Introduction: Approaching Different Colonial Settings

Nadin Heé / Ulrike Schaper

Historical research on colonialist enterprises in different parts of the world is *en vogue*. One reason for this attention is a new search for the origins of today's globalising processes, of which colonialism is seen as one of the starting points. Having long been designed within the analytic framework of the nation state, historical research has recently suggested that solely national approaches are insufficient to analyse these potentially global relations and has consequently drawn its attention to the exchanges and interactions between colonial regimes, colonising and colonised societies and the common context of a colonial global order. This attention to global entanglements and the search for their early manifestations thus resulted in an adaptation of transnational approaches to the history of colonialism, approaches that try to overcome the nation state as the organising principle of historical narratives.[1] The methodological debate on how transnational histories of colonialisms should be written drew attention to comparisons, transfers and intertwinements between colonies and colonising powers.[2]

---

1   S. Conrad / G. Budde / O. Janz (eds.), Transnationale Geschichte. Themen, Tendenzen und Theorien, Göttingen 2006.
2   S. Randeria, Geteilte Geschichten und verwobene Moderne, in: J. Rüsen / H. Leitgeb / N. Jegelka (eds.), Zukunftsentwürfe. Idee für eine Kultur der Veränderung, Frankfurt am Main 1999, pp. 87-96; S. Conrad/S. Randeria, Einleitung. Geteilte Geschichten – Europa in einer postkolonialen Welt, in: S. Conrad / S. Randeria (eds.), Jenseits des Eurozentrismus. Postkoloniale Perspektiven in den Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften, Frankfurt am Main / New York 2002, pp. 9-49; J. Osterhammel, Geschichtswissenschaft jenseits des Nationalstaats. Studien zu Beziehungsgeschichte und Zivilisationsvergleich, Göttingen 2001.

Only reluctantly do historians try to realise such programmatic demands in empirical case studies. The new methodological challenges are accompanied by many practical and institutional problems: Research requires the ability to read several different languages, the knowledge of a broad historical context (in the worst case the whole world), and familiarity with the different local histories and cultures of the regions incorporated in the analysis. Expensive and time-consuming archival sojourns in different countries can be necessary to find the relevant sources and literature. Moreover, the outline of the research agendas is often structured by disciplinary limitations. Research on non-European history is – at least in Germany – often still left to Area Studies and not situated within History departments.

Nevertheless, in colonial history first attempts have been made to include comparative, transnational approaches. Such studies, for example, compare different colonial powers or the effects of colonialism in different areas[3] or inquire into relations between metropole and the periphery.[4] The attention to transnational processes has also sharpened the awareness of interactions between colonial powers and knowledge transfers between colonising and colonised cultures, as well as between colonising powers.[5]

To address the concerns of such works and reconcile methodological demands and empirical research, this collection – as an intermediate step – uses the expertise of researchers who study different colonial systems. To contribute on the one hand to the comparison of different colonial powers and on the other hand to shed light on the entangled nature of colonial histories, this volume assembles several case studies on the organisation of colonial rule. It thus unites perspectives on different colonial settings (Germany, imperial Russia, Japan, the United States, Great Britain), in the late 19th and early 20th century, the era which C. A. Bayly describes as "New Imperialism".[6] To prepare the ground for further comparisons and analogies, all case studies pose similar questions about the structure and organisation of colonial rule and the policies concerning the colonised popu-

---

3   Matthew Lange, James Mahoney and Matthias vom Hau examine the British and Spanish colonialism in economic perspective, see: M. Lange / J. Mahoney / M. v. Hau, Colonialism and Development: A Comparative Analysis of Spanish and British Colonies, in: The American Journal of Sociology, 111 (2006) 5, pp. 1412-1462. For a comparison of Russian domination in Samarkand and the British colonialism supplies, see: A. Morrison, Russian Rule in Samarkand 1868–1910: A Comparison with British India, New York 2008; Crawford Young compares colonialisms of different European powers in Africa, see: C. Young, The African Colonial State in Comparative Perspective, New Haven (Conn.) 1994.

4   A. L. Stoler / F. Cooper, Between Metropole and Colony: Rethinking a Research Agenda, in: id. (eds.), Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World, Berkeley 1997, pp. 1-57; B. Ashcroft / G. Griffiths / H. Tiffin, The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures, London 1989; A. Thompson, The Empire Strikes Back? The Impact of Imperialism on Britain from the Mid-Nineteenth Century, Harlow 2005.

5   One example, in which the German Empire is examined in a transnational perspective: S. Conrad / J. Osterhammel (eds.), Das Kaiserreich transnational. Deutschland in der Welt 1871–1914, Göttingen 2004. With the example of the East-Chinese railway, Urbansky analyses the colonial competition, exchanges and interactions of the three powers Russia, China and Japan, see: S. Urbansky, Kolonialer Wettstreit. Russland, China, Japan und die Ostchinesische Eisenbahn, Frankfurt am Main 2008. For the British Empire in India, see: B. S. Cohn, Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India, Princeton 1996.

6   C. A. Bayly, The Birth of the Modern World 1780–1914: Global Connections and Comparisons, Victoria 2004, especially pp. 227-234.

lation. Within recent debates on the heuristic use and value of the term "colonialism" concerning forms of domination not only in overseas territories but also in the margins of empires, scholars have drawn attention to different forms of colonial rule and structural similarities in various colonial situations.[7] In order to stimulate such discussions on the similarities and differences of colonialisms, this volume brings together various colonial settings which have not always been subsumed under the label of colonialism.[8] All cases presented include at least the occupation of alien territories as well as a notion of ethnic difference. Especially the case of the Soviet Union, whose classification as colonial is not clear and heavily debated in historiography, generates these questions.[9] By using the example of Great Britain, this collection includes one of the older colonial powers with a long colonial experience, which often functioned as a model of colonial rule for other imperial powers. In contrast, Germany, the United States, Russia and Japan, are examples of "late comers" to the colonial enterprise. Within the mutual perceptions and assessments of the colonial powers, the United States and Japan tried to develop a counter-model, thus distinguishing their colonial endeavours from the European form of colonialism, which they judged as immoral. Quite similarly, the Soviet Union criticised colonialism by linking it to the former Tsarist Empire and officially tried to overcome its colonial legacies.

All articles in this volume focus on state colonialism, administrative and governmental actors, and the different processes of establishing and maintaining colonial order. They examine different concepts, justifications and practices of dealing with the indigenous population. Policies that range from creating difference, conserving legal customs, and attempting to create a dual legal system, to abolishing 'uncivilised' customs, re-organising agricultural methods, and fostering education and modernisation can be subsumed under two basic strategies: a strategy of separation and a strategy of convergency.

Separation as a concept of dealing with the colonised population was closely connected to the constitution and construction of difference between the colonisers and the colonised. It stressed the necessity to distance the two groups in order to maintain colonial rule and culminated in segregational plans and actions. By the end of the 19th century

---

7   For a discussion on the definition of the terms colonialism and imperialism, see: R. J. C. Young, Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction, Oxford 2001, pp. 15-43; already Geyer for example describes the constitution of tsarist Russia as a form of colonialism, see: D. Geyer, Der russische Imperialismus. Studien über den Zusammenhang von innerer und auswärtiger Politik 1860–1914, Göttingen 1977, especially pp. 238-240; for the Japanese case some studies discussed the question whether the annexation of Hokkaido and Okinawa can already be considered as colonialism, see for example: T. Komagome, Shokuminchi teikoku nihon no bunka tôgô [The cultural unification in the Japanese colonial empire], Tokyo 1996.

8   For a definition of colonialism, see: J. Osterhammel, Kolonialismus. Geschichte – Formen – Folgen, München 1995, especially pp. 19-22; for a definition of imperialism versus colonialism, see pp. 26-28.

9   K. Adeeb, Backwardness and the Quest for Civilization: Early Soviet Central Asia in Comparative Perspective, in: Slavic Review, 65 (2006) 2, pp. 231-251; D. Kandiyoti, Post-Colonialism Compared: Potentials and Limitations in the Middle East and Central Asia, in: International Journal of Middle East Studies, 34 (2002) 2, pp. 279-297.

such measures were often motivated by racial theories and differences between the colonisers and the colonised related to the categories of biology and race.[10]

Convergency, in contrast, aimed in a broad sense at a decrease of perceived differences between colonisers and colonised. The attempted transformation was always conceptualised as a reduction of the colonised's inferiority. Disciplinary, educational and civilising measures were thus seen as part of 'uplifting' the colonised. Most consistently realised, convergency resulted in policies of assimilation.[11] Transformational approaches were embedded in the discourse of a civilising mission. The idea of 'civilising' was one of the key concepts in modern colonial discourse and formed an important often legitimating point of reference within the negotiations on dealing with the colonised population.[12]

The contributions in this volume discuss how both converging and separating tendencies were inscribed into 'native policies' and the various ways to deal with the indigenous populations. This volume tries to explore the tense relation between these two concepts, which nevertheless are both based on a hierarchical difference between the colonisers and the colonised in which the latter is devalued. Various explanations and scientific models rationalised the inferiority of the colonised in relation to their development, state of civilisation and 'race'. Such explanations had an impact on both separating and converging measures. The connection between racial differentiation and segregating policies are evident and well researched.[13] However, the question remains as to how these ideological distinctions were undermined by political necessities and as to how the sharp distinction between colonisers and colonised was blurred in the colony, for example in respect to local elites or indigenous employees of the colonial administration.[14] In contrast, the interference of civilising attempts with other aspects of 'native policy' has not been examined to a satisfactory extent, even though the topic of the civilising mission has attracted much attention in recent historiographical debate.[15] Particularly the often mutual constitutive relationship of civilising missions and racisms needs to be explored further.

---

10   M. Adas, Machines as the Measure of Men: Science, Technology, and Ideologies of Western Dominance, Ithaca / London 1989, p. 339.

11   Two examples for assimilation policies that are not included in this volume are the cases of French and Portuguese colonialism.

12   J. Osterhammel, Kolonialismus (footnote 8), 1995, p. 20.

13   See for example: C. Anderson, Legible Bodies: Race, Criminality and Colonialism in South Asia, Oxford 2004, D. Thomas, Black France: Colonialism, Immigration, and Transnationalism, Bloomington 2006, A. Warwick, Colonial pathologies: American tropical medicine, race and hygiene in the Philippines, Durham 2006.

14   F. Cooper, Conflict and Connection: Rethinking Colonial African History, in: The American Historical Review, 99 (1994) 5, pp. 1516-1545; M. M.-C. Lo, Doctors within Borders: Profession, Ethnicity, and Modernity in Colonial Taiwan, Berkeley Los Angeles London 2002, W. Ernst, et. al. (eds.), India's Princely States: People, Princes and Colonialism, London / New York 2007.

15   M. Adas, Machines as the Measure (footnote 10); L. Pyenson, Civilizing Mission: Exact Sciences and French Overseas Expansion, 1830–1940, Baltimore 1993; B. Barth / J. Osterhammel (eds.), Zivilisierungsmissionen. Imperiale Weltverbesserung seit dem 18. Jahrhundert, Konstanz 2005; H. Fischer-Tiné/M. Mann (eds.), Colonialism as Civilizing Mission: Cultural Ideology in British India, London 2004; A. Conklin, A Mission to Civilize: The Republican Idea of Empire in France and West Africa, 1895–1930, Stanford 1998; S. Malinowski, Modernisierungskriege. Militärische Gewalt und koloniale Modernisierung im Algerienkrieg (1954–1962), in: Archiv für Sozialgeschichte, 48 (2008), pp. 213-248; N. Berman, Impossible Missions? German Economic, Military, and Humanitarian Efforts in Africa, Lincoln / London 2004.

Some historians see a civilising mission which builds on potential equality as logically incompatible with racism, because the latter is based on indelible biological difference.[16] Others judge racism as a phenomenon which is integrated into civilising practices in the colony but is not part of the essence of the civilising mission. Racism, in this view, undermines the civilising mission.[17] Furthermore, excessive violence in this perspective is seen as a reaction to the failure of civilising attempts rather than a part of them; a "change" takes place in which liberation transforms into force, a conversion from exercising benevolent influence to using physical violence. But this is only convincing if a very narrow concept of biological racism based on the idea of immutability of different polygenetic human races and a concept of civilising with the concrete goal of complete equality are taken for granted. But the empirical material shows complex connections between civilising attempts and racialisation, which are, in regard to the historical situations, fairly unidimensional. Such definitions distract the attention from the question of how civilising efforts were intertwined with racialisations which manifested in processes of defining and signifying characteristics and actions of certain groups in relation to the concept of race,[18] categorisations of human beings, social Darwinist ideas and concepts of relative development.

By simply opposing racism and civilising mission, and herewith stressing the mutual exclusiveness of these two concepts, one could fail to acknowledge the specific relation of the different racialising, devaluating, deviating, segregating efforts and the educational, 'uplifting', developing efforts. In analysing these ambiguous attempts, it is necessary to conceptualise their relation as more complex than simply a binary opposition. Moreover, the question arises whether intellectual processes and social practices which rest on essentialised cultural and ethnic categories and reassign inferiority to the colonial other should be called racist, in a wider sense. In his work on concepts of racism, Robert Miles sees race thinking and ideas of civilisation in the 19th century as mutually developing. Concepts of civilisation and barbarism, he states, pre-shaped the space for racialised thinking. At the same time racialisations actualised and nurtured the concepts of civilisation and barbarism.[19] As empirical studies have shown, the lack of understanding of the political strategies of the colonised could even lead to an increase in biologistic explanations of cultural differences as a consequence of the frustration toward the inconvincible 'natives'.[20]

---

16 B. Barth, Die Grenzen der Zivilisierungsmission. Rassenvorstellungen in den europäischen Siedlungskolonien Virginia, den Burenrepubliken und Deutsch-Südwestafrika, in: B. Barth / J. Osterhammel (eds.), Zivilisierungsmissionen (footnote 15), pp. 201-228, here p. 203.

17   J. Osterhammel, "The Great Work of Uplifting Mankind". Zivilisierungsmission und Moderne, in: B. Barth / J. Osterhammel (eds.), Zivilisierungsmissionen (footnote 15), pp. 363-425, here p. 371; J. Osterhammel, Europe, the "West" and the Civilizing Mission, London 2006, p. 31.

18 See: R. Miles, Racialization, in: E. Cashmore, Encyclopedia of Race and Ethnic Studies, London 2004, pp. 348-349.

19 R. Miles, Rassismus. Theorie und Geschichte eines Begriffes, Hamburg/Berlin 1999 [1991], p. 46.

20 C. Marx, Kolonialkrieg und rassistische Dämonologie – Das südliche Afrika im 19. Jahrhundert, in: M. Dabag/H. Gründer / U.-K. Ketelsen (eds.), Kolonialismus: Kolonialdiskurs und Genozid, München 2004, pp. 167-184, here p. 184; J. Osterhammel, Europe (footnote 17), p. 31, stresses that civilising missions were undermined by racism

However, the possible inclusion of racisms into civilising efforts does not say that the attempt to civilise was always built on strict biological race thinking.[21] As different works on civilising missions have pointed out, biologistic racism was not the only, and sometimes not even, an important factor in establishing the superiority of the colonial powers over the colonised.[22] Devaluation of the 'other', which referred to cultural or ethnic differences within the civilising discourse, can only be included in a wider concept of racism.[23] On the other hand, widening the term of racism too much endangers its value as an analytic tool. If every devaluation is automatically called racism, then there is no possibility of differentiating between various explanations for difference when referring to culture as well as biology. In addition, too wide a concept of racism leaves no opportunity to distinguish between racialisation as a concept of difference and discriminating practices. Rather than excluding racisms from civilising attempts, it is more fruitful for historical analysis to differentiate between various racisms and analytically specify if racist thought or racist practices are relevant for the civilising context. To draw attention to various forms of racism is even more important since at the end of the 19th century different forms of racial thinking existed and the usage of the term "race" was incoherent and contradictory.[24] Civilising missions were not always directed towards people that were defined as racially different (see Teichmann, Heé in this volume). In the Japanese case, however, the objective of the self civilisation as well as the civilisation of the colonised was to achieve the level of civilisation of the 'white race', and therefore was linked with ideas of racial categorisation. Especially where civilising missions were not only directed towards the colonies but also towards the metropole, racial difference as a motive for transformation played an inferior role. These cases, which included the transfer of civilising concepts to the underdogs of the colonising societies, are at the same time persuasive examples of how colonialism shaped both the colonised and the colonising societies and how impulses went in both directions.[25]

Following such considerations it becomes clear that the relation of racialisation and segregation, indirect rule, and the necessity for the colonisers to create governable colonial subjects remains an important task of historiographical research. Closely connected to

---

because of the perceived unalterable inability of the people in need of civilisation.

21   Adas, for example, states the role of "racism in its more restricted sense" in the intellectual discourse has to be re-evaluted, see: M. Adas, Machines as the Measure (footnote 10), p. 274.

22   See: M. Mann, Torchbearers upon the Path of Progress: Britain's Ideology of a 'Moral and Material Progress' in India: An Introductory Essay, in: H. Fischer-Tiné / M. Mann (eds.), Colonialism as Civilizing Mission (footnote 15), pp. 1-26, here p. 22; M. Adas, Machines as the Measure (footnote 10), pp. 338-339. Nina Berman has pointed out, that actions which were motivated by the wish to 'help' and 'develop' often produced similar domination to those actions motivated by openly racist concepts, see: N. Berman, Impossible Missions (footnote 15), p. 3.

23   For an overview on debates on the definition of racism, see: R. Miles, Rassismus (footnote 19).

24   Adas has pointed out, that in the civilising discourse race was a vague category that was used in different ways sometimes even by the same author, see: M. Adas, Machines as the Measure (footnote 10), pp. 272-273; for the development of racial thinking, see: W. Conze, Rasse, in: O. Brunner / W. Conze / R. Koselleck, Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe, v. 5, Stuttgart 1984, pp. 135-178.

25   S. Conrad, "Eingeborenenpolitik" in Kolonie und Metropole. "Erziehung zur Arbeit" in Ostafrika und Ostwestfalen, in: S. Conrad / J. Osterhammel (eds.), Das Kaiserreich (footnote 5), pp. 107-128; M. Mann, Torchbearers (footnote 22), pp. 14-17.

this problem remains the question of violence and its entanglement with the ideology and practise of civilising. Gyan Prakash states in his work on (post)-colonial relations that the "myth of the civilising mission" found its "perverse expressions" in "racist stereotyping and exploitation of blacks" and the spread of "civic virtue with military power".[26] The claim of universality was qualified in the colonies "due to a functioning of colonial power as a form of transaction and translation between incommensurable cultures and positions".[27] Violence thus does not appear as a degeneration of the civilising thought but can be seen as closely connected and partly consequential to civilising missions.

Following these reflections the articles in this volume address violence in the colonial setting, mainly in the form of penalisation through corporal punishment. Violence was used for the purpose of maintaining colonial order and disciplining the colonised. Delving deeper, the articles ask whether such violence should be understood as a substantial transformation of the idea of civilising or whether devaluations should be conceptualised as inherent to the civilising mission. Violence is included in the context of the civilising mission, which evolves out of a chauvinistic universalisation of one's own cultural values and practices. Physical violence in this sense could be understood as the transformation of disrespect for the 'other', and subordination and actual violent acts could be assessed as a consequence of the latent epistemic violence.[28] Colonial powers interpreted resistance against civilising attempts as a legitimation to use violent means to punish people who did not embrace the, in the eyes of the civiliser, benevolent civilisation and then to force them under it. Violent actions against the colonised thus could be read as the consequence of the epistemic violence of devaluating the 'other'.

Another crucial aspect in the concept of civilising was the idea of a gradual development of cultures in reference to evolutionistic ideas, which brought the consideration of long periods of human history into perspective. In the case of colonialism 'civilisation' often served as a justification of colonial expansion and was reduced to a rhetoric figure.[29] The civilising mission is characterised by an ambiguous tension between rhetoric and realisation which can also be addressed in order to pose questions about the relationship of discourse and practices. Some articles in this volume address this issue in discussing how abstractly the goal of the civilising mission was formulated and how far the moment of realising civilisatory ideas was postponed to the future (especially Schaper, Schumacher).

As Matsuzaki shows in his reflections on comparative analysis of colonial states, functions of law mark a difference between the nation state and the colonial state. The importance of law for the institutionalisation of colonial rule, as well as its interference with ideas of civilising legal questions, is taken up by Schaper, Heé, and Lindner. They

---

26   G. Prakash, Introduction: After Colonialism, in: id. (ed.), After Colonialism: Imperial Histories and Postcolonial Displacements, Princeton 1994, pp. 3-17, here p. 4.

27   Ibid., p. 3.

28   S. Hofmann, Die Konstruktion kolonialer Wirklichkeit. Eine diskursanalytische Untersuchung französischer Karibiktexte des 17. Jahrhunderts, Frankfurt am Main 2001, p. 79.

29   M. Mann, Torchbearers (footnote 22), pp. 5-10.

explore transcultural processes of the transformation of law in the context of civilising discourse, reflecting on the attempts to enforce cultural transformation with the help of legal regulations and the abolishment of 'uncivilised' practices ranging from marital regulations to practices of punishment. They also show that law was not only an instrument of transformation; laws also appeared as an instrument of governance upon which racialisations were inscribed. Thus, law and legal practices functioned to transport and implement devaluations of the colonised and civilising efforts and converted abstract concepts into practices of governance.

The shape of colonial rule was determined by national as well as local factors and their specific interplay. Some of the articles examine the significance of such national and local factors including transfer processes of knowledge, mutual imitations between colonising powers and refinements of each other's concepts (see Lindner, Schumacher, Heé). In this context, the contribution of the local populations and elites to the process of shaping the case-specific constitution of colonial domination is an important aspect, to which Schaper pays special attention.

Another important factor for the self-definition of colonial rulers has been the policies concerning the colonised population, a topic which will be addressed in all contributions. The development of a counter-model of colonialism in the United States, Russia and Japan was, for example, centred on the idea of a more benevolent treatment of the colonised population than in European colonialism. Especially the Japanese case shows how the counter-model to European colonialism resulted into a double-bind civilising mission towards the in- and outside. The search for an alternative colonialism has to be seen within the context of debates on a specific Japanese way of modernisation.[30] However, the Japanese as well as the Russian case demonstrates the twisted ways in which the political elites and colonial planners perceived the entanglement of Western modernisation with colonial expansionism.[31] The search for a counter-model remained captive within the Western discourse of modernisation against which it was directed (Heé, Schumacher and Teichmann). In reciprocal assessments of colonial powers, Great Britain appears to have been the most prominent role model for all later colonial enterprises. Even the United States and Japan, who tried to distinguish their practices from European colonialism, still followed the British example.

A theoretical contribution to this volume (Matsuzaki) takes up the question of defining characteristics of colonial rule by reflecting on the areas of political negotiation which shape the colonial state in the specific historical setting. Building on the findings of the case studies, he contributes to the methodological discussion on comparative colonial history.

---

30   For the concept of multiple modernities, see: S. N. Eisenstadt, Vielfältige Modernen, in: Zeitschrift für Weltgeschichte, 2 (2001), pp. 9-33.

31   For Russia and the Soviet Union, see: W. Sunderland, The 'Colonial Question'. Visions of Colonization in Late Imperial Russia, in: Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas, 48 (2000) 2, pp. 210-232; A. Edgar, Bolshevism, Patriarchy, and the Nation. The Soviet 'Emancipation' of Muslim Women in Pan-Islamic Perspective, in: Slavic Review, 65 (2006) 2, pp. 252-272, for the Japanese case there are no studies focusing on this question.

The case studies of this volume discuss the questions of convergency and separation through the following specific issues:

Ulrike Schaper in her article on German colonialism examines legal discussions and practices surrounding the 'native law' and 'native courts' in Cameroon from 1884 until 1914. She shows how law and jurisdiction were understood as a means of 'native policy'. Political measures were shaped by the tension between the alignment of indigenous legal customs towards European values and the maintenance of order, which included the conservation of local customs. In her analysis she asks how the colonised undermined legal measures and how far the colonial legal policy in Cameroon was shaped by their interventions and actions. She elaborates upon how within the rhetoric of civilising a long term perspective which postpones the civilising to a vague future appears as a sign of the discrepancy between discourse and practice.

Christian Teichmann poses the question if and for what period politics in Russian Central Asia can be understood as colonial. Focusing on prominent Bolshevik leaders of the1920s and 1930s he examines the Soviet policy in Central Asia as a 'civilising mission' to overcome Russian colonial racism, on the one hand, and destroying Central Asian 'traditional' lifestyle and economy, on the other hand. To this end, the re-structuring of cotton production as a means to centralise economic control and to force collectivisation is identified as a civilising mission. As widely known, collectivisation and monoculture were main characteristics of the Soviet economy throughout the country (and not only Central Asia) – it is in this context that the question arises whether 'colonialism' is the appropriate label to describe the Soviet endeavour.

In the next contribution *Nadin Heé* examines the penal system in Japan as well as different forms of punishment in the Japanese colony of Taiwan. In this context she draws attention to a civilising mission, which is both directed towards the outside (the colony) and the inside (Japanese society) between the 1850s and 1900s. Heé highlights attempts of self-civilisation and self-modernisation by the Japanese government which aimed at a reform of the Japanese penal code and first followed Chinese and later European law in order to prove Japanese 'civilisation' to Western powers. In particular, she assesses the prohibition and reintroduction of the penal practice of flogging in Taiwan in relation to debates on civilising the Taiwanese. Finally, she explores the construction of prisons in Taiwan and Japan as a marker to prove the degree of the state's civilisation.

Frank Schumacher argues that the American way of colonial empire in the early 20th century was strongly shaped by the appropriation of European, in particular British, models of colonial governance. His analysis of U.S. colonial state-building in the Philippines questions the notion of exceptionalism and demonstrates the intensity and depth of this transatlantic inter-imperial dialogue in which the British experience of empire provided an intellectual framework for emerging American discourses on the intricacies of colonial rule.

Ulrike Lindner compares British and German concepts and practices of colonial rule in Africa. She examines the similarities and differences in the colonial concepts of the two colonial powers in respect to national characteristics and local conditions. Under

the focus of debates on "mixed marriages" she examines race policies in German and English colonies. In tracing the mutual perceptions and the beginning cooperation and exchanges of knowledge between colonial powers, for example the excursions of members of the colonial government to other colonies, she finally draws the picture of the formation of a European colonial archive and system of collaboration in colonial rule before World War I.

Finally, *Reo Matsuzaki* deepens the methodological discussion on the comparison of different colonial settings. He argues that researchers should move away from empires as the primary units of analysis and instead place the colonial state in the centre of their investigations; in doing so, the diverse conditions and histories of colonised territories can be related. Second, he discusses how we can take the concrete examples of individual cases to a more conceptual level by comparing three different political arenas of the colonial state in order to identify the mechanisms that structured the interactions between the colonial state and other key players within each arena. To develop and strengthen his theoretical analyses he incorporates the results of the other authors and thus draws the first comparative conclusions.

This volume explores determining factors for the concept and implementation of colonial rule and exchanges between and entanglements of colonising powers. The different contributions come to new results within the historiographical discussions of their respective fields. They occasionally also highlight relations and knowledge transfers between the colonising powers, which are examined in this volume. Between the contributions, connections and entanglements of colonising powers become apparent. By focusing on one aspect of colonial policies, this volume thus strives to stimulate attempts to relate and synthesise findings on different colonial settings as well as methodological reflections on comparative and transnational approaches on colonialisms and empirical research.