement Gillman came from a German-British background. As a British citizen, he was educated in Freiburg by his grandfather and studied engineering in Zürich. In between Britain and Germany he decided on a colonial career. In 1905 he started to work for the company Philipp Holzmann in German East Africa, developing the new rail connection in the hinterland of the colony.⁵² He wrote a diary of his experiences. His fluent English became an important factor, as he had to work with Indian workers on the German railway project. During World War I he was interned by the Germans as a British citizen.⁵³ After the war he could follow his career again and started to work for the British administration of the now British Tanganyika as a railway engineer, his British citizenship now being an asset. He worked until 1936 in British Tanganyika as chief engineer of the railway.⁵⁴ These new colonial experts were technical experts who could work in many different settings and could be hired as international specialists.⁵⁵ The new forms of technical experience also added to the notion that colonial knowledge should be transferred and exchanged. The ICI took up such technical questions as irrigation, railway construction and mining techniques in its conferences and publications.⁵⁶

Thus, the founding of the ICI has also to be seen in the context of those emerging or newly established colonial expert groups.

II. ICI – institutionalizing knowledge transfer and expert meetings

All these developments furthered forms of exchange between different colonial empires. Colonial knowledge was amassed in new dimensions. It is not surprising that it went along with new forms of institutionalization. The 1912 session of the ICI in Brussels that this chapter opened with seems to be less astonishing within the context of growing colonial and imperial exchange.

The ICI was founded in Brussels in 1894, mainly by French, Belgian and Dutch colonial administrators and experts as an institution to promote the exchange of colonial knowledge between imperial powers.⁵⁷ The foundation of the institute was strongly linked with the development of French colonialism and the new French concept of *colonisation comparée*. The notion of ‘comparative colonialism’ was first

represented by the French expert Paul Leroy-Beaulieu in the new colonial department of the Ecole Libre des Sciences Politiques in Paris, founded in 1886. Joseph Chailly, one of the most important French experts on colonial affairs at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, strongly promoted the concept of comparative colonialism in the following years. It became a new and important subject in colonial discussions and was supposed to bring together French colonial experiences with the experiences of other imperial powers. In 1892, Chailly described it as a modern method to avoid serious mistakes in the colonial realm that would help French colonialism to prosper and make it economically successful.⁵⁸

Another forerunner of the ICI was the already mentioned *Revue coloniale internationale*, published in Amsterdam from 1885 and edited by the Dutch professor of colonial law Pieter van der Lith. The journal was able to attract many colonial experts from different nations and empires and published articles in several languages on a wide variety of themes.⁵⁹ Chailly met Lith during the 1880s. The meeting of the two colonial experts certainly fostered the idea of promoting international exchange.

Chailly was also highly active in French national colonial affairs, being one of the co-founders of the Union Coloniale Française (UCF) (the French Colonial Association) in 1893, and being its secretary-general for over twenty years.⁶⁰ In the same year, he also played a significant role in the process of inaugurating the ICI. He organized a meeting of international colonial experts in Paris on 6 October 1893. The founding members of the ICI comprised Chailly Léon Say, an economist and former French minister of finance, along with Professor Pieter van der Lith and Isaac Franssen van der Putte from the Netherlands, van der Putte being a former Dutch colonial minister. From Belgium came Albert Thys, who was engaged in the administration of the Congo Free State, and Camille Janssen, honorary governor general of the Congo Free State and former minister of finance. Lord Reay, one of the British founding members along with Sir Alfred Lyall, had been the governor of Bombay and was a member of the Royal Asiatic Society.⁶¹ He had strong ties to the Netherlands, having been born in The Hague and becoming a British citizen only later in life. His connections to the Dutch sphere remained tight.⁶² He hardly figures as a typical expert of the British Empire as he was very much inclined towards exchange with continental Europe. Thus, from the beginning, the ICI was clearly a French-Dutch-Belgian-centred enterprise, a fact that is also mirrored in the leading figures of the institute. The offices of president and vice-president that changed after each session were taken over by French, Belgian and Dutch active members on a regular basis. The post of secretary-general of the ICI remained in the hands of the founding Belgian member Camille Janssen for thirty-two years. He was followed by another Belgian colonial expert, Octave Louwers.⁶³

The small office of the ICI was in Brussels, and the yearly or biannual sessions of the institute took place either in Belgium (Brussels and The Hague) or in cities of other members. The institute laid down its statutes at its first conference in 1894 in Brussels and organized fourteen more sessions up to the outbreak of World War I.⁶⁴

The discussions of the meetings were published in the proceedings of the ICI, the so-called *compte rendu* of each session. The proceedings were themselves a reservoir of colonial knowledge, as they included substantial debates on various colonial topics.⁶⁵

Additionally, the ICI edited a book series called *La bibliotheque coloniale internationale*. The series, comprising over forty volumes, was published between 1895 and the 1930s and covered more than ten different topics in sub-series: colonial labour, the training of colonial administrators, land management in the colonies, the organization of protectorates, colonial education, railways, mining, forestry, hunting, colonial law etc.⁶⁶ Each sub-series consisted of several, mostly massive, volumes, mainly assembling regulations and methods of colonial organization in European and Western colonies around the world, from India over the South Seas to Africa and the Caribbean. It is obvious that the ICI publication series concentrated on the gathering of regulations and on the compiling of administrative principles in various areas of common interest to the institute's members. The publications of the *Bibliotheque Coloniale Internationale* rarely developed theories or future concepts of colonialism. Rather, it is characteristic of the ICI that the sub-series on colonial law was the most extensive of all and was published over the longest period of time, from 1906 to 1927; a similar focus was laid on the problems of the legal system of colonial protectorates.⁶⁷ Legal regulations were clearly at the centre of interest for many members of the ICI, also owing to the fact that most founders of the institute were lawyers by training. Some years later, many of the now over forty members of the ICI also came from the legal profession. For example, at the meeting in 1900, the active delegate of the United States was a professor of international law at Columbia University, New York and three of the six active French members worked as professors of law at French universities.⁶⁸ Furthermore, from 1911, the ICI also published the *Recueil International de Législation Coloniale*, a collection of colonial laws, underlining the focus on colonial legal problems.⁶⁹

More than being the publications of an international learned society on colonialism bringing together national colonial societies, the periodicals and series of the ICI generally served as a place for collecting information on various areas of colonial knowledge. They provided material for the new expert groups mentioned earlier in this chapter. Colonial engineers and economists would profit from the information on colonial railway construction and irrigation, scientifically-oriented colonial administrators would benefit from the compilations on colonial labour and colonial administration. Doctors engaged in colonial and tropical medicine would employ the expert discussions of the ICI on these issues.

The tasks of knowledge production and storage were executed with modern techniques, following the common use of modern governmental reports and statistics in European empires.⁷⁰ For example, the scientific commission of the ICI developed questionnaires on certain colonial topics and sent them to the active members of different colonial empires to collect their diverse assessments of certain questions.⁷¹ The answers were collected by the ICI and were used during the next meeting. Such an approach was also employed in most of the book series, as for example in the publications on mining in the colonies. The first volume presented a number of questions the ICI had sent to various colonies, for example:

1. What is the nature of the lodes bearing precious metals and precious stones?
Which are the chief mining centres?
2. Is the mining carried on by small or by large undertakings? [...]

4. What were the areas of workings in operation in 1890, 1895 and 1905 [...]
8. Give the yearly production.⁷²

The secretariat of the ICI followed up the answers from the colonies and would often give short-term contracts to experts who would elaborate on critical issues identified by the questionnaires.⁷³

Publications of the institute were certainly read in the colonial administrations of the members. They can for example be found in German and in British colonial files.⁷⁴ In what way they had an actual impact on colonial decisions of the participating nations is hard to evaluate. However, topics from the journals and publications were taken up in ongoing national discussions. As an example, at the meeting of the ICI in London in 1913, a medical expert reported on the training of indigenous nurses and midwives in the French colony of Madagascar and the British colony of Nigeria.⁷⁵ This was quoted in a petition of the Society of Protection of Natives in Germany in 1914, when it asked the German Parliament to establish training for native nurses, health personnel and midwives to combat infant mortality in German colonies.⁷⁶ Obviously, expert circles of the participating nations were aware of the ICI discussions, particularly of the proceedings of the ICI conferences.

Taking these different examples together, one of the main aims of the institute was thus to order, organize and store knowledge on colonial issues by using an inter-imperial approach. The ICI certainly created forms of collective imperial knowledge that were shared between colonial powers and developed processes of information-gathering and knowledge production.⁷⁷ The ICI could also be regarded as a form of continental European 'imperial archive' following the argument of Thomas Richards, who identified the existence of a British Imperial Archive, calling it a 'fantasy' of knowledge collected and united in the service of state and empire. Even if Richards's analysis is mainly based on literary fiction, his interpretation might also be used to describe the undertakings of the ICI.⁷⁸

The other important aim of the ICI was to bring together international experts on colonialism in its meetings and to offer them a forum for discussions. They should work comparatively, as stated in the first session in 1894. Besides the collection of colonial knowledge this exchange should help to develop new concepts of colonialism and to initialize reforms that would make the colonies more profitable.⁷⁹ Clearly, the idea of developing a modern, scientific form of colonialism prevailed. The members defined the institute as a scientific organization, not a political one.⁸⁰ Researchers dealing with the ICI have characterized it as a 'learned association'.⁸¹ Still, the members of the ICI saw colonial knowledge as expert knowledge on colonial politics, colonial administration, colonial law and economy. Thus, the main issues the institute dealt with were actually those of colonial policy. The rich body of expert literature that was generated by the institute during the next decades was intended to be received and read by the governments and colonial administrations of member states. In this, the institute aimed at scientific exchange but also at forms of international political consulting.

The ICI constituted itself as an international but non-governmental institution and was not financed by the member states. However, most of the states having active

members in the ICI subsidized the organization quite substantially.⁸² Further funds came from membership fees, donations and the publications of the institute.

Subjects that could cause political controversy between the participating nations were formally excluded in the statutes of the ICI.⁸³ Debates over the frequent border disputes between colonial powers or discussions about the many colonial wars the participating nations fought in their colonial territories would not be found in the proceedings or publications of the institute, but in the files of the colonial administrations.⁸⁴ The transfer of military knowledge on colonial wars – being quite common between imperial powers around 1900 – was also excluded from the topics of the institute.⁸⁵ The ICI tried to aim at a better understanding of the participating nations, as Lord Reay said in 1895: the institute should try to combat prejudices between the nations and to establish an entente cordial between the nations that were represented in the institute.⁸⁶

Soon after its foundation, the institute attracted members of many different imperial nations who joined it in its endeavour to develop a systematized knowledge reservoir on colonial administration, colonial law and generally on colonial knowledge. There was a distribution key allocating a certain number of active member places to certain nations, in order to guarantee the internationality of the institute. In 1894, sixty active members were allowed. According to the perceived prominence of each empire, the distribution key allowed eleven active members from the UK, seven from France, six from the Netherlands, five each from Germany and Russia, three each from Italy, Belgium, Portugal, Spain, the USA and Latin America as well as two from Denmark. Six members could attend the sessions coming from other destinations.⁸⁷ However, the actual number of active members varied between thirty in 1894 to forty-three in 1900 to fifty-seven in 1913. Furthermore, not all of the active members joined every conference. The French, German, Belgian and Dutch delegates figured most prominently in the debates of the institute until 1914, whereas British delegates were often absent. The institute also allowed associated and corresponding members (respectively from motherlands and colonies of the participating nations). The active members could choose these additional members on the basis of their possessing a useful expertise for the ICI.⁸⁸

The ICI was able to attract some high-profile experts among its active members. In 1907, Bernhard Dernburg, German colonial secretary, and the president of the German Colonial Society, Count Mecklenburg, were members. From the British side came Sir Alfred Lyall, former governor of India, and Sir Alfred Moloney, former governor of Honduras. From Belgium, Baron Descamps, one of the ministers in the Belgium government dealing with the Congo, and from France Prince August d'Arenberg, president of the Committee of French Africa, and president of the Sues-Canal Compagnie.⁸⁹

Interestingly, not only nations with overseas colonies became members. There were also delegates from territorial empires and independent nations in Latin America. The following nations had permanent active delegates at the institute before World War I: Germany, Latin America (with two members from Chile), Britain, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Denmark, the USA, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal and Russia. It is striking that the ICI integrated different forms of empires as a matter of course in 1900.

Territorial empires such as Austria-Hungary and Russia were members as well as empires with overseas colonies, and non-European empires such as the USA, then administrating a colony in the Philippines.⁹⁰ Obviously, Latin America, with its forms of internal colonization, was also part of the concept of a colonization *comparée* in the ICI.⁹¹ Whereas historical research started only very recently to compare territorial, overseas and non-European empires, as recent works on empires by Burbank and Cooper, Stoler and McGranahan, and Leonhard and von Hirschhausen show,⁹² the ICI worked more than 100 years ago on such a comparative basis.

However, the ICI excluded certain empires in its comparative approach. Neither Japan, being a successful imperial power in the East after the Russo-Japanese War of 1904–5, nor the Ottoman Empire, had delegates at the institute before World War I.⁹³ In the debates within the institute it was obvious that only European or Western states could be members of even if the statutes did not explicitly adhere to such exclusion mechanisms. The notion of being a white superior European colonizer played a significant role in the self-understanding of the ICI. Already in the first session of the institute in 1894 questions were discussed about how European colonizers could survive in tropical climates, how Europeans could prepare themselves for their task and how European and indigenous bodies would function differently. Similar debates on colonialism and tropical hygiene emerged in the session of 1895 in The Hague.⁹⁴ As in other discussions at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century, 'European' was used synonymously with 'white' in these debates. Against such a background of racial assumptions, it was clear that the membership of the institute could only be taken up by 'white Europeans'. In the session of 1895, it was stated that the aim of the institute remained to consolidate European rule over other races.⁹⁵ The concept of European rule obviously included the USA and Latin American countries and their delegates as being of European ancestry, but not deputies from Japan and 'oriental countries' such as the Ottoman Empire.

As to the limitations of the ICI there are several points to be mentioned. Besides serving as a place for colonial knowledge collection and beyond providing a discussion forum for comparative colonization, the ICI did not figure as a paramount and highly influential institution for colonial policy in the two decades before World War I. If one looks at decision-making in colonial administrations, the British example was still in many ways the benchmark for any successful colonization at the end of the nineteenth century. For example, even if German colonial secretary Bernhard Dernburg (1906–10) and the governor of German South West Africa and subsequent colonial secretary Friedrich von Lindequist (1910–11) were highly active in the ICI in the period between 1907 and 1914,⁹⁶ the German colonial administration under colonial secretaries Dernburg and Wilhelm Solf (1911–18) was still inclined to follow British colonial approaches. A strong influence of the ICI in actual colonial decisions cannot be traced in German files. The German administration remained, as my research has shown, fixed on British colonization as a role model throughout the whole period of active German colonization.⁹⁷

The ICIs sphere of influence was also constrained by the fact that it rarely launched new initiatives and rather mirrored the discussions in the main colonial metropolises. As Benoit Daviron has shown in his research, one of the initiatives the institute tried to launch between 1895 and 1905, an international regulation of Asian indentured

labour in the colonies, failed completely. The ICI drafted a regulation that should have led to an international treaty. However, the discussions made it quickly clear that an international treaty of labour migration would never succeed. Furthermore, Great Britain, as the main supplier of indentured work, was not interested in the ICI's arrangements. The whole discussion was quickly dropped.⁹⁸

Furthermore, many of the active delegates of the ICI were retired ministers or former governors. The British delegation within the ICI consisted almost completely of former colonial governors.⁹⁹ Other countries sent retired politicians as well.¹⁰⁰ As an additional prominent example, Lord Frederick Lugard, who has to be seen as one of the architects of colonial rule in British Africa during the first two decades of the twentieth century, was an associated member of the institute in the 1930s, long after his active and most influential period.¹⁰¹ Thus, the ICI was not always at the forefront of colonial debates and colonial politics.

Generally, the ICI was most strongly hampered by the indifference of its British members. They hardly engaged themselves in the debates of the institute. Great Britain had a high number of active representatives in the official rota of the institute, however they were not present at most of the meetings and remained uninterested.¹⁰² Therefore, the largest worldwide empire with the most elaborate knowledge reservoir on colonization, as well as a huge publication record on colonial issues, was rather absent in the ICI. This substantially weakened the claim of the institute to present an international forum on colonization.

The main reason for British indifference was certainly the founding of the ICI as a French-Belgian-Dutch expert group.¹⁰³ The ICI understood itself in some ways as a continental alternative to British imperial dominance. Furthermore, the British Empire was economically most successful in its trade with the settlement empire, i.e. with Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa.¹⁰⁴ Therefore, British colonial administrators and economists were not greatly interested in the French project of '*mise en valeur*' for the new tropical colonies in Africa that dominated the discussions within the ICI. Besides an economic focus on the white settlement colonies, India had always been at the centre of British colonial interest. The British Raj was not seen as comparable to other European colonies and their administrative and economic problems.¹⁰⁵ The British view on forms of comparative colonization as they were represented by the ICI remained reserved. As a consequence, the institute could only execute a limited influence on international developments in the colonial world that was being dominated by the British Empire.

World War I meant a long break in the history of the institute. After a meeting in 1913, the institute next reassembled two years after the end of the war in Brussels in 1920.¹⁰⁶ Germany, having lost its colonies, was excluded. Italy became much more engaged and sent a growing number of active and associated members to ICI meetings.¹⁰⁷ The conferences of the 1920s were held in Paris in 1921, in Rome in 1924, in The Hague in 1927, and again in Brussels in 1929. The number of active delegates increased to seventy in 1920, now with a new quota regulation.¹⁰⁸ The racial scheme of the ICI also changed during the 1920s. At the meeting in Paris in 1931, three Japanese delegates appeared. Masaji Inouye, president of an international development company from Tokyo, Shunji Miyao, vice-president of the Japanese Colonial Bureau, former

director for the government in Korea and Kunio Yanagida, professor of the history of colonialism at the University of Waseda represented the Japanese Empire.¹⁰⁹ This clearly meant a shift in the understanding of imperial networks within the ICI. Formerly only including ‘European’ colonizers or rulers of ‘European descent’ (the US and Latin American States), the presence of Japanese experts meant a rather pragmatic opening up of concepts of imperial internationalism.

In the international context, the arguments of colonizers started to change generally after World War I – a transformation that had a strong impact on the ICI. A first impetus of change was provided by the Versailles Treaty, with the mandates of the League of Nations that emphasized the trusteeship of the colonial powers for indigenous populations. ‘Colonial development’ became the new key term. The new trusteeship ideology put a great deal of pressure not only on the mandate powers to invest in development and social programmes in their territories, but on all colonizing powers.¹¹⁰ The concept of *mise en valeur* the ICI had committed itself to before World War I now seemed outdated, as it concentrated mainly on plantation management in the colonies. The ICI developed some new concepts dealing with an expansion of indigenous agriculture in the colonies in the 1920s.¹¹¹ However, new organizations such as the International Labour Organization (ILO) that was founded in 1919 in connection with the peace conference at Versailles quickly developed a strong expertise and could exert a dominant influence in these fields, pushing back the ICI.¹¹² Also, population decline was now seen as an immense threat to productivity in the colonies. From the mid-1920s onwards, health problems in the colonies were connected with issues of subsistence. As Michael Worboys has shown, the ‘discovery’ of malnutrition in Africa happened in 1925 in association with research on cattle diseases and on the diets of different African peoples. The consequences of this research were now debated in British expert groups and in international forums. New attention was directed to social welfare and development in the colonies.¹¹³ However, these topics were hardly taken up by the ICI in the 1920s.

Generally, other new organizations such as the League of Nations and the League of Nations Health Organization started to take a great interest in the situation of colonial populations and societies after World War I. Their wish to develop international programmes influenced the colonizing powers in their outlook on colonies.¹¹⁴ Clearly, the ICI found itself now in the second row of institutions furthering international transfer on colonial issues.

The ICI continued to be a place for exchanging colonial knowledge on legal and economic matters. For example, after the economic crisis in 1929, the session of 1931 was partly devoted to the effects of the crisis in the colonies. The institute also published detailed reports on different consequences of the crisis in various types of colonial economies.¹¹⁵

What should remain important is the fact that the ICI institutionalized colonial knowledge transfer and created new forms of regular discussion and meetings between political and scientific experts. The institute certainly excelled in systematically ordering knowledge on colonialism. However, local knowledge that was always integrated in the process of collecting material on colonial issues was hardly mentioned and was not addressed as valuable. The ICI has to be seen in the strong tradition of stabilizing Western hegemony in the fields of science and knowledge.¹¹⁶

III. Conclusion

Exchange of colonial knowledge was an expanding field at the end of the nineteenth century. Explorers, scientists and colonial merchants had always had mobile careers between colonial empires and had added to a growing body of colonial knowledge. Now, with the increasing scientific interest in colonization, with the emerging of new fields of science, with a further differentiation of colonial knowledge and with more expert groups engaged in colonial matters, the exchange of imperial knowledge reached new dimensions. Information and knowledge on colonial matters were read, translated and commented upon by a growing number of people. Furthermore, the administrations of different colonial empires became more interested in their neighbours and tried to learn from each other's experiences; political and scientific experts mingled. New careers emerged, connected with the systematic exploitation of the colonies and with the building up of infrastructural systems.

The ICI as an international, non-governmental institution can be seen as a typical outcome of all these developments.¹¹⁷ Exchange of colonial knowledge between empires is something quite unknown in historical research, still, constant mutual observation and a desire to learn from each other was a rather common phenomenon in the interactions between empires at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century.¹¹⁸ The ICI is an exemplary case showing the extent of these developments. Until 1914 it certainly served as a nodal point in the networks of European and Western colonial experts. Even if the disinterest of British experts curtailed the influence of institute, the ICI was an important exchange forum for colonial knowledge, at least for the colonial empires of continental Europe. After 1918, the role of the ICI became less prominent. New concepts emerged. Other international organizations such as the ILO and the League of Nations now addressed colonial politics and provided more important international networks and more influential forums for knowledge exchange. However, the ICI continued to offer a growing reservoir of colonial knowledge that accommodated the demands of its members.

As a last point it should be mentioned that the development of an international exchange forum of colonial knowledge involved first and foremost the aim of stabilizing European rule over dependent colonies. The ICI was keen to reform colonialism in a form that helped to preserve European or Western rule over colonized people. Seeing it from the perspective of postcolonial studies it served to institutionalize forms of constructing knowledge about colonized people and helped to stabilize European hegemony over certain reservoirs of knowledge.¹¹⁹ Even if it created knowledge exchange and international connections, the ICI always displayed various layers of exclusion and considerable differences in levels of power.

Notes

- 1 Institute Colonial International, *Compte-Rendue de la Session tenue à Bruxelles les 29, 30 et 31 Juillet 1912*, (Brussels et al.: Augustin Challamel, 1912) (in the following: *Compte Rendu* 1912), p. 43.

- 2 Cf. *Compte Rendu*, 1912, pp. 311–14.
- 3 For the tensions between cooperation and rivalry that shaped the relations of European empires and for strong proofs of cooperation see Ulrike Lindner, *Koloniale Begegnungen: Deutschland und Großbritannien als Imperialmächte in Afrika 1880–1914* (Frankfurt, M., New York: Campus 2011); Ann Laura Stoler, Carole McGranahan and Peter C. Perdue (eds), *Imperial Formations* (Santa Fe, N.M., Oxford: School for Advanced Research, 2007).
- 4 Cf. Madeleine Herren, *Internationale Organisationen seit 1865: Eine Globalgeschichte der internationalen Ordnung* (Wiss. Buchgesellschaft: Darmstadt, 2009), pp. 15–17.
- 5 See e.g. John Boli and George M. Thomas (eds), *Constructing World Culture: International Nongovernmental Organizations since 1875* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1999).
- 6 Cf. Janny de Jong, 'Kolonialism op een Koopje: Het International Koloniale Instituut, 1994–1914', *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis*, 109 (1996), pp. 45–72; Jan Henning Böttger, 'Internationalismus und Kolonialismus: Ein Werkstattbericht zur Geschichte des Brüsseler 'Institut Colonial International' (1894–1948)', *Jahrbuch für europäische Überseegeschichte*, 6 (2006), pp. 165–73; Jan Henning Böttger, 'Bienvenue dans la capitale de l'Empire! Die Tagung des Institut Colonial International in Berlin (1897)', in: Ulrich van der Heyden and Joachim Zeller (eds), *Macht und Anteil an der Weltherrschaft: Berlin und der deutsche Kolonialismus* (Unrast: Münster, 2005), pp. 109–15; Benoit Daviron, 'Mobilizing labour in African agriculture: the role of the International Colonial Institute in the elaboration of a standard of colonial administration 1895–1930', *Journal of Global History*, 5 (2010), pp. 479–501; Pierre Singaravélou, 'Les stratégies d'internationalisation de la question coloniale et la construction transnationale d'une science de la colonisation à la fin du XIX^e siècle', *Monde(s)*, 1 (2012), pp. 135–57. See also the chapter by Florian Wagner in this book and his forthcoming PhD thesis that will deal with the ICI more thoroughly.
- 7 Cf. Frederick Cooper and Ann Laura Stoler, 'Between metropole and colony: rethinking a research agenda', in: Frederick Cooper and Ann Laura Stoler (eds), *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), p. 13.
- 8 Cf. Robert A. Stafford, 'Scientific exploration and empire', in: Andrew Porter (ed.), *The Oxford History of the British Empire: The Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999), pp. 294–319; Benedikt Stuchtey, 'Introduction: towards a comparative history of science and tropical medicine in imperial cultures since 1800', in: Benedikt Stuchtey (ed.), *Science Across the European Empires, 1800–1950* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005), pp. 1–2; see also Christopher Bayly and Roy MacLeod (eds), *Nature and Empire: Science and the Colonial Enterprise* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000); or more generally: Daniel R. Headrick, *The Tools of Empire: Technology and European Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1981).
- 9 Cf. Helen Tilley, 'Global histories, vernacular science, and African genealogies; or, is the history of science ready for the world?', *Isis*, 101 (2010), pp. 113–14; see more generally Kapil Raj, *Relocating Modern Science: Circulation and the Construction of Scientific Knowledge in South Asia and Europe 1650–1900* (Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).
- 10 For the history of the Royal Geographical Society see Ian Cameron, *To the Farthest Ends of the Earth: The History of the Royal Geographical Society 1830–1980* (London: Macdonald, 1980).
- 11 Cf. Lewis Pyenson, *Civilizing Mission: Exact Sciences and French Overseas Expansion 1830–1940* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1993).

- 12 Cf. Tony Ballantyne and Antoinette Burton, Empires and the reach of the global, in: Emily S. Rosenberg (ed.), *A World Connecting 1870–1945*, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 2012), pp. 288–90.
- 13 For the British Empire as role model for German colonialism see Lindner, *Koloniale Begegnungen*, p. 43.
- 14 Cf. Tilley, Global histories.
- 15 Cf. Ulrike von Hirschhausen, People that count – the imperial census in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Europe and India, in: Jörn Leonhard and Ulrike von Hirschhausen (eds.), *Comparing Empires. Encounters and Transfers in the Long Nineteenth Century* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), pp. 145–70.
- 16 An infamous example is the explorer and publicist Henry Morton Stanley, who was supported by the British Empire, by the Belgium King Leopold II and by several other financiers. See Frank McLynn, *Stanley. The Making of an African Explorer* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991).
- 17 Cf. Stuchtey, Introduction, pp. 20–1.
- 18 Cf. Lindner, *Koloniale Begegnungen*, pp. 95–7.
- 19 Cf. Christopher A. Bayly, *The Birth of the Modern World: Global Connections and Comparisons* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2004), p. 461; John Darwin, *After Tamerlane: The Global History of Empire Since 1405* (London: Bloomsbury, 2008), pp. 300–4.
- 20 Cf. Roland Wenzlhuemer, *Connecting the Nineteenth-Century World: The Telegraph and Globalization* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2012).
- 21 Cf. Lindner, *Koloniale Begegnungen*, p. 459.
- 22 Cf. Bouda Etemad, *Possessing the World: Taking the Measurements of Colonisation from the Eighteenth to the Twentieth Century* (New York: Berghahn, 2007), pp. 212–18.
- 23 Cf. Lindner, *Koloniale Begegnungen*, pp. 309–10.
- 24 Cf. H.L. Wesseling, *The European Colonial Empires: 1815–1919* (London: Routledge, 2004), pp. 125–30.
- 25 Cf. Christian Geulen, *Geschichte des Rassismus* (Munich: Beck 2007), p. 85.
- 26 Cf. Alice Conklin, *A Mission to Civilize. The Republican Idea of Empire in France and West Africa, 1895–1930* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1997), pp. 239–41.
- 27 Cf. Lindner, *Koloniale Begegnungen*, p. 90.
- 28 Cf. Sebastian Conrad, *Deutsche Kolonialgeschichte* (München: Beck, 2008), p. 37.
- 29 See the massive publications of the ICI on colonial labour and labour management during the 1890s: ICI (ed.), *La Main-d'oeuvre aux colonies. Tome I : Documents officiels sur le contrat de travail et le louage d'ouvrage aux Colonies (Colonies allemandes, Etat indépendant du Congo, Colonies françaises, Indes orientales néerlandaises)* (Paris: A. Colin, 1895); ICI (ed.), *La Main-d'oeuvre aux colonies, Tome II: Documents officiels sur le contrat de travail et le louage d'ouvrage aux colonies (Indes anglaises, Colonies anglaises)* (Paris: A. Colin, 1897); ICI (ed.), *Main-d'oeuvre aux colonies, Tome III: Documents officiels sur le contrat de travail et le louage d'ouvrage aux Colonies (Colonies françaises, Surinam)* (Paris: A. Colin, 1898).
- 30 Cf. Stuart Michael Persell, *French Colonial Lobby 1889–1938* (Stanford, Ca.: Hoover Press Publications), pp. 97–9.
- 31 Cf. Bernhard Dernburg, *Zielpunkte des deutschen Kolonialwesens* (Berlin: Ernst Friedrich Kittler 1907). See for Rechenberg, Detlef Bald, Die Reformpolitik von Gouverneur Rechenberg. Koloniale Handlungsexpansion und indische Minderheit in Deutsch-Ostafrika, in: D. Oberndörfer (ed.), *Africana Collecta II* (Düsseldorf 1971), pp. 242–61.
- 32 Cf. Crawford Young, *The African Colonial State in Comparative Perspective* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1994), p. 82; B.R. Tomlinson, Economics and empire: the periphery

- and the imperial economy, in: Andrew Porter (ed.), *The Oxford History of the British Empire. The Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999), pp. 53–74. There was quite a successful programme of local cash crop production (cocoa) in the British African colony of the Gold Coast.
- 33 Cf. Lindner, *Koloniale Begegnungen*, p. 83; for the growing significance of scientific colonialism see also Nadin Hée, *Imperiales Wissen und koloniale Gewalt. Japans Herrschaft in Taiwan 1895–1945* (Frankfurt, M.: Campus, 2012), pp. 14–17. See e.g. the German colonial secretary Wilhelm Solf who published as a colonial expert and translator before and while working for the colonial service. For Solf see Eberhard von Vietsch, *Wilhelm Solf: Botschafter zwischen den Zeiten* (Tübingen: Wunderlich, 1961).
- 34 Cf. Dirk van Laak, *Imperiale Infrastruktur: Deutsche Planungen für eine Erschließung Afrikas* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2004), pp. 35–40, 91–3.
- 35 Cf. Paul Rohrbach, *Deutsche Kolonialwirtschaft. Kulturpolitische Grundsätze für die Rassen- und Missionsfragen* (Berlin: Hilfe 1909); Paul Rohrbach, *Der deutsche Gedanke in der Welt*, (Königstein i.T.: Langewiesche, 1912); Paul Rohrbach, *Zum Weltvolk hindurch* (Stuttgart: Engelhorn, 1914).
- 36 Cf. Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde (in the following BAB), R 1001/8739, Cape of Good Hope, Blue Book of Native Affairs, 1891; cf. as a summary of a British colonial report: R 1001/8729, Swaziland, after the colonial report No. 559, Cd. 3729/23, 1908.
- 37 Cf. BAB, R 1001/8741, German General Consulate South Africa to Chancellor von Bülow, 2.5.1905, BAB, R 1001/8748, report of the Chief Native Commissioner Matabeleland, Southern Rhodesia, 1908, f. 52–6. This report that was specifically requested by colonial secretary Bernhard Dernburg.
- 38 Cf. Joseph Chailly-Bert, *Java et ses habitants* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1900); Joseph Chailly-Bert, *La colonisation de l'Indo-Chine: L'expérience anglaise* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1892); Joseph Chailly-Bert, *L'impôt sur le revenu: Législation comparée et économie politique* (Paris: Guillaumin, 1884). For Chailly and his admiration of the Dutch role model see also Frances Gouda, *Dutch Culture Overseas: Colonial Practice in the Netherland Indies, 1900–1942* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam UP 1996), pp. 45–6.
- 39 Cf. Louis Hamilton, The German colonies 1910–1911, *United Empire*, 3 (1912), p. 970; see also articles by Wyatt Tilby, Germany as a colonising factor, *United Empire* 3 (1912), pp. 57–9 and The German record in colonising, *United Empire* 5 (1914), pp. 711–15.
- 40 Cf. Anon., 'Interkoloniales Verständnis: Eine Wertschätzung deutscher Leistungen von englischer Seite', *Deutsche Kolonialzeitung*, 7 May 1910.
- 41 Cf. extracts from the *Deutsche Kolonialzeitung* being translated into English celebrating the thirtieth anniversary of the German Colonial Society: Anon., German view on colonisation: extracts from German sources, *Journal of the African Society*, 14 (1914), pp. 40–52.
- 42 Cf. anon., The German colonies, *The Times*, 11 October 1902, p. 7.
- 43 See *Revue Coloniale Internationale* 1 (1885) for the international character of the journal. For Pieter van der Lith see Lith, *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek vol. 8* (Leiden 1911–37), p. 1063.
- 44 Cf. Pieter van der Lith and Arnold Pistorius, *De grondslagen voor het British-Indisch beheer* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1876); Pieter van der Lith, Bombay onder het bestuur van Lord Reay, *De Gids* 56 (1892).
- 45 On Asmis see Bettina Brockmeyer, Der Kolonialbeamte Rudolf Asmis, in: Rebekka Habermas and Alexandra Przyrembel (eds), *Von Käfern, Märkten und Menschen:*

- Kolonialismus und Wissen in der Moderne* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), pp. 84–94.
- 46 The German article, W. Asmis, Eingeborenenrecht und Eingeborenenpolitik in der Goldküste und in Nigerien, *Koloniale Rundschau* (1912), pp. 678–706, was translated and published as W. Asmis, Law and policy: relating to the Natives of the Gold Coast and Nigeria, *Journal of the African Society*, 12 (1912/13), pp. 17–51.
- 47 Cf. Ulrike Lindner, The transfer of European social policy concepts to tropical Africa, 1900–50: the example of maternal and child welfare, *Journal of Global History*, 9 (2014), p. 211.
- 48 Cf. Wolfgang U. Eckart, *Medizin und Kolonialimperialismus: Deutschland 1884–1945* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1997), pp. 340–1.
- 49 Cf. Christoph Gradmann, *Krankheit im Labor: Robert Koch und die medizinische Bakteriologie* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2005), pp. 278–82.
- 50 See the discussion on tropical medicine and hygiene during the first session of the institute: ICI (ed.), *Compte-Rendu des Séances Tenues à Bruxelles les 28 et 29 Mai 1894* (Brussels: Typographie-Lithographie Populaire 1894), pp. 43–69.
- 51 van Laak, *Imperiale Infrastruktur*, p. 243.
- 52 Cf. B.S. Hoyle, *Gillmann of Tanganyika 1882–1946: The Life and Work of a Pioneer Geographer* (Aldershot: Avebury, 1987), pp. 47–53, 56.
- 53 Cf. Hoyle, *Gillmann*, pp. 85–6.
- 54 Cf. Rhodes House, Oxford, MSS Afr.s.900 (1), Clement Gillman, History of Tanganyika Railway, 1921; cf. also Hoyle, *Gillmann*, pp. 198–332.
- 55 Cf. Singaravelou, Les stratégies, pp. 149–150. See also Pierre Singaravelou, *Professeur L'Empire. Les Science coloniales en France sous la III^e République* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 2011).
- 56 Cf. ICI (ed.), *Bibliothèque Coloniale Internationale, no. 5: Les Chemins de fer aux colonies et dans les pays neufs* (Brussels et al.: Établissements généraux d'Imprimerie et al., 3 vols. 1900–1); ICI (ed.), *Bibliothèque coloniale internationale, no. 6: Le régime minier aux colonies* (Brussels et al.: Établissements généraux d'Imprimerie et al., 3 vols. 1902–3); ICI (ed.), *Bibliothèque coloniale internationale, no. 7: Les différents systèmes d'Irrigation* (Brussels et al.: Établissements généraux d'Imprimerie et al., 4 vols. 1906–9).
- 57 Cf. ICI (ed.), *Compte-Rendu des Séances tenues à Bruxelles les 28 et 29 Mai 1894*, (Brussels: Établissements généraux d'Imprimerie, 1894) (in the following *Compte Rendu*, 1894). See p. 4: 'De créer des relations internationales entre les personnes qui s'occupent d'une façon suivie de l'étude du droit et de l'administration des colonies, hommes politiques, administrateurs, savants, – et de faciliter l'échange des idées et des connaissances spéciales entre hommes compétents.'
- 58 Cf. Singaravelou, Les stratégies, p.150.
- 59 See *Revue coloniale internationale*, 1 (1885). The first volume featured German, French and English articles by authors from many different colonial empires covering a wide variety of subjects.
- 60 Cf. Daviron, Mobilizing labour, p. 480; see for the development of the national colonial unions in continental Europe the chapter by Florian Wagner in this volume.
- 61 Cf. Singaravelou, Les stratégies, p.151; for the professions of the founding members see *Compte Rendu* 1894, pp. 21–5.
- 62 Cf. Thomas Baty, Lord Reay, *Journal of the Society of Comparative Legislation*, 13 (1912), pp. 9–10.
- 63 Cf. *Compte Rendu*, 1894, p. 21; *Compte Rendu*, 1912, p. 11; ICI (ed.), *Compte Rendu de la session tenue à Paris, les 17,18 et 19 mai 1921* (Brussels et al.: Établissements

- Généraux d'Imprimerie et al., 1921), (in the following *Compte Rendu* 1921), p. 13; ICI (ed.), *Compte Rendu de la XXI^e session tenue à Paris, les 5-6-7 mai 1931* (Brussels et al.: Établissements généraux d'Imprimerie et al., 1931), pp. 18–19.
- 64 1895 in The Hague, 1897 in Berlin, 1899 in Brussels, 1900 in Paris, 1901 again in The Hague, 1903 in London, 1904 in Wiesbaden, 1905 in Rome, 1907 in Brussels, 1908 in Paris, 1909 in The Hague, 1911 in Brunswick, 1912 in Brussels and 1913 in London. See for the locations of the conferences *Compte Rendu* 1894–1913.
- 65 Cf. *Compte Rendu*, 1894–1937.
- 66 For the publications of the ICI see ICI (ed.), *Bibliothèque Coloniale Internationale, no. 1: La main-d'œuvre aux colonies* (Paris: Armand Clon et Cie., 3 vols. 1895–7); ICI (ed.), *Bibliothèque Coloniale Internationale, no. 2: Les fonctionnaires coloniaux* (Brussels et al.: Adolph Mertens et al., 3 vols. 1897–1910); ICI (ed.), *Bibliothèque coloniale internationale, no. 3: Le régime foncier aux colonies* (Brussels et al.: Adolph Mertens et al., 6 vols. 1898–1905); ICI (ed.), *Bibliothèque Coloniale Internationale, no. 4: Le régime de protectorats* (Brussels et al.: Établissements généraux d'Imprimerie et al., 2 vols. 1899); ICI (ed.), *Bibliothèque Coloniale Internationale, no. 5: Les Chemins de fer aux colonies et dans les pays neufs* (Brussels et al.: Établissements généraux d'Imprimerie et al., 3 vols. 1900–1); ICI (ed.), *Bibliothèque coloniale internationale, no. 6: Le régime minier aux colonies* (Brussels et al.: Établissements généraux d'Imprimerie et al., 3 vols. 1902–3); ICI (ed.), *Bibliothèque Coloniale Internationale, no. 7: Les différents systèmes d'Irrigation* (Brussels et al.: Établissements généraux d'Imprimerie et al., 4 vols. 1906–9); ICI (ed.), *Bibliothèque coloniale internationale, no. 8: Les lois organiques des colonies* (Brussels et al.: Établissements généraux d'Imprimerie et al., 3 vols. 1906–27); ICI (ed.), *Bibliothèque Coloniale Internationale, no. 9: L'enseignement aux indigènes* (Brussels et al.: Établissements généraux d'Imprimerie et al., 2 vols. 1909–10); ICI (ed.), *Bibliothèque Coloniale Internationale, no. 10: Les droits de chasse dans les colonies et la conservation de la faune indigène* (Brussels et al.: Établissements généraux d'Imprimerie et al., 2 vols. 1911); ICI (ed.), *Bibliothèque coloniale internationale, no. 11: Le régime forestier aux colonies* (Brussels et al.: Établissements généraux d'Imprimerie et al., 3 vols. 1914).
- 67 Cf. ICI (ed.), *Bibliothèque Coloniale Internationale, no. 8: Les lois organiques des colonies* (Brussels et al.: Établissements généraux d'Imprimerie et al., 3 vols. 1906–27).
- 68 Cf. *Compte Rendu* 1900, p. 10: Bassett-Moore, professor of International Law at Columbia University, New York; Despagnet, professor of law at Bordeaux; Girault, professor of law at Poitiers; Leseur, professor of colonial law at Paris.
- 69 Cf. Karl Rathgen, ICI, in: Heinrich Schnee (ed.), *Deutsches Koloniallexikon*, vol. 2, (Leipzig 1920), p. 99.
- 70 See e.g. Ann Laura Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain. Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2009), pp. 158–60; see also von Hirschhausen, *People that Count*.
- 71 Cf. *Compte Rendu* 1894, pp. 35–7.
- 72 See e.g. ICI (ed.), *Bibliothèque Coloniale Internationale, no. 6: Le régime minier aux colonies* (Brussels et al.: Établissements généraux d'Imprimerie et al., 3 vols. 1902–3), vol. 1, pp. 9–10.
- 73 Cf. *Compte Rendu* 1894, p. 37.
- 74 Cf. Boettger, *Internationalismus*, p. 171.
- 75 Cf. *Compte Rendu* 1913, pp. 86–8.
- 76 Cf. Eingabe der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Eingeborenenschutz an den Reichstag und das Reichs-Kolonialamt, *Koloniale Rundschau*, 1914, pp. 129–32.
- 77 Cooper, Stoler, *Between Metropole and Colony*, p. 13.

- 78 Cf. Thomas Richards, *The Imperial Archive. Knowledge and the Fantasy of Empire* (London: Verso, 1993), p. 6.
- 79 Cf. *Compte Rendu*, 1894, p. 3: De faciliter et de répandre l'étude comparée de l'administration et du droit des colonies, mainly: 'différents systèmes de gouvernement des colonies, la législation coloniale and des ressources des diverses colonies, de leur régime économique et commercial'.
- 80 Cf. *Compte Rendu*, 1894, p. 3.
- 81 Daviron, 'Mobilizing labour', p. 499.
- 82 Cf. Böttger, Internationalismus und Kolonialismus, p.168.
- 83 Article 13 of the Regulations of the Institute, see *Compte Rendu*, 1894, p. 9.
- 84 See e.g. the longstanding negotiations between Britain and Germany on the drawing up of a definite frontier between Kenya and Tanzania. BAB, R 1001/6931, Vermerk über weiter bestehende Differenzen mit England wegen Grenzstreitigkeiten auf kolonialem Gebiet, 19 April 1904; BAB, R 1001/6936, Deutsch-englisches Abkommen vom 19.5.1909 über die endgültige Festlegung der Grenze zwischen Deutsch-Ostafrika und Uganda, 19 May 1909.
- 85 On the exchange of military knowledge between colonial powers see Ludwig von Estorff, *Wanderungen und Kämpfe in Südwestafrika, Ostafrika und Südafrika, 1894–1910* (Windhoek: John Meinert, 1968), pp. 91–6; Eckard Michels, Das Ostasiatische Expeditionskorps des Deutschen Reiches in China 1900/01, in: Tanja Bühner, Christian Stachelbeck and Dierk Walter (eds), *Imperialkriege von 1500 bis heute. Strukturen, Akteure, Lernprozesse* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2011), pp. 401–18.
- 86 ICI (ed.), *Compte-Rendu de la Session tenue à la Haye, les 9, 10, 11 et 12 septembre 1895* (Paris: Armand Clon et Cie., 1895), (in the following *Compte Rendu*, 1895), p. 41. 'Nos discussions ont pour but de faire une trêve à bien des malentendus, de combattre les préjugés. D'établir une entente cordiale entre les nations que nous représentons, d'améliorer le sort des populations de nos colonies.'
- 87 Cf. *Compte Rendu*, 1894, p. 6.
- 88 Articles 7 and 8 of the regulations, *Compte Rendu*, 1894, p. 7.
- 89 ICI (ed.), *Compte Rendu de la Session tenue à Bruxelles les 17, 18 et 19 juin 1907*, (Brussels et al.: Établissements généraux d'Imprimerie et al., 1907) (in the following *Compte Rendu*, 1907), pp. 13–17.
- 90 *Compte Rendu*, 1907, p. 14; *Compte Rendu*, 1912, p. 21; *Compte Rendu*, 1921, pp. 15, 21.
- 91 The discussions on internal colonization in Latin America and the colonial situation in European empires in the nineteenth century are still separate issues in contemporary research; on the lack of connections between these research areas see Enrique Dussel, C. Jáuregui and Mabel Moraña (eds), *Coloniality at Large: Latin America and the Postcolonial Debate* (Durham: Duke UP, 2008).
- 92 Cf. Jane Burbank and Frederick Cooper, *Empires in World History* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2010) or Stoler, McGranahan and Perdue, *Imperial Formations*; Jörn Leonhard and Ulrike von Hirschhausen (eds), *Comparing Empires: Encounters and Transfers in the Long Nineteenth Century* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011).
- 93 See *Compte Rendu*, 1894, pp. 23–5; *Compte Rendu*, 1895, p. 17; *Compte Rendu*, 1900, pp. 8–12; *Compte Rendu*, 1907; *Compte Rendu* 1912.
- 94 Cf. *Compte Rendu*, 1894, pp. 52–7; *Compte Rendu*, 1895, pp. 45–74.
- 95 *Compte Rendu*, 1895, p. 21, '[...] à cause de la diversité des systèmes de colonisation adoptés et pratiqués par les différentes nations européennes, à cause des différences de race et de caractère des populations auxquelles ces systèmes étaient appliqués; que ses divergences de race, de climat [...] de tirer des conclusions générales.'

- 96 Cf. *Compte Rendu*, 1907, p. 12; *Compte Rendu*, 1912, p. 43.
- 97 Cf. Lindner, *Koloniale Begegnungen*, pp. 43–9.
- 98 Cf. Daviron, Mobilizing labour, pp. 481–3.
- 99 Cf. *Compte Rendu*, 1907, p. 13.
- 100 See the member lists in the *Compte Rendu* of 1894, 1895, 1900, 1903, 1907, 1912.
- 101 Cf. ICI (ed.), *Status et Règlement, Liste de Membres, Listes de Publication*, (Brussels, 1931), p. 22.
- 102 Cf. Jong, Kolonialisme, pp. 50–1; Daviron, 'Mobilizing labour', p. 485.
- 103 Cf. Jong, Kolonialisme, pp. 45–6.
- 104 Cf. P.J. Cain, Economics and empire: the metropolitan context, in: Porter, *Oxford History*, pp. 42–5.
- 105 Cf. Robin J. Moore, Imperial India 1858–1914, in: Porter, *Oxford History*, pp. 441–2.
- 106 See ICI (ed.), *Compte Rendu de la session tenue à Bruxelles les 24, 25 et 26 mai 1920* (Bruxelles: Établissements Généraux d'Imprimerie, 1920) (in the following: *Compte Rendu*, 1920).
- 107 See ICI (ed.), *Compte Rendu de la session tenue à Rome les 22, 23 et 24 avril 1924* (Bruxelles: Établissements Généraux d'Imprimerie, 1924).
- 108 Cf. *Compte Rendu*, 1920, p. 29. The number of active delegates was limited to seventy with the following regulations: England: fourteen, Belgium: eight, Spain: two, USA: three, France: twelve, Italy: six, Netherlands: nine, Portugal: three, further countries: thirteen.
- 109 ICI (ed.), *Status et Règlement, Liste de Membres, Listes de Publication*, (Brussels: Établissements Généraux d'Imprimerie, 1931), p. 33.
- 110 Cf. Joanna Lewis, *Empire State-Building. War & Welfare in Kenya 1925–52*, (Oxford: James Currey, 2000), pp. 25–6; Vernon Marston Hewitt, Empire, international development & the concept of good government, in: Mark R. Duffield and Vernon Marston Hewitt (eds) *Empire, Development & Colonialism: The Past in the Present* (Woodbridge: Currey, 2009), pp. 30–44.
- 111 Cf. Daviron, Mobilizing labour, p. 497.
- 112 See for the history of the ILO Daniel Maul, *Menschenrechte, Entwicklung und Dekolonisation – Die Internationale Arbeitsorganisation (IAO) 1940–1970*, (Essen: Klartext, 2007).
- 113 Cf. Michael Worboys, The discovery of malnutrition between the wars, in: David Arnold (ed.), *Imperial Medicine and Indigenous Societies*; (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1988), pp. 210–11.
- 114 Cf. Tilley, *Africa*, pp. 177–81.
- 115 ICI (ed.), *Compte Rendu de la XXIIe session tenue à Paris les 5-6-7 et 8 mai 1931* (Bruxelles: Établissements Généraux d'Imprimerie, 1931).
- 116 Cf. Veronika Lipphardt and David Ludwig, Wissens- und Wissenschaftstransfer, in: Institute for European History (IEG) Mainz (ed.), *Europäische Geschichte Online (EGO)*, 2011-09-28. URL: <http://www.ieg.-ego.eu/lipphardt-ludwigd-2011-de>.
- 117 Cf. Herren, *Internationale Organisationen*.
- 118 Cf. Ann Laura Stoler and Carole McGranahan, Introduction: refiguring imperial terrains, in: Stoler, McGranahan, Perdue, *Imperial Formations*, p. 12.
- 119 Cf. Edward Said, *Orientalism*. Reprint with a new Preface, (London: Penguin 2003), pp. 44–5.