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THE PEDAGOGY OF COLONIAL VIOLENCE: LAW, MORALITY AND POLICY IN IMPERIAL INTERVENTIONS
Partha Chatterjee, Columbia University

This paper offers a genealogy of contemporary practices of global power that goes back to 19th-century imperialism.

1 Utilitarian philosophers of the early 19th century introduced a conceptual framework for the comparative evaluation of all governments everywhere. Techniques of normalization justified imperial intervention to bring backward or deviant states to global norms through the pedagogy of violence and the pedagogy of culture.

2 The law of nations emerged in Europe with an assumption of equal sovereignty of the major states among whom the balance of power had to be maintained.

3 The comparative methods of norm and deviation allowed for the classification of non-European cultures by degrees of civilization and hence of morality.

4 Graded sovereignty allowed imperial powers to use legally authorized violence against non-European peoples in order to carry out the subsequent project of cultural education.

This paper will illustrate this argument with a historical account of the annexation of Awadh in 1856.

Partha Chatterjee is a political theorist and historian. He studied at Presidency College in Calcutta, and received his Ph.D. from the University of Rochester. He divides his time between Columbia University and the Centre for Studies in Social Sciences, Calcutta, where he was the Director from 1997 to 2007. He is the author of more than 20 books, monographs and edited volumes and is a founding member of the Subaltern Studies Collective. He was awarded the Fukuoka Asian Culture Prize for 2009 for outstanding achievements in the field of Asian studies. His books include: The Politics of the Governed: Considerations on Political Society in Most of the World (2004); A Princely Impostor? The Strange and Universal History of the Kumar of Bhawal (2002); A Possible India: Essays in Political Criticism (1997); The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories (1993), and Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse? (1993). He is also a poet, playwright, and actor. In the Mira Nair film The Namesake (2007), he played the role of “A Reformed Hindoo.”
Violence was an enduring problem on Australia’s century-long colonial frontiers, arising from endemic confrontation between Aboriginal people and settlers, particularly relating to threats to settler property and stock. From colony to colony and from decade to decade, various colonial governments were confronted with the contradictions between settler demands for swift retribution against Aboriginal ‘crime’ and the principles and policies of a humanitarian Empire that demanded equal treatment for Aboriginal people as subjects of the Crown. In response to this dilemma, colonial governments implemented punitive policing strategies designed to bring Aboriginal people within the effective reach of British jurisdiction. These strategies included native policing and magisterial powers of summary punishment, which were applied only to Aboriginal people. Importantly, they were conceived not just as solutions to the immediate causes of frontier violence, but also as long-term ‘civilising’ measures that would further the objectives of a humanely-administered Empire.

Drawing upon examples from the 1840s to the end of the nineteenth century, this paper will focus on native policing and corporal punishment as two forms of legally-sanctioned, state-administered violence intended to bring law and order to the frontier. As legitimised forms of violence, these strategies reflect some of the different responses colonial governments deployed to address the recurring problems of the frontier, and they reveal the extent of tensions that underpinned imperatives to ‘civilise’ Aboriginal people on the one hand and to punish Aboriginal ‘crime’ on the other.
**Amanda Nettelbeck** is a Professor in the School of Humanities at the University of Adelaide. She has published widely on the history of the settler frontier. She and Robert Foster are co-authors of three books, including Out of the Silence: The History and Memory of South Australia’s Frontier Wars (2012) and In the Name of the Law: William Willshire and the Policing of the Australian Frontier (2007). A new collaborative book, Fragile Settlements: Aboriginal Peoples, Law and Resistance in south-west Australia and prairie Canada, is forthcoming with UBC Press. Amanda is a Chief Investigator on two projects currently supported by the Australia Research Council: ‘Protection and Punishment: colonial networks and the legal reform of indigenous people 1837-1911’ and ‘Intimacy and Violence in Anglo Pacific Rim settler colonial societies’.

---

**Lyndall Ryan** is Conjoint Research Professor in the Centre for the History of Violence at the University of Newcastle, Australia. Her most recent books include *Tasmanian Aborigines: A History since 1803* (2012), and *Theatres of Violence: Massacre, Mass Killing and Atrocity throughout History* (2012), co-edited with Philip Dwyer. She currently holds two Australian Research Council: ‘Frontier violence in Australia 1788-1960’; and ‘Intimacy and Violence in Anglo Pacific Rim settler colonial societies’. She is currently serving the final year of a three-year term as a member of the ARC College of Humanities and Creative Arts.

Find out more about Lyndall’s work at newcastle.edu.au/profile/lyndall-ryan.
How are we to understand the widespread settler violence against indigenous peoples in the British empire of the early nineteenth century? I do not mean the military campaigns or the official salutary terror that the British state frequently launched against indigenous peoples, but the commonplace, quotidian, violence that was a constant feature of the new settler colonies in the antipodes. Sometimes legitimated by the State, sometimes ignored by the State, and sometimes abhorred by the colonial authorities, the consequences of this violence could be dramatic—as local studies in Australia have shown. The place of violence in the making of Empire was discretely forgotten by subsequent generations of historians and publics alike. But it was a widely recognized aspect of the British imperial presence in the early nineteenth century. Colonial officials knew its extent, missionaries raised their voices in vain against its atrocities, and pondered its meaning; it was extensively described in published commentary on the empire until the middle of the century. The Victorian conscience was shocked by its incidence because it subverted the proclaimed values of liberal society and denied the idea of the civilizing mission of the empire. Drawing mainly upon examples from Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, this paper will address the dynamics of settler violence. It will pose two big questions.

First, what were the subjectivities of this form of colonial violence? How may we understand its behavioral dynamic? I am interested in the psychology of settler violence and how it interacts with and informs some of the themes of imperial culture in the period of the early nineteenth century. So, I will suggest that violence was closely connected with ignorance and rumor, with fear and vulnerability, with volatile and unstable feelings about indigenous peoples. In this respect, the early nineteenth-century Empire was a fragile, disordered place, not an imperial hegemon.

The second question the paper will ask has to do with what these subjectivities can tell us about the key question of how Liberalism relates to Empire. More specifically, what can we learn about the mechanisms liberal societies employ to explain Empire and its accompanying qualities to themselves? This is hardly a mere historical problem; it is an issue that continues to haunt liberal societies. But it was a particularly acute tension of empire within the “humanitarian” discourse of the early nineteenth century when Empire was seen as a liberating and not a repressive force.
The paper will, therefore, explore the strategies that were used to prevent the violence from destabilizing the normative values of Liberalism. It will use individual stories and more general themes to identify, for example, narratives of displacement that were developed to contain the violence within the imperial culture of the time. And it will explore the different regimes of silence and denial that have marked the treatment of colonial violence since the early nineteenth century in the imperial culture of Britain and in its historiography.

Richard N. Price is Professor of History at the University of Maryland, College Park. He has written on British labor and social history and the British Empire. His most recent book *Making Empire: Colonial Encounters and the Creation of Imperial Rule in Nineteenth Century Africa* (Cambridge, 2008) won the 2009 Albion Prize for the best book in post-1750 British History from the North American Conference on British Studies. He is currently working on a book manuscript titled *Liberalism and Empire: Histories and Legacies*. 
While a broad range of scholarship has begun to emerge on the history of colonial violence, such scholarship focuses primarily upon episodic violence and upon the violence inflicted by European colonizers, rather than upon the quotidian violence through which colonial power was perpetuated – and that was, crucially, enacted not only by Europeans or their agents but by the colonized upon each other. Moreover, the complex nature of colonial violence – encompassing not just ‘hard’ forms of power, but ‘soft’ forms generated through, for example, colonial economic or social policies – has garnered little historical or theoretical attention. This is also true of the actual impact of colonial violence upon the bodies of the colonized. Indeed, in spite of the blossoming of histories of gender, sexuality and the body in recent decades, the body itself – particularly the violated body – has been largely absent from such scholarship. In the work of Michel Foucault and much of the literature inspired by it the body has been largely taken for granted as an unproblematic biological given, rather than being seen as a form of knowledge continually being invested and re-invested in power relations. Drawing upon pain and trauma theory, in particular on Elaine Scarry’s conception of pain as a process of ‘unmaking’ or ‘unworlding’, this paper aims to develop a new methodological and theoretical approach to understanding colonial violence through exploring colonialism as a process of ‘unmaking’ that unleashed an escalation of interpersonal violence among the colonized. Focusing on colonial India, it will examine sources such as medical jurisprudence manuals and colonial police and judicial records to consider both the ways in which ‘difference’ was constructed through violence and that pain was inscribed as central to the ‘civilizing mission’. Turning to the domestic sphere, it will then interrogate the ubiquity of extreme violence perpetrated by Indians upon each other’s bodies, such as torture and brutal sexualized forms of violence (on men as well as on women and children), as evidence of Indian attempts to overcome the ‘unmaking’ of their world wrought by colonialism. It will conclude by outlining the insights to be gleaned about colonial power through approaching it from the perspective of the body in pain. Continued >
This paper is part of a larger project on torture in colonial India. The paper and the larger project relate to all three conference themes, through: demonstrating how particular forms of violence, in this case violence committed in the domestic sphere by Indians, came to operate as a cultural norm; moving beyond Western notions of violence, or at least the common conceptual framework of colonial violence as violence committed by the colonizers upon the colonized, to view interpersonal violence among the colonized as an effect of, and key to the maintenance of, colonial regimes; and through outlining a new methodological and theoretical approach to understanding such interpersonal violence, namely from the perspective of the body in pain, which will make possible new understandings of colonialism, violence, and subjectivity that transcend national histories.

**Deana Heath** is a senior lecturer in Indian history at the University of Liverpool. Her research focuses on colonialism, the body, and state power. She is the co-editor of *Communalism and Globalisation: South Asian Perspectives* (Routledge, 2011), and author of *Purifying Empire: Obscenity and the Politics of Moral Regulation in Britain, India and Australia* (Cambridge, 2010), which explores the threat that ‘obscene’ publications were perceived to have on British, Indian, and Australian bodies in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and the role of attempts to regulate such publications in fashioning anti-colonial movements in this period. Her current research focuses on various forms of embodied violence in colonial India, including torture, sexual violence against men, and interpersonal violence.
This paper will speak directly to the conference’s second aim, offering an interrogation of the relationship between various forms of violence and the construction of imperial spaces. It will provide this general interrogation through particular approaches to space and violence. For the former it will examine the urban scale as a register of theatrical violence and as a practical means for assembling and disciplining the population. For the latter it will examine violence through its opposite. The role of ahimsa (non-violence) as a means of anti-colonial protest, politics and ethics will be used to provide insights into both nationalist governmentalities and imperial arts of governing through violence. It will take as its case study the capital of the British Raj, Delhi. In particular it will focus on the densely populated walled city of Old Delhi, which was the major campaigning ground for nationalists attempting to win over the people of the ancient capital, which had been made the seat of a New Delhi in 1911. As with the other major cities of north India, Delhi contributed in generic but also highly localised ways to the mass movements of non-cooperation (1920-24), civil disobedience (1930-34) and Quit India (1942-44). While Delhi lacked the status of other major cities, such as intellectual Calcutta, “gateway to India” Bombay, or the “shock city” of industrialising Ahmedabad, it traded heavily on its imperial past and its richly mnemonic landscape. This historical geography became overlaid with new memoryscapes, as nationalist processions routinized a new series of associations into the self-consciously theatrical layout of the Mughal city, while sites of counter-memory emerged marking sites of state violence, such as the showdown between the police and Swami Shraddhanand before the Town Hall in 1919, the shooting at the Gurdwara Sisganj on Chandni Chowk in 1930 (Legg, 2005), or the putting down of the Victory Day disturbances in 1946.

To equate the anti-colonial/colonial split to that of non/violence would, however, be to ignore both historical fact and recent scholarship. Indian National Congress advocacy of non-violence was ignored by communalists, revolutionaries, and the “urban masses”, while recent literature has highlighted Gandhi’s “martiality” and his dependence upon (colonial- and, to an extent, self-) violence (Devji, 2012, Misra, 2014). Continued >
Combining a decade’s worth of research on material from archives in Delhi and London this paper will analyse the various spatial tactics of non-violence (from politicising homes, to networking mohalla urban communities, to reclaiming spaces of the city) to the ethical practices of self-formation propounded by nationalists. In so-doing it will explore the role of violence in what we might call “nationalist governmentalities”, in particular drawing upon the recent translation of Michel Foucault’s lectures which pose the ethical question of the role of truth-regimes in these governmentalities. The question, therefore, will be one of the non-/violent spaces of “experiments with truth” (Gandhi, 1927 [2007]) in interwar Delhi.

Stephen Legg is an Associate Professor in the School of Geography at the University of Nottingham. He is a specialist on interwar colonial India with a particular interest in the politics of urban space within imperial and international frames. He has analysed these spaces and frames through drawing upon theoretical approaches from memory scholarship, postcolonialism, political theory and governmentality studies. His publications include Spaces of Colonialism: Delhi’s Urban Governmentalities; Prostitution and the Ends of Empire: Scale, Governmentalities and Interwar India; and the edited collection Spatiality, Sovereignty and Carl Schmitt: Geographies of the Nomos. He is currently focusing on Indian constitutional reform in the 1920-30s as well as continuing a longer project on Spaces of Anticolonialism in Delhi.
The formal end of British colonization and the emergence of nation-states during the latter half of the twentieth century has given rise to a new range of studies devoted to reexamining the history, politics, psychology and the language of colonialism (Spurr 1993). In the Naga Hills of colonial Assam, textual description through monographs, tour and military reports, memoirs and para-ethnographic descriptions have preoccupied scholarly attention towards understanding colonial situation and power exercised over the Naga tribes of frontier Indo-Burma. Photography, cartography (the art of drawing maps) and representation through visual art, exhibits and museum displays as powerful project of empire and state making has entered more recently in anthropological discourses and historical descriptions that have primarily relied on ethnographic treaties, narratives and ‘notes and queries’ as investigative tools. Here I introduce photographs as powerful mediums of representation that not only produce the ‘other’ but have played critical role in bringing out the tensions of colonial dominance and rule over little known communities like the Kalyo-Kengyo Nagas – collectively known these days as the Eastern Nagas[1]. Till 1947 vast past of the Kalyo-Kengyo Naga territory remained unadministered occasionally captured by the ‘colonizing camera’ during punitive raids (colonial counter insurgency operations) and ‘good-will’ annual tours, that were carried out by British civil servants occasionally accompanied by adventure anthropologists, botanists and explorers aimed at building patronage with friendly villages and to punish head takers and slave trading Nagas.[2]

Photography that emerged as an investigative tool of anthropological research after 1857 in the subcontinent became a sophisticated means of representation in Christoph von Furer-Haimendorf’s and H.E. Kauffman’s ethnography in the mid-1930s. Together they took more than 3600 images of the Kalyo-Kengyo, Konyak, Sangtham, Ao, Angami, Chang, Yimchunger, Lotha and Rengma Nagas representing their rich material culture. These photographs reached metropolitan public and academic circles through press news and late Victorian magazines (anthropological, oriental and geographical journals) in the late 1930s, that informed the metropolitan public on the civilizing mission and the colonial attempts at improving the ‘savage race’. Continued >
These images unlike travelogues and adventure stories had a far greater impact among western audience on the way non-western colonized subjects were presented to the metropolis, through visual means of communication (Maxwell 1991: ix). Museums displays that began with the Great Exhibit of 1851[3], also played a vital role in constructing the image of the 'noble savage' through curators who established the 'genealogy tree' and the 'progress of mankind' by arranging artifacts of material culture corresponding to the progress made by human races. In particular the Pitts River Museum in Oxford became the centre of Naga artifact collection. Colonel Pitts River, the founder of the Pitts River Museum, for example, wished to create a display of artifacts which would show the social evolution of technology from primitive culture to modern western civilization. His ideal scheme of display was that of concentric circles, which he believed to be particularly suited to the exhibition of the expanding varieties of evolutionary arrangement.[4] Balfour the first curator of the museum collaborated with J.P. Mills and J.H. Hutton in establishing the Naga section of the collection. This laid the ideological and aesthetic foundation and established the primitiveness of Naga culture through display of Naga artifacts and material culture in metropolitan museum collection. Representation of native culture with the use of photographic images and through the colonial exhibitory complex has escaped scholarly attention until quite recently in anthropological literature and remains undervalued in Naga ethnography.[5] Through this paper I would try to show how important still images or photography has played in colonial counter insurgency complex where regular textual description based on intensive participant observation was impossible during punitive tours made by colonial administrators and ethnographers in the unadministered Naga Hills. It is through photographs and ethnographic raw material of the ‘other’ that was used by Fürer-Haimendorf to textualise the Naga in his ethnographic treaties.

**Debojyoti Das** is an anthropologist of maritime South Asia, who focuses on the borderlands of eastern India and the Indian Ocean; his work is deeply interdisciplinary, bridging his training as an ethnographer with archival research and extensive use of visual and oral sources. While his PhD research focused on the political ecology of highland farming in northeastern part of India, Nagaland, his current research aims to study coastal calamities and social resilience in the Bay of Bengal-Indian Ocean rim. He completed his PhD in Anthropology from SOAS, University of London and is currently working as a Post Doctoral Associate in the European Research Commission funded project titled ‘Coastal Frontiers’. He is also interested in anthropological research ethics, environmental anthropology, religion, ethnicity, postcolonial studies and visual anthropology.
This paper explores ways in which late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century colonial violence was sustained and aided by a specific form of visual representation. The picturesque, which was a popular mode for depicting the domestic landscape of Great Britain, required amateur and professional artists to work within strict aesthetic rules, to the extent that the material realities of land became significantly less important than the desired outcome of the work of art. Within this discourse, the complexities of nature were reduced and simplified, and people were often eliminated from the scene.

When applied to colonial spaces, it was less the elimination of people than their transformation into stereotypes that became the common practice of picturesque practitioners, while the sites themselves—from the West Indies to the Indian Ocean littoral—were transformed into visually uniform, familiar, and “tranquil” places. Given that many of those who produced picturesque images in the colonies were military personnel, a close investigation of the relationship between material and epistemic violence is undertaken here, in order to contextualize such imagery in relation to the stated goals and activities of imperial agents. Informed by a framework of intellectual history, postcolonial theory, and landscape studies, this paper specifically explores the picturesque as it was practiced in early colonial Sri Lanka during the period of British conquest, from the late 1790s throughout Britain’s engagement in a series of wars with the inland kingdom of Kandy, which extended late into the second decade of the nineteenth century. Using first-hand accounts (both verbal and visual) produced by travellers, clergymen, civil servants, doctors, artists, and soldiers in Sri Lanka, in conjunction with published government gazettes and unpublished letters exchanged by government officials, it is demonstrated that the use of picturesque discourse on the island served to comfort colonizers (and metropolitan viewers) in the midst and aftermath of violence perpetrated by British soldiers in the course of conquest and Sinhalese soldiers in the course of anti-colonial struggle; that it played a role in justifying British imperial expansion in South Asia; and further, that erasure of the island’s local realities constituted violence in itself. As such, this mode of representation is discussed as a distinct form of violence that was pervasive ideologically as well as highly practical, especially in the matter of colonial contestation of land.
Of particular interest in this paper is the manner in which artists participating in a range of imperial projects skilfully enfolded British military accoutrements into the colonial landscape, as they utilized the discourse to demonstrate in visual terms the process of conquest. A comparative analysis of imagery by Robert Home, of the militarized landscape near Mysore (1794); by John Eckstein, of the arming of a small island near Martinique (1805); and by Samuel Daniell, of views of Sri Lanka following the first Kandyan war (1808), demonstrate the degree to which forts and cannons could be made visually compatible with traditional elements of landscape, enabling the process of colonialism to look not only acceptable but natural.

Elizabeth Mjelde co-chairs the art history program at De Anza College in Cupertino, California, and is presently writing a doctoral dissertation in the Department of History at the University of North Dakota. She recently published an essay, “The Imperial Wye,” in the journal *Romanticism* (Edinburgh University Press) about the colonial picturesque.
My paper is on the use of torture by Indian revenue officers against peasants to collect tax revenue for the state. According to a Madras judge writing in 1840, ‘the practice of torture is universal, systematic, and habitual […] it prevails in forms the most disgusting and cruel, that mutilation and death are its frequent results.’ When the British public was made aware of the situation they demanded an inquiry, forcing the Madras administration to officially admit, “the acts complained of are commonly practiced.” Thus they became the first government in modern history to acknowledge the use of torture by its officials until 2011, when Britain admitted using torture during Kenya’s decolonization. Despite the Madras government’s admission, Indian officials accused of torture rarely faced punishment, and were commonly acquitted for lack of physical evidence or conflicting witness testimony.

My paper focuses on how the state’s legal apparatus was used to protect torture by its officials in mid-nineteenth-century South India. Much of the research on this topic looks at issues of race, institutional failures, or how law was used to legalize various forms of violence practiced by the colonial state. I demonstrate how, contrary to received wisdom, the practice of extrajudicial violence by officials was controverted by lower district courts through adjudicative and courtroom procedures. These exploited artificial technicalities in the law, resulting in a justice of principles being subordinated to a justice of facts. I do this by examining previously unused records of district court torture cases to offer a view of colonialism as experienced on the ground away from the nodes of British power.

My project is guided by an interest in how law protected the use of colonial violence in order to ideologically and politically justify its quotidian practice as a tool to maintain control over subject populations and extend state power. Previous research that informs my analysis has focused on colonial law in India as a tool for state formation and extending British sovereignty, and how the process of codification was used to order and make sense of alien subjects. I build upon recent work on colonial violence that has examined the racialized dimensions of how cases of homicide and assault between Indians and Europeans were decided in high courts.

Continued
The British in India considered themselves among the foremost liberal states of the era; “she conquers but to set free,” was the prevailing imperial ethos. As such, my work is also informed by legal scholarship demonstrating how even in liberal democratic legal regimes “judges deal pain and death,” and that the adjudication of law is inherently violent. Bringing these perspectives together, I intersect issues of law, violence and race, as they were experienced by Indian peasants living along the ragged edges of imperial power in India. As a result, I demonstrate how the application of law and the adjudicative process as undertaken by an untrained judiciary of district officials, holding over local subjects the coercive power of a disciplinary colonial state that prioritized revenue above justice, effectively sanctioned the illegal use of torture by its officials.

**Derek L. Elliott** is a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Canada doctoral candidate at University of Cambridge.
This paper examines the role of policing as an everyday performance of state authority in twentieth-century British India. Specifically, it provides a close look at the police beat in the Tamil districts of southern India, in the first half of the twentieth century. It argues that policemen on the beat performed two functions i.e. surveillance and coercion, at the level of the quotidian. Drawing upon previously unexplored police beat journals and richly detailed cartographic and narrative records of police planning, the paper discusses how the beat brought colonial subjects under the gaze of the state and made them vulnerable to the force of its law.

The beat lent flexibility to police operations. This paper demonstrates that policemen did not only operate in their station-houses; they also monitored the subject population on carefully charted beats. Furthermore, station-houses themselves were rarely permanent structures, but instead shifted from place to place in response to changing requirements of surveillance. I argue that the colonial police built a dynamic, institutional memory of crime and criminals, which was used to determine the location of police-stations and the path of the beat. Therefore, their numerical disadvantage notwithstanding, the colonial police exercised considerable authority in the vast reaches of the Tamil countryside.

Through its police, the colonial state and its law reached down and shaped everyday life in rural India. In particular, I argue that policemen on the beat were active agents in colonial governmentality. Not only did the colonial police perform tasks typically associated with Foucauldian governmentality – such as monitoring sanitation, controlling epidemics, and regulating the flow of people and exchange of grains, they also drew upon colonial knowledge that classified India into communities and mapped the population as thrifty and laboring castes, criminal classes, litigious castes, and so forth. Policemen used this knowledge on the beat so that certain communities were policed more closely and with greater violence than others. This routinized and well-calibrated violence was directed towards refashioning rural society, to enable the expansion of settled agriculture, the development of a productive labour force, and the circulation of people and commodities.

Continued>
Finally, a study of the beat throws light on the surveillance techniques of the colonial state and the visual practices of its constable. The paper discusses how police practices drew upon colonial knowledge – consolidated since the late-eighteenth century, which privileged property and criminalized vagrancy. In turn, these police practices redirected the constable’s gaze (and stave) towards subjects now recognized as lazy, wayward and, therefore, criminal.

Radha Kumar is Assistant Professor of History at Syracuse University, New York. Radha graduated from Princeton University in 2014, with a specialization in colonial and postcolonial South Asian history. Her work examines policing and the everyday experience of coercive state authority in southern India in the twentieth century.
In October 1890 nine German colonialists were killed in Witu, a British protectorate, after a dispute with the Sultan of Zanzibar. The Berlin press was outraged and demanded revenge. The London government responded quickly by sending a military expedition to East Africa. Led by Admiral Sir Edmund Fremantle, the troops burned the town where the murders had taken place, killed a part of its population and destroyed the livelihoods of the tribes in the surrounding area. As Fremantle explained, the violence and destruction he oversaw was not accidental, but had been planned with the aim of ‘teaching a lesson’. It was also carried out with audiences in Europe in mind. Both the German and British press applauded Fremantle for having restored the ‘honour of Europeans’. As Sir James Ferguson, Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, put it in Parliament, it had ‘unquestionably’ been Britain’s duty ‘to inflict punishment for murders of white men’.

The papers analyses the 1890 expedition as part of a by then well-established genre of punitive campaigns through which the imperial powers of the nineteenth century avenged what they understood as crimes committed by colonial peoples against Europeans. Some of these were large-scale conflicts such as seen during the Opium Wars or the Boxer Rebellion, but the vast majority were smaller wars, which rose markedly in frequency in the decades before 1914. While differing according to geographical and chronological context as well as in extent and duration, they had important features in common. They followed a similar structure and were accompanied by similar rhetoric, with ‘punishment’ and ‘revenge’ being the most widely used concepts employed to give meaning to these campaigns.

Using sources from a wide range of backgrounds, including central government records (political, military, diplomatic, colonial), public and political debate, academic writing and legal texts, the paper explores the thinking that informed the specific episode of 1890, in which British troops avenged the death of Germans. The paper works outwards from this case study and asks questions about discourses and practices of revenge in imperial Europe more broadly. In going beyond established national-imperial histories of colonial conflict it asks if a shared culture of colonial revenge existed in the age of empire, a culture in which civilization and violence were intrinsically bound up with one another.
Jan Rüger teaches modern history at Birkbeck, University of London. He has held visiting fellowships at Yale University and the Australian National University. He is the author of *The Great Naval Game: Britain and Germany in the Age of Empire* (Cambridge, 2007) and a number of articles on Britain and Germany in Europe and the world. His book on the Anglo-German relationship and a small island in the North Sea will come out with OUP in 2016.
This paper will examine reports of military operations during the French conquest and occupation of Tonkin between 1884 and 1914 in order to draw out the implications for the colonial regime of the obvious violence of these operations and the ways they were described by the French military. While the French declared as early as 1888, in a decree organizing the gendarmerie in Tonkin, that “the conquest is completed,” and French administrators such as Paul Doumer distinguished between the conquest and the subsequent “normal” colonial rule of his administration after 1897, these distinctions downplayed the continuities in violence after the conquest. Rather, asserting French control in the face of opposition from lettrés loyal to the deposed emperor, armed bands who thrived in the countryside of Tonkin and had never been under the control of the pre-colonial Annamese government, as well as deserters and regular troops from China, necessitated frequent military operations throughout the entire period. It is clear that violence was a “normal” part of colonial administration well into the 20th century. Historians have begun to recognize this ongoing violence, but this paper will focus in particular on the ways in which the language used in the reports of military operations created categories of inhabitants of Tonkin, defining first the enemy that the French faced as they sought to extend and maintain their control over the province and then the colonial subjects who were governed by the colonial administration. These categories, such as “bandits,” “pirates,” or “Chinese,” were used in ways that described the relationships between these groups and their connection to the French. These terms attempted to marginalize the opponents of French rule and locate them outside of the mainstream of Vietnamese society, but because their positioning was sometimes contradictory, it is apparent that the terms were unstable in use. The violent actions of the French themselves also destabilized the divisions between the French and their indigenous allies, on the one hand, and the opponents of French rule on the other. The paper thus delineates some of the limits to the power of the colonial state and the extent to which it operate, in the 20th century, on terms formulated during the conquest of Tonkin even decades later. The paper is based primarily on the records of unit operations in Indochina, required by procedures established in the aftermath of the Franco-Prussian War and kept in series 10 H 15-20 in the Service Historique de la Défense (Vincennes).
These records often describe the violence of these military operations in great detail, and reveal the ways in which the French retelling of these operations constructed a colonial society in the making. These have been supplemented by reports stored in the Centre des Archives d’Outre-Mer in Aix-en-Provence from the French Residents in Tonkin on banditry to their superiors in the French administrators.

**James R. Lehning** is Professor of History at the University of Utah in Salt Lake City, Utah. He specializes in modern French history and European colonialism, and has published a number of books and journal articles on various aspects of 19th and 20th century French social, political and cultural history. Most recently, he is the author of *European Colonialism since 1700*, published by Cambridge University Press in 2013.
This paper explores how the normative boundaries of legitimate violence in armed conflict shifted as a result of the mid-twentieth century wars of decolonization. It first examines how legitimate modes of violence (as defined by international law) were deployed, contested and altered in those wars of the 1940s, 50s and 60s (especially, but not solely, the American war in Vietnam). It then shows how the international community, building on the experiences of those wars, formally changed the bounds of legitimate violence in the 1970s.

For much of the history of empire, the laws of war were held not to apply: insurgencies were classified as “internal” matters outside the purview of international law, and insurgents were treated not as lawful combatants but as criminals and traitors. Changing international expectations after World War II, combined with savvy liberation movement diplomacy increasingly prompted the great powers to justify the violence wrought in empire’s name in accordance with the laws of war. The paper focuses on two sets of legal issues: the laws which determine who should be considered a lawful combatant with the privilege to kill and, if captured, prisoner of war rights; and the laws which determine the circumstances under which civilians might (unintentionally) be killed.

The first half of the paper examines how the great powers grappled with these two issues during the wars of decolonization. As the powers gradually relented on the former issue—acknowledging guerrilla liberation fighters as worthy of at least some legal recognition—a significant shift occurred with regard to the second issue. Civilian casualties were initially reasoned mostly in spatial terms: civilians in rebel areas were corralled into specified “safe” zones, and so any who remained were considered fair game. As this justification became discredited over time, the great powers came to rely increasingly on the rule of proportionality: civilian deaths were now considered acceptable so long as they were not out of proportion to the value of the desired military objective.

The second half of the paper turns from the battlefield to the negotiating table. From 1974 to 1977, representatives of the international community gathered in Geneva, Switzerland, to update the laws of war in order to, among other reasons, take fuller account of guerrilla warfare.
The result, the Additional Protocols to the 1949 Geneva Conventions, both extended combatant rights and privileges to guerrilla fighters and codified the rule of proportionality, thereby formalizing and legitimizing the patterns of violence developed during the wars of decolonization. In tracing the diplomatic controversies over both these issues, and identifying the contingencies inherent in the negotiating process, the paper shows how the violence enacted at empire's end has shaped the legal architecture of warfare ever since.

Brian Cuddy is a Ph.D. Candidate in History at Cornell University. His dissertation project, “Wider War: American Force in Vietnam, International Law, and the Transformation of Armed Conflict, 1961-1977”, examines the changing role of the law of armed conflict in U.S. foreign policy, and in world politics more generally, over the years of the Second Indochina War. Brian holds a B.A. (Hons) from the University of Canterbury, New Zealand, and an M.A. from Yale University. He has been awarded a Dissertation Completion Fellowship from the American Council of Learned Societies for 2015-16.
Violence was constitutive of colonialism. It fell into three broad forms. The first was foundational violence, which unfolded in terms of construction of its very objects while at the same time authorising conquest as a form of ‘pacification’ of black people who had been ‘Othered’ as barbarians. The second was legitimation violence, which was used to normalise colonial project’s practices of white supremacy, domination, repression, and oppression. The last form of violence is called maintenance violence, which assumed the most banal colonial cultural practices, forms, and ordinariness. This paper uses the case study of the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) to explicate the three forms of violence named above. The DRC continues to be a site of various form of violence. This will entail delving deeper into the colonial history of the DRC particularly to its foundation as a private property of King Leopold II of Belgium. It will also assess the aftermath of colonial violence particularly focusing on the postcolonial phenomenon of warlordism and violence, which has continued to haunt the DRC up to today. Broadly speaking, this paper will deal with the questions of how violence was used to initially impose colonial power; how violence was used to legitimise colonialism; how violence was used to maintain colonial power; and how colonial culture of governance by violence has been able to reproduce itself after the end of administrative colonialism, with far reaching consequences on Africans.
Sabelo J. Ndlovu-Gatsheni is Professor and Head of Archie Mafeje Research Institute for Applied Social Policy (AMRI) based at the University of South Africa (UNISA). He is also the founder and coordinator of the Africa Decolonial Research Network (ADERN) based in at the University of South Africa. He is a decolonial theorist who has published extensively in African history, African politics, and development.


He is the Editor-In-Chief of the *Africa Insight* published by Africa Institute of South Africa (AISA) and the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) in South Africa and Deputy Editor of the International Journal of African Renaissance Studies published by the University of South Africa Press and Francis and Taylor.
My paper will explore the dynamics of British colonial warfare in consideration of three cases of violence in the British Empire: the Perak War 1875-6; the Anglo-Egyptian War of Reconquest in the Sudan 1896-99; the ‘Hut Tax’ Revolt in Sierra Leone 1898. These incidents of violence were part of a long European tradition of colonial warfare and each campaign utilised a variety of methods to enforce and maintain British power in these regions. These methods include: the use of collective reprisals and scorched earth policies; starvation tactics on the enemy as well as the wider population; punitive expeditions; looting, as well as a disregard for international standards of warfare, including the use of banned weaponry and the massacring and neglect of the enemy wounded. These military tactics were accompanied by propaganda which sought to dehumanise the ‘enemy’ and justify British supremacy over ‘inferior races’ in the name of ‘civilisation’; thus advocating racial prejudices and superiority complexes prevalent throughout Europe at the end of the nineteenth century. Accounts written by soldiers who participated in these conflicts will be considered as they provide new evidence that sheds further light on the nature of the British military campaigns and the ways in which British troops perceived their own roles in colonial warfare and how they sought to justify the devastation that ensued throughout these countries. The importance of the communications between London and the periphery are of great importance here in terms of understanding the decision-making processes which led to atrocities being committed; official correspondence held at the National Archives is integral to exploring these processes and is also essential to considering the importance of individual colonial policy-makers, their intentions in undertaking colonial violence and how they shaped events on the ground.

Furthermore, these episodes of violence will be considered within a wider framework of extreme violence and mass killing. Genocide scholars have recently been considering the dynamics of violence in the colonies – initially focusing on the case of Germany in particular – and it will be argued that the dynamics of genocidal violence should not only be sought in outbreaks of genocide, but also in examples of violence where the genocidal potential was not realised.
The brutal, unrestrained and illegal nature of European colonial warfare resulted in a mindset, which was later transferred to Europe. It will be argued that there has been a neglect of British cases within the historiography of colonial violence. Historians are beginning to highlight the scale of British colonial atrocities and the links between them and there is a need to place these events within a wider context of intra-European violence, which escalated in the first-half of the twentieth century.

Michelle Gordon is a research student at Royal Holloway University and is currently writing her thesis on British colonial atrocities under the supervision of Professor Dan Stone. Michelle’s work explores the links between colonial atrocities which occurred throughout the British Empire, as well as examining British colonial violence within a wider framework of both European genocidal violence in twentieth century European warfare and the Holocaust. Michelle has a BA in History and Politics, an MA in Modern European History and her other research interests include comparative genocide studies.
‘SWIFT INJUSTICE’: THE EXPEDITION OF IMPERIAL PUNISHMENT
Chris Ballard, Australian National University

For a term accorded such ready recognition and wide employment, the ‘punitive expedition’ has drawn surprisingly little attention from analysts other than military theorists. Perhaps the notion of a well-armed expedition sent to administer punishment in response to some distant outrage is held to be sufficiently universal a military tactic, and so widely understood by a metropolitan public, as to be self-evident or even natural. But how does ‘punishment’, and especially the invariably collective punishment of a military operation, become naturalised as a colonial or imperial action? Under what conditions does that punishment take the form of an expedition, and what specific events or qualities render an expedition punitive? When is an expedition recognised as punitive, or an act of punishment as expeditionary? From these foundational questions flow others: What is the moral basis for the violence of the punitive expedition, and how are the effects of this spectacular or exemplary violence either mediatised or masked, for metropolitan or local audiences? What role have punitive expeditions played in the extension of state sovereignty or colonial control? How have the practices and technologies of the punitive expedition been communicated, transferred and inherited between states or state-like actors? What are the narrative tropes and vocabularies of the punitive expedition; and how are terms such as disturbance, honour and outrage mobilised in its support? And what can be said about the efficacy of punitive expeditions, and what this might in turn tell us about their intended effects?

Some preliminary research suggests that deployment of the precise term ‘punitive expedition’ has a particular history of its own, and I want to suggest that this etymological genealogy is critical in identifying the broad moral regimes under which such actions become authorised. Punitive expeditions feature along a continuum of military operations referred to variously as ‘small wars’, ‘savage wars’, ‘forgotten wars’ and, more recently, ‘counter-insurgency operations’.
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The central feature of punitive expeditions is their fundamentally spectacular, exemplary and tutelary deployment of violence, whether that violence is implied or implemented: spectacular in their conscious theatrics of military and power and intent; exemplary or demonstrative with respect to the multiple audiences for this display, ranging from the local to domestic or metropolitan, and including international and other military observers; and tutelary in terms of their explicit mission to educate and inculcate the lessons of that power.

**Chris Ballard** is Associate Professor in Pacific History at The Australian National University. His current research combines archival studies of race, colonialism and frontier violence, with fieldwork in several Pacific and Asian countries on Indigenous historicities. Recent publications include *Film and History in the Pacific* (2010), *Foreign Bodies: Oceania and the science of race, 1750-1940* (2008), and *The Sweet Potato in Oceania: a reappraisal* (2005). His most recent project, in collaboration with Elena Govor, addresses the role of drawing in the early anthropological field research of Nikolai Miklouho-Maclay.
Japan’s expansion into Southeast Asia in the 1940s was framed ideologically as part of a racial struggle for survival between the ‘Asian’ and ‘white’ races, and as such, was couched in pan-Asian rhetoric calling for the liberation of the Asian peoples. Hence, the Japanese military expected to be welcomed in the areas they occupied after the outbreak of the Pacific War in December 1941. However, while declaring ‘Asia for the Asiatics’, the Japanese military firmly believed in a ‘might is right’ occupational style which resulted in oppressive, exploitative, and ultimately, violent policies towards those they had ‘liberated’. As the realities of harsh, wartime occupation set-in, the military administration faced outbreaks of resistance from the populations throughout the occupied areas. It was in the Philippines that the Japanese military experienced the most virulent resistance than anywhere else in Southeast Asia as a considerable number of Filipinos had taken up arms and fought alongside the US troops, forming guerrilla bands after the Japanese occupied the Philippines in January 1942.

This paper explores the radicalisation of Japanese occupation policies used in the control of the Filipino population with a particular focus on responses to resistance. It argues that violent practices were central to efforts to control the Filipino population throughout the occupation period, but that, from November 1944, the Japanese military, facing a precarious situation in regards to their war effort and expecting both an impending US campaign and a massive Filipino uprising, escalated this violence to genocide as an effective, pre-emptive response to resistance. Indeed, from November 1944 through to March 1945, Japanese troops received orders to kill all Filipinos they came across, and were instructed that ‘when Filipinos are to be killed, they must be gathered into one place and disposed of with the consideration that ammunition and man power must not be used to excess.’

The paper is based on research undertaken at the Library of Congress and the National Archives and Records Administration in the United States.

Continued>
It uses a variety of different, under-utilised sources including captured Japanese documents collected from a number of US military intelligence agencies, war crimes investigations case files and trials, Filipino diaries and memoirs, official Japanese publications, as well as contemporary newspapers and periodicals. This paper offers fresh insights into violence inherent to practices utilised in the control of native populations. In particular it advances understandings of the relationship between resistance and violence, and particularly how, within the imperial space, such violence can escalate to the use of extreme eliminationist methods.

**Kelly Maddox** is a PhD student funded by the Economic and Social Research Council and based in the Department of History at Lancaster University. She is currently in her final year working on her thesis; “The Strong Devour the Weak”: Tracing the Genocidal Dynamics of Imperialism through the Case of Imperial Japan’, which explores the ways in which violence, at times, radicalised to genocidal policies in Japanese imperialism. From April to October 2014, she conducted research as a scholar-in-residence at the Library of Congress’ Kluge Center generously funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council.
Recent discussions in the Netherlands about violence during the decolonization conflict in Indonesia, 1945-1949, have predominantly focused on forms of indiscriminate (mass) violence. But as Stathis Kalyvas teaches us (2008), the majority of victims of both insurgents and the established power tend to be the result of ‘selective violence’, based on more or less reliable information. In insurgent wars, gaining reliable intelligence is of essential importance to both sides of the conflict. Intelligence and security services therefore assumed a central and powerful role. Not only was the information that they produced used for directing the violence of army and police forces, the information itself was often also procured through more or less violent means.

In my paper I examine the functioning of Dutch intelligence and security services in the Indonesian decolonization conflict, focusing in particular on their practices of arresting people to be questioned or interrogated. There are reliable indications that (some) security services engaged in forms of torture as part of their interrogations practice (Van Doorn and Hendrix 1970), but these do not concern me here. Rather, I am interested in the effects and the practice itself of either arbitrary or targeted arrests: Who was arrested, where were they arrested, and with what justifications or on what basis? What information did the intelligence services hope to gain from the prisoners, and how did they question them? And what happened to the prisoners once they had been questioned? On the basis of interrogation reports produced by the various intelligence and security services, I argue that the arrest and interrogation practices of the intelligence apparatus itself should be seen as a form of violence. They created a psychological terror with long-lasting effects for the social peace within Indonesian society. Moreover, this psychological pressure often forced ‘ordinary’ citizens to choose sides, exposing themselves to retribution from one of either sides (cf. MacMaster 2011).  
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Subsequently, I reflect on the question how we can or should characterize this system of psychological violence. Is it a modernized form of older, typically colonial ways of oppression (Thomas 2007), or is it something specific of the escalation of colonial violence in the era of decolonization? Or is this, as Kalyvas would have it, a more general characteristic of civil wars the world over? And finally, what is the influence of ‘new’ practices of intelligence and surveillance pioneered during World War 2? The mid-twentieth century wars of decolonization, like the one in Indonesia, challenge our concept of what is ‘colonial’ about colonial violence.

Bart Luttikhuis is a researcher at the KITLV (Royal Netherlands Institute of Southeast Asian and Caribbean Studies) in Leiden, specializing in late-colonial and decolonization history with a special focus on Indonesia. In October 2014 he was awarded a PhD from the European University Institute (Florence, Italy) for his thesis ‘Negotiating Modernity: Europeanness in Late Colonial Indonesia, 1910-1942’. He is currently involved in a project titled ‘Dutch Military Operations in Indonesia, 1945-1950’, where he studies Dutch and Indonesian violence and their interactions during the Indonesian Revolution.
The abduction of Miss Molly Ellis and the murder of her mother by Ajab Khan Afridi and three accomplices on April 14, 1923, was an international scandal that sent shockwaves across the British Empire. Described by the contemporary officials as ‘fanatical outrages’, the abduction prompted an urgent search and rescue mission and an ongoing debate in Parliament about the problem of violence on India’s northwest frontier. This paper will present a gendered analysis of the competing narratives of abduction set against a backdrop of colonial violence and anti-colonial resistance at the vulnerable edge of Britain’s Indian Empire.
Elizabeth Kolsky is an Associate Professor of History at Villanova University (USA). Her research and teaching focus on colonization and decolonization in South Asia and the British Empire. She is the author of *Colonial Justice in British India: White Violence and the Rule of Law* (Cambridge University Press, 2010) and the co-editor of *Fringes of Empire: People, Place and Spaces in Colonial India* (Oxford University Press, 2009), among other publications. She holds a B.A. in Middle Eastern and Asian Languages and Cultures and a Ph.D. in History, both from Columbia University.
SEARCHING FOR A STANDARD OF LEGITIMATE COLONIAL VIOLENCE IN THE ERA OF ‘SELF‐DETERMINATION’: INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC TALKS AROUND THE RIF WAR AND THE GREAT SYRIAN REVOLT, 1924-26
Giorgio Potì, European University Institute

The interwar years corresponded to a ‘Copernican Revolution’ between what is conventionally regarded as the age of empires and the proper age of decolonization. The Allies’ promise of ‘self-determination’ gave way to the perpetuation of pre-WWI colonial empires, or, in the case of former Ottoman and German possessions, to their reshaping through the mandates system of the League of Nations (LoN). Yet, a ‘moment of self-determination’ survived after the failed ‘Wilsonian Moment’ [Manela 2007]. First, as highlighted by the recent work of Susan Pedersen [2006] and other scholars, higher standards of morality and legitimacy for acceptable colonial rule were established through the mandates regime. Further, the institutions and practices of interwar internationalism – having in the League their cornerstone – provided new public arenas in which compliance with such standards had to be proved by imperial powers and could be questioned by anti‐colonial campaigners.

To what extent and how did this ‘Copernican Revolution’ affect the practices, public representation and the moral-legal justification/questioning of imperial violence? I will attempt a response by comparing two cases of anti‐colonial insurgency and repression from the interwar Middle East: the revolt occurred in the French Mandate of Syria (1925), and the last phase (1924–26) of the Rif War that inflamed France’s and Spain’s protectorates in Morocco. In both cases, counter‐insurgency took particularly brutal shapes—like the aerial bombing of unfortified villages or, in Morocco, the employment of asphyxiating gases, while French and Spanish authorities charged the insurgents with all sorts of ‘atrocities’. Moreover, both events resulted in wide public debates—in the metropolitan and the international press, as well as, especially in the Syrian case, within the LoN—on the legitimacy, morality and proportionality of both imperial and insurgent violence.
Basing on a huge apparatus of primary sources—diplomatic records, British, French and Spanish press excerpts, the petitions emanating from Syria’s and Morocco’s populations and diasporas, I will investigate the arguments and discourses by which violence was denounced/defended by both insurgent leaders and the metropolitan governments. The rhetorical confrontation between these two groups of actors, however virtual and unbalanced in favour of the latter, brought about a tentative standard of civilization/barbarianism, since all the parts involved appealed to a framework of ethical or juridical norms to define ‘legitimate’ violence. The Rif rebels invoked the Hague Conventions to denounce France’s and Spain’s atrocities, but the two powers denied recognition of the belligerent status to the insurgents. As for Syria, the ‘spirit’ of the mandate was under question – rather than its letter, since it was interpreted, by Syrian nationalists, as constraining the mandatory authority, and, by the French, as giving free hand in repression. This leads to a last analytical question, that is, whether the mandates regime made any significant difference in the discipline and justification of colonial violence compared to pre-existing forms of imperialism. The French government reacted with irritation to the LoN’s attempts at questioning mandatory policies in Syria, which Paris conceived, de facto, as a pure colony. Conversely, insurgents in both Syria and Morocco deplored repression as in contrast with the new ‘spirit of the time’, which seems to reveal an osmosis between the mandates system and the broader colonial world, as far as the expectations and rhetorical strategies of anti-colonial elites are concerned.

**Giorgio Poti** is about to complete a doctorate in History and Civilization at the European University Institute (Florence), while also serving as an Adjunct Faculty member in the International Relations and Global Politics Program at the American University of Rome. His expertise and research interests lie in modern European history, the international relations of the Mediterranean, comparative imperialism and nationalism, and international legal history. He has especially worked on the political, legal and ethical reconfiguration of colonial empires in the interwar years. His doctoral dissertation examines five cases of anti-colonial unrest and repression across European Mediterranean empires during the 1920s—notably, Egypt, Iraq, Libya, Morocco and Syria, with a dual focus. On the one hand, it traces the international resonance of those events, in terms of press coverage, diasporic mobilization, and the involvement of international organizations like the League of Nations. On the other, it seeks to assess the weight of publicity concerns and international oversight in the shaping of British, French, Spanish and Italian imperial policies.
FASCIST VIOLENCE AND THE ETHNIC RECONSTRUCTION OF CYRENAICA (LIBYA), 1922-34
Michael R. Ebner, Syracuse University

This paper examines the long war between the Italian military and the Senussi of Cyrenaica between 1923 and 1931 and its consequences up until about 1934. I use violence as an interpretive lens to examine the social, cultural, political, economic, and demographic repercussions of warfare, internment, atrocity, and what the Fascists referred to as “ethnic reconstruction.” To do this, I am obviously interested in detailing military campaigns, war crimes, and, ultimately, the deportation of the population of the Jebel Akhdar to concentration camps. Moreover, I am interested in what happened after the population was released from the camps. The regime returned many Bedouins to the areas they inhabited before being sent to the camps. Tens of thousands of others, however, were banned from returning to their lands, since the most fertile lands were reserved for Italian colonists. A central focus of the project is on how the Fascist regime used military violence and atrocity in its colonies. I am asking many basic questions in this regard: What typologies of violence did the regime use? Beyond strategic motives, what ideological motives drove military violence and atrocity? Did the Fascists intend to use violence to transform their colonies in some fundamental way? Did the Fascists intend to use military violence to transform colonists and Italians? Did different types of elites – Fascist hierarchs, generals, nationalists, career state officials – have different views of the relationships between violence and imperialism? The paper will also go beyond violence to look at the economic, political, and ideological motives behind Fascist imperialism. As for sources, the paper draws on archival documents, published military sources, memoirs, and contemporary accounts.
Michael Ebner is an associate professor in the history department at Syracuse University. He is the author of *Ordinary Violence in Mussolini’s Italy* (Cambridge University Press, 2011). He is currently co-editing a volume on everyday life in Fascist Italy, and researching and writing a book project entitled *Mussolini’s Empire: How the Fascists Ruled in Africa.*
In September of 1902, in the staff quarters of a recently constructed sugar mill in the small southern Egyptian town of Nag` Hammadi, Henri Esnault, a French accountant, was murdered as he slept. The date of Esnault’s murder is of note: 1902 was also the year of the completion of the first Aswan dam, constructed several hundred kilometers to the south of Nag` Hammadi. Both Esnault’s presence in southern Egypt and the dam’s completion signaled a transformation of Egypt’s agricultural environments. The completion of the 1902 Aswan dam facilitated the emergence of a new irrigation frontier demarcating the agricultural environments of northern and southern Egypt. The gaze of the colonial state focused on the cotton-producing lands of the north, and agro-industrial business, specifically the Egyptian Sugar Company, dominated large swaths of the south. In Egypt’s south, the practice of the colonial state and its authority included that of colonial business. Sugarcane cultivation meant the introduction of new agricultural and industrial labor regimes, often enforced through the deployment of violence. Southern Egypt had a long history of violence in the encounters of this region’s inhabitants with political authority: In the early nineteenth century, the Ottoman-Egyptian state crushed rebellions; the force of the whip policed labor and land tenure; colonial narratives of the 1880s and 1890s often complained of brigandage in this region. At the turn of the twentieth century, with the construction of the dam and the emergence of new agricultural environments, new forms of violence were woven into the fabric of Egypt’s colonial economy and the agricultural environments in which it was enmeshed.

Using documentary evidence from the Egyptian National Archives in Cairo (Dar al-Watha’iq al-Qawmiyya) and the archives of Le Ministère des Affaires Etrangères in Paris and Nantes (France), this paper explores the meaning and theorization of violence in colonial southern Egypt during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, posing the following question: How should violence in colonial southern Egypt be understood within the broader framework of environmental transformation and colonial economy?
The agricultural economies that emerged in Egypt during the colonial period forced new experiences of physical subjectivity through a wide range of encounters with the non-human material world, including intensified labor regimes, migration, and environmental disease. Colonial authority was made material through these encounters and the possibilities that framed engagements with this authority were robust and extended beyond vocalized articulations to include the realm of the physical. Violent incidents in colonial southern Egypt are most productively conceptualized as the product of environmental transformation and new agricultural economies, and a means subject expression.

Jennifer L. Derr is an Assistant Professor of History at the University of California, Santa Cruz where she teaches courses in the history of the modern Middle East. She completed a Ph.D. in History at Stanford University in 2009. She also holds a Bachelor of Science in Biological Sciences from Stanford University and a Master of Arts from Georgetown University in Contemporary Arab Studies. Professor Derr’s research explores the historical intersections of environments, bodies, colonial practice, and configurations of science. She is currently completing a manuscript titled *A New Nile* which charts the multifaceted history of the 1902 Aswan dam. Her research has been supported by the Fulbright-Hays Commission, the Social Science Research Council, the American Research Center in Egypt, the Mellon Foundation, the Institute for Historical Studies at the University of Texas at Austin, and the Institute for Humanities Research at the University of California, Santa Cruz.
DISCIPLINING NATIVE MASCULINITIES: COLONIAL VIOLENCE IN THE ‘LAND OF THE PIRATE AND THE AMOK’
Jialin Christina Wu, EHESS (Paris, France) and UC Louvain (Belgium)

In the Malay archipelago, Europeans developed generalisations on ‘native’ temperament, nature, and culture based upon their encounters with amok, a pattern of indiscriminate, homicidal ‘rampage’ observed mainly amongst Muslim men. Initially regarded as the ‘native’ equivalent of the Norse berserker, amok later lost its military connotations and was judged as an ‘Oriental phrase of crime’ in the eyes of colonial law, before being diagnosed as a mental illness under the lens of colonial psychiatry. From British Malaya to the Dutch East Indies, amok shaped colonial perspectives on ‘the Malay character’, prescribing tangible mental, emotional and biological distinctions between the binaries of Colonisers–Colonised and Occident–Orient. Amok remains classified as a ‘cultural-bound syndrome’ in psychiatric literature, and retains its latent symbolism of a raw, uncontrollable, primitive, ‘native’ form of violence in contemporary societies.

By analysing the multi-faceted colonial reactions and interpretations of ‘native acts of violence’ such as amok in Southeast Asia over the longue durée, this paper seeks to contribute towards extant literature on violence and imperialism within a transcolonial perspective in four main ways. First, it shifts attention towards ‘native’ (vis-à-vis western) forms of violence and analyses colonial resistance and containment of indigenous actions and ‘behavioural patterns’. Thus, it departs from current narratives of colonial histories, which remain largely focused on ‘European actors and indigenous resistance’. Second, this paper analyses amok in a gendered perspective by delving into colonial (re)-classifications of amok – from an expression of masculine martial prowess into a violent ‘condition’ afflicting only indigenous men, with indigenous women as victims.
Third, this paper aims to unpack well-established assumptions of colonial forms of violence by examining concrete examples of colonial ‘cold violence’ such as the legal, medical and scientific responses of British and Dutch colonials on amok. Indeed, although imperial disciplinary measures such as law or psychiatry could be perceived as impassive, this paper uses well-documented examples of visceral colonial responses to amok to illustrate that such forms of colonial discipline also constituted ‘hot’ violence. Continued>
For instance, when British colonials debated amok within a legal framework, some insisted that ‘amokers’ (or ‘Mahommedan murderers’), be hanged, drawn, quartered, and dishonourably buried with ‘the pig, the pig, and nothing but the pig as as the real bogey [to deter] would-be amokers.’ In line with the above, the fourth element of this paper illustrates how legal, medical and ‘scientific’ forms of colonial oppression/containment of amok were perpetuated and couched within imperial discourses of ‘progress’ (or ‘civilising mission’) from the colonial period – into the ‘post’-colonial present. These influential discourses continue to lead scholars and Malay politicians to admit that ‘[Western] Civilisation has subdued the Malay’, for violent acts of amok ceased due to the ‘penetration of modernising influences’ such as European imperialism.

Jialin Christina Wu is a Research Fellow of the FNRS (Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique, Belgium), at the Catholic University of Louvain, Belgium, and the School of Advanced Studies in the Social Sciences (EHESS), France. In April 2015, she defended her dissertation on the social, political and cultural impact of colonial youth movements in British Malaya. Her research interests include colonial psychiatry, medicine, science, law, as well as the history of childhood and youth in colonial contexts, with a focus on comparative studies of European empires in Southeast Asia.
French colonial historians have consistently remarked upon the widespread imperial belief in Algerian criminality, with psychiatrists and ethnographers characterizing North African Muslims as primitive and barbaric (in contrast to “civilized” Europeans), violent religious zealots whose criminal behaviour was driven by fatalistic Islam, inherent racial defects, and child-like intellect. Concomitantly, scholars have noted increased concern with policing and punishment in both metropole and empire by the late nineteenth century, and consequent demands for a professional constabulary to both prevent and investigate crime. In the Algerian context, settlers referred to a “low intensity war” of the colonized against the colonizer in rural areas, where the murder rate alone was eight times that of the metropole, and proved equally distressed during the interwar era in urban centres, where violent crime surged dramatically in the wake of an increasing population shift towards cities. From the press to scientific lecture halls, calls for enhanced policing burgeoned throughout the empire, and debates about security dominated public discourse, often tinged with racial stereotyping. However, many so-called criminal acts were in fact deeply political, seeking to destabilize and undermine colonial authorities and their highly visible representatives in government and law enforcement. This paper will examine the prevalence of anti-imperial violence in the Department of Constantine during the interwar era. In urban settings like Bône and Philippeville, Arab/Kabyle inhabitants regularly engaged in criminal acts that struck at the imposed imperial order and its purported legitimacy, including football hooliganism, in which Muslim supporters of Algerian clubs fought pitched battles with European fans of all-white teams, and assaults against settlers, mostly at night in isolated districts. Both simultaneously challenged the imposition of foreign rule mentioned in the call for papers, while contesting the violence and “construction of imperial spaces” perpetrated by colonial state and society. More seriously, certain “criminals” engaged in robbery and rape against settlers, and assaulted or killed police officers and colonial officials, providing armed “resistance to the colonial enterprise”. Continued>
Similar attacks occurred in rural communities, where Caids and adjoints were frequent targets of anti-colonial campaigns perpetrated by bandits in the mountainous and forested Constantinois, who also perpetrated train derailments and industrial sabotage. In both city and countryside, the official response was brutal: the violation of suspects’ rights, excessive force in lieu of arrests, police and settler vigilante killings of suspects, and the forced removal of the families of anyone deemed hors-la-loi. The sources used in this paper include police and government files from the Archives nationales d’outre-mer in Aix-en-Provence, military records from the Service historique de la défense in Vincennes, and a variety of primary texts and newspapers (Algerian and European) from the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris and the CAOM. It addresses a number of conference topics, including interpersonal violence between the colonizer and the colonized, the role of violence in maintaining social order, and resistance to the imperial enterprise.

Samuel Kalman is Associate Professor in the Department of History at St. Francis Xavier University (Nova Scotia, Canada). He is the author of French Colonial Fascism: The Extreme Right in Algeria, 1919-1939 (Palgrave, 2013), The Extreme Right in Interwar France: The Faisceau and the Croix de Feu (Asghate, 2008), and numerous book chapters and journal articles. He is also the editor of The French Right Between the Wars: Political and Intellectual Movements from Conservatism to Fascism (Berghahn, 2014) and a 2010 special issue of the journal Historical Reflections/Réflexions historiques devoted to the theme of colonial violence.
This paper will focus on contests that took place over violence in three distinct contexts in the French settler colony of New Caledonia: the recruitment of indigenous volunteers for the war of 1914-18; the repression (by colonial authorities, settlers, the French army and indigenous auxiliaries) of a so-called “revolt” in 1917; and the use of forced labour in the inter-war decades. Drawing on David Riches’ notion of “contested legitimacy” as a defining feature of violence, and following Pamela Stewart and Andrew Strathern in stressing the extent to which contests of legitimacy can themselves contribute to violence, I examine the ‘processes of agreement and disagreement about the justification for violence’ in these situations.

In New Caledonia the agreements and disagreements that emerged over the use of violence not only help to identify the social and spatial structures of colonial violence, they also helped produce them in the first place. Violence (and the fear of violence) had a critical role in the imagining and production of colonial subjects (both European and indigenous), as well as in the colonial project to contain violence within different spheres (such as the labour regime, the regime of the indigénat applying to “native” subjects, or the armed forces). In exploring the above contests, the paper addresses several of the questions and themes identified in the CFP, notably ‘the politics of repression and the structures inherent in empire’; and ‘how patterns of violence, embedded within other forms of colonialism and culture, created cultural, legal, social, or imperial “spaces”’. It also addresses the second aim to explore ‘the ways in which empires were and are constructed through violence’ and the concern ‘to move beyond Western notions of violence’. The contests over violence show the part that indigenous (in this case Melanesian) conceptions and practices of violence played in shaping patterns of colonial violence in conjunction with New Caledonia’s function as a colony of free and penal settlement: ideas about reciprocity and social and spatial segregation emerge as key preoccupations.

In relation to the third stated aim of connecting national historiographies, the paper explores practices in a French colony in the Pacific islands drawing on the historiography and anthropology of violence in wider regional and imperial settings. It engages, for instance, with the work of Martin Thomas on political economies of colonial violence in the French empire and Tracey Banivanua-Mar’s notion of “violence and colonial dialogue” in the context of the experiences of Pacific islander labourers in colonial Queensland. Continued>
Adrian Muckle is a Senior Lecturer in the History Programme at Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand. His main research areas are nineteenth- and twentieth-century Pacific history, colonialism and colonial societies, decolonisation, violence and race relations. Much of his research focuses on New Caledonia including the dynamics of colonial rule and power relations, indigenous (Kanak) experiences of the Great War, New Caledonia’s links with the wider Oceanian region and recent political developments. He is the author of Specters of Violence in a Colonial Context: New Caledonia, 1917 (University of Hawai’i Press, 2012) and co-author (with Alban Bensa and Yvon Goromoedo) of Les Sanglots de l’aigle pecheur: la guerre kanak de 1917 (Paris: Anacharsis, 2015). He is now working on a collaborative study of the indigénat regime in New Caledonia. He is currently also the Reviews Editor for the Journal of Pacific History.

The paper will draw on research for my 2012 study of warfare and violence in New Caledonia (Specters of Violence in a Colonial Context, University of Hawai’i Press), a more recent collaboration exploring the Kanak oral literature of New Caledonia’s 1917 war (Les sanglots de l’aigle pecheur, co-authored with Alban Bensa and Yvon Goromoedo, forthcoming with Anacharsis in 2015) and my current research on the indigénat regime. The sources used include: records of the colonial administration and missions; the French colonial inspectorate; the settler press; colonial-era fiction; and indigenous texts.