

# COLONIALISM, ANTI-COLONIALISM AND THE IDEA OF PROGRESS

**Brett Bowden**

*School of Humanities & Communication Arts, University of Western Sydney, Australia*

**Keywords:** civilization, progress, colonialism, imperialism, modernization, development, underdevelopment, anti-colonialism

## Contents

1. Introduction
  2. Civilization and Progress
  3. The Idea of Progress
    - 3.1. Christian Eschatology
    - 3.2. Anthropology and Ethnology
    - 3.3. The Influence of Anthropology on Politics and Philosophy
    - 3.4. Enlightenment Views on Progress
      - 3.4.1. French
      - 3.4.2. British
      - 3.4.3. German
    - 3.5. Modernization Theory
    - 3.6. The “End of History”
  4. Universal History and Colonialism
  5. Justifying Colonialism
  6. America: From Colony to Colonizer
  7. Conclusion: Anti-colonialism
- Glossary  
Bibliography  
Biographical Sketch

## Summary

The idea of progress has two related components. The first is that the human species universally progresses, albeit at different rates and to different degrees, from an original primitive or child-like condition, referred to as savagery, through to barbarism, and culminates at the apex of progress in the status of civilization. The second component of the idea of progress holds that human experience, both individual and collective, is cumulative and future-directed, with the specific objective being the ongoing improvement of the individual, the society in which the individual lives, and the world in which the society must survive. For some thinkers it seems logical that what follows from the general idea of progress is the notion that progress is directed in a particular direction, or that history is moving forward along a particular path toward a specific end. History, in this conception, is not merely the cataloguing of events, but a universal history of all humankind, a cumulative and collective history of civilization, that is, History. The notion that different peoples or cultural groups are at different stages of development along the path of universal progress has led some to deem it necessary to try to ameliorate the condition of those thought to be less civilized. This enterprise has

variously been known as the “white man’s burden,” the “burden of civilization,” or the “sacred trust of civilization.” The general aim of these often violent and overly-zealous “civilizing missions” was to ameliorate the state of the “uncivilized” through tutelage, training, and conversion to Christianity. With European expansion, wherever “civilized” and “uncivilized” peoples existed side by side, there soon developed an unequal treaty system of capitulations, also known extraterritorial rights. In much of the uncivilized world this system of capitulations incrementally escalated to the point that it became full-blown colonialism.

## 1. Introduction

The idea of progress and theories of human evolution more generally have played a significant role in attempts to justify the colonization of one peoples by another. Ideas about progress, development and modernity have subsequently also played a prominent role as drivers of anti-colonial movements. Outlined below is the intimate relationship between ideas about the progress of individuals and societies and how these ideas have been used by some societies to justify the subjugation and colonization of other collectives of peoples. It is further shown how the passage of time has seen similar ideas about progress successfully deployed to advance arguments for the liberation and self-determination of colonized peoples.

Eric Wolf has made the point that many of us have grown up believing that the “*West has a genealogy, according to which ancient Greece begat Rome, Rome begat Christian Europe, Christian Europe begat the Renaissance, the Renaissance the Enlightenment, the Enlightenment political democracy and the industrial revolution. Industry, crossed with democracy, in turn yielded the United States, embodying the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness*” (Wolf, 1982: 4-5). This commonly adopted and often warmly embraced evolutionary schema renders history as some sort of hierarchical “moral success story,” a tale of civilization and progress, a race through time in which successive runners pass on the torch of progress and liberty. “*History is thus converted into a tale about the furtherance of virtue, about how the virtuous win out over the bad guys*” (Wolf, 1982: 5). This narrative goes a considerable way toward explaining how ideas about civilization and progress became influential factors in the theory and practice of colonialism.

Norbert Elias has described this general sense of superiority in terms of the very ideals of civilization and progress as expressing the “*self-consciousness of the West.*” Moreover, this consciousness “*sums up everything in which Western society of the last two or three centuries believes itself superior to earlier societies or ‘more primitive’ contemporary ones*” (Elias, 2000: 5). This view of the West as boldly forging the way ahead on the path of progress and virtue is one that has been described by Robert Nisbet in his work on the idea of progress. “*The history of all that is greatest in the West,*” he tells us, that is, “*religion, science, reason, freedom, equality, justice, philosophy, the arts, and so on – is grounded deeply in the belief that what one does in one’s own time is at once tribute to the greatness and indispensability of the past, and confidence in an ever more golden future*” (Nisbet, 1980: 8).

But just as the idea and space we call “the West” did not evolve in a vacuum, devoid of external influences, neither was it as homogenous and cohesive as this account suggests. It was not until around the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that European cleavages began to ameliorate, slowly being replaced by a modicum of cohesion and solidarity, at least among Western European nations anyway. Slowly and steadily, the expanding entity we now call the West was incrementally forged by and through the exploring nations of Western Europe. Moreover, it was in relation to and by way of contrast with this entity that the non-European world and its inhabitants came to be known and described. Equally, the “civilized” West also came to define itself in contradistinction to the “barbarians” and “savages” discovered beyond the European horizon. This process was neatly captured by Friedrich von Schiller in the late-Eighteenth century when he writes: “*A wise hand seems to have preserved these savage tribes until such time as we have progressed sufficiently in our own civilisation to make useful application of this discovery, and from this mirror to recover the lost beginning of our own race*”. But these peoples painted an “*embarrassing and dismal ... picture of our [Europe/the West’s] own childhood,*” for Schiller declared them the “*barbarous remains of the centuries of antiquity and the middle ages!*” (Schiller, [1789] 1972: 325-27).

As Oswald Spengler explains, the “*Western European area*” came to be “*regarded as a fixed pole, a unique patch chosen on the surface of the sphere for no better reason, it seems, than because we live on it.*” Moreover, “*great histories of millennial duration and mighty faraway Cultures are made to revolve around this pole in all modesty.*” It is from and in relation to this select and privileged corner of the globe, and its successor the West, that all other peoples and events were “*judged in perspective*” (Spengler, 1962: 13) – politically, socially, morally, technologically. If they did not compare favorably, which was generally the case, then civilized Europeans often took it upon themselves to take uncivilized nations under their colonial wing, more often than not by violent conquest.

Elias has also highlighted, that “*it is not a little characteristic of the structure of Western society that the watchword of its colonizing movement is ‘civilization’*” (Elias, 2000: 431). For centuries now, those considering themselves civilized have often been tempted to take on the duty of bringing enlightenment and salvation to the uncivilized hordes of the world – all in the name of civilization and progress (Bowden, 2009a). This has particularly been the case when the exploring nations of Europe have come into contact with indigenous peoples during their voyages of discovery and subsequent settlement. For instance, following the Spanish discovery of the Americas, Franciscus de Vitoria claimed that the Amerindians “*really seem little different from brute animals and are utterly incapable of governing, and it is unquestionably better for them to be ruled by others than to rule themselves*” (Vitoria, [1539] 1964: 120-21). And so the Spaniards conquered and colonized the Amerindians.

One of the justifications for dispossession and oppression was often couched in terms of the self-appointed duty of “civilized” European nations to bring the blessings of civilization and progress to the “savage” and “barbarian” hordes; variously known as the “white man’s burden,” the “burden of civilization,” or the “sacred trust of civilization.” Perhaps surprisingly, such language was still being used centuries later in

important statutes such as the Covenant of the League of Nations, further entrenching the principle of foreign rule. Article 22 of the Covenant states that the welfare of “colonies and territories” that “are inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves” constitutes “a sacred trust of civilization.” The Covenant adds that the “best method of giving practical effect to this principle is that the tutelage of such peoples should be entrusted to advanced nations who by reason of their resources, their experience or their geographical position can best undertake this responsibility.” And so the Mandate System and colonialism persisted for decades to come.

While much time separates these two important moments in history, much of the thinking underpinning these developments is remarkably similar. This could be considered somewhat surprising given the considerable progress that had been made in many branches of human endeavor in the intervening years. Nevertheless, whether it was the Spanish in the Americas in the fifteenth century or British settlers in Aboriginal Australia in the nineteenth- and twentieth-centuries, the general aim of these often violent and overly-zealous “civilizing missions” that became full-blown colonialism was to ameliorate the state of the “uncivilized” through tutelage, training, and conversion to Christianity.

## 2. Civilization and Progress

It is difficult to explore the idea of progress without also delving into the related idea of civilization. As the French linguist Jean Starobinski notes, the “*word civilization, which denotes a process, entered the history of ideas at the same time as the modern sense of the word progress. The two words were destined to maintain a most intimate relationship*” (Starobinski, 1993: 4; italics (turned bold for distinction here) in original). The extent of the interrelation between the ideas of civilization and progress is evident in Nisbet’s questioning of “*whether civilization in any form and substance comparable to what we have known ... in the West is possible without the supporting faith in progress that has existed along with this civilization*” (Nisbet, 1980: 9). In exploring the nature of this relationship it becomes evident that these twin ideas have played a significant role in the pursuit of a wide-reaching philosophy of history that explains the existence of the diversity of peoples that make up our world. The nature and significance of this pursuit is hinted at in Nisbet’s claim that “*No single idea has been more important than ... the idea of progress in Western civilization for nearly three thousand years.*” While ideas such liberty, justice, equality, and community have their rightful place and should not be discounted, it “*must be stressed: throughout most of Western history, the substratum of even these ideas has been a philosophy of history that lends past, present, and future to their importance*” (Nisbet, 1980: 4). The significance of the idea of progress is further revealed when Starobinski’s point that “*civilization is a powerful stimulus to theory*” leads to the conclusion that “*Despite its ambiguity ... the temptation to clarify our thinking by elaborating a theory of civilization capable of grounding a far-reaching philosophy of history is thus irresistible*” (Starobinski, 1993: 33-34). Indeed that has proven to be the case, for in recent centuries a diverse range of thinkers who have sought to undertake precisely that task.

In essence, the capacity for reasonably complex socio-political organization and self-government according to prevailing standards has long been thought of as central requirements of civilization (Bowden, 2004a; Bowden, 2009a; Bowden, 2009b, Vol. 1). The presence, or otherwise, of the institutions of society that facilitate governance in accordance with established traditions – originally European but now more broadly Western – have long been regarded as the hallmark of the makings of, or potential for, civilization. Central to the ideal of civilization are its tripartite components as identified by R. G. Collingwood: economic civilization, social civilization, and legal civilization (Collingwood, 1992). What they amount to is socio-political civilization, or the capacity of a collective to organize and govern itself under a system of laws or constitution.

An exemplar of the importance of society to the qualification of civilization is John Stuart Mill's recipe in which he lists the "ingredients of civilization." Following Montesquieu to some degree, Mill states that whereas

*a savage tribe consists of a handful of individuals, wandering or thinly scattered over a vast tract of country: a dense population, therefore, dwelling in fixed habitations, and largely collected together in towns and villages, we term civilized. In savage life there is no commerce, no manufactures, no agriculture, or next to none; a country in the fruits of agriculture, commerce, and manufactures, we call civilized. In savage communities each person shifts for himself; except in war (and even then very imperfectly) we seldom see any joint operations carried on by the union of many; nor do savages find much pleasure in each other's society. Wherever, therefore, we find human beings acting together for common purposes in large bodies, and enjoying the pleasures of social intercourse, we term them civilized (Mill, 1977: 122).*

Just as the ideal of civilization includes different aspects – such as the arts and the "hard" and "soft" sciences – so too the idea of progress encompasses a range of elements. The most significant of these are identified by Ruth Macklin in the following assertion: "*It is wholly uncontroversial to hold that technological progress has taken place; largely uncontroversial to claim that intellectual and theoretical progress has occurred; somewhat controversial to say aesthetic or artistic progress has taken place; and highly controversial too assert that moral progress has occurred*" (Macklin, 1977: 370). In speaking of moral progress, Macklin is referring to what is "wholly a social concept;" one which encapsulates only "*events, institutions, and practices in countries, cultures, societies, eras, or periods in history*" (Macklin, 1977: 370; italics in original). As to whether it is highly controversial to assert that there has been progress in the social sphere is a point open to debate, for this is at odds with the claim that the idea of progress constituted an article of faith for much of the past three centuries. Like Macklin, E. H. Goddard and P. A. Gibbons note that there is a general historical consensus that "*Progress has certainly taken place in science, in thought, and in all branches of knowledge.*" But unlike Macklin, they argue that there has long been a widely held conviction "*that progress has taken place in social order and political institutions.*" They conclude that much of recent history is characterized by a general belief that "*all the great branches of human achievement, art, science, religion, politics, society, thought, everything in fact which goes to constitute what we call civilization,*

are affected by a discussion of the reality of progress” (Goddard and Gibbons, 1926: 1-2).

The aspects of civilization and progress most relevant here are those relating to social co-operation or degrees of socio-political organization. The logic underpinning this is based on the argument, as seen in Thomas Hobbes, that some degree of socio-political organization is a basic necessity for the foundation of civilization and, hence, progress. This is readily distinguishable in the following well-known passage from Hobbes’ *Leviathan*:

*Whatsoever therefore is consequent to a time of Warre, where every man is Enemy to every man; the same consequent to the time, wherein men live without other security, than what their own strength, and their own invention shall furnish them with all. In such condition, there is no place for Industry; because the fruit thereof is uncertain: and consequently no Culture of the Earth; no Navigation, nor use of the commodities that may be imported by Sea; no commodious Building; no Instruments of moving, and removing such things as require much force; no Knowledge of the face of the Earth; no account of Time; no Arts; no Letters; no Society; and which is worst of all, continual feare, and danger of violent death; And the life of man, solitary, poore, nasty, brutish, and short (Hobbes, [1651] 1985: 186).*

What Hobbes is effectively arguing here is that without initial co-operation in political society, there is no knowledge of science and technology, no philosophy and fine arts, no personal property, wealth, or wellbeing, and naturally, “no progress in these things” (Van Doren, 1967: 376). For Hobbes, at least in the first instance, progress in society and politics comes prior to every other form of progress and, moreover, progress within the other sub-elements of civilization is contingent upon it. Or, as Friedrich von Schiller would later put it, “would Greece have borne a Thucydides, a Plato, and an Aristotle, or Rome a Horace, a Cicero, a Virgil, and a Livy, if these two states had not risen to those heights of political achievement which in fact they attained?” (Schiller, [1789] 1972: 329). Once this initial societal condition is secured, however, there is no reason why progress in other fields should not surpass the rate of progress in the socio-political arena. On this basis it is argued that civilization and progress would provide “superior institutions for organizing people more rationally” (Norgaard, 1994: 51).

Of particular importance in respect to colonialism are the normative demands of the ideas of progress and civilization. As Starobinski points out, “as a value, civilization constitutes a political and moral norm. It is the criterion against which barbarity, or non-civilization, is judged and condemned” (Starobinski, 1993: 31). A similar sort of argument is made by Anthony Pagden, who states that civilization “describes a state, social, political, cultural, aesthetic – even moral and physical – which is held to be the optimum condition for all [hu]mankind, and this involves the implicit claim that only the civilized can know what it is to be civilized” (Pagden, 1988: 33). The suggestion that only the civilized know what it means to be civilized is an important one; for as Starobinski argues, the “historical moment in which the word civilization appears marks

*the advent of self-reflection, the emergence of consciousness that thinks it understands the nature of its own activity.” More specifically, it marks “the moment that Western civilization becomes aware of itself reflectively, it sees itself as one civilization among others. Having achieved self-consciousness, civilization immediately discovers civilizations” (Starobinski, 1993: 32; italics (turned bold for distinction here) in original).*

The oft-overlooked implications of this value-laden conception of civilization led to what Georg Schwarzenberger called the “*standard of civilization in international law*” (Schwarzenberger, 1955); or what Gerrit W. Gong later termed the “*standard of civilization in international society*” (Gong, 1984). Historically, the standard of civilization was a means used in international law to distinguish between civilized and uncivilized peoples in order to determine membership in the international society of states. The concept entered international legal texts and practice in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries under the influence of anthropologists and ethnologists who drew distinctions between civilized, barbarian, and savage peoples based on their respective capacities for social co-operation and organization. Operating primarily during the European colonial period, the standard of civilization was a legal mechanism designed to set the benchmark for the ascent of non-European states to the ranks of the civilized “Family of Nations,” and with it, their full recognition under international law. A civilized state required: a) basic institutions of government and public bureaucracy; b) organizational capacity for self-defense; c) published legal code and adherence to the rule of law; d) the capacity to honor contracts in commerce and capital exchange; and e) recognition of international law and norms, including the laws of war (Gong, 2004; Bowden, 2004b). If a nation could meet these requirements it was generally deemed to be a legitimate sovereign state entitled to full recognition as an international personality.

The inability of many non-European societies to meet these European established criteria and the concomitant legal distinction that separated them from civilized societies led to the unequal treaty system of capitulations. The right of extraterritoriality, as it was also known, regulated relations between sovereign civilized states and quasi-sovereign uncivilized states in regard to their respective rights over, and obligations to, the citizens of civilized states living and operating in countries where capitulations were in force. In much of the uncivilized world this system of capitulations incrementally escalated to the point that it became the large-scale European civilizing missions that in turn became colonialism.

-  
-  
-

TO ACCESS ALL THE 41 PAGES OF THIS CHAPTER,  
Visit: <http://www.eolss.net/Eolss-sampleAllChapter.aspx>

## Bibliography

Acosta, J. de. 2002 [1950]. *Natural and Moral History of the Indies*. Ed. J. E. Mangan. Trans. F. M. López-Morillas. Durham and London: Duke University Press. [One of the first detailed anthropological accounts of the New World based on Acosta's own travels as a Jesuit missionary].

Alexandrowicz, C. H. "The Juridical Expression of the Sacred Trust of Civilization." *American Journal of International Law* 65, no. 1 (1971): 149-159. [A concise account of the principle of the sacred trust of civilization by an acclaimed jurist].

Almond, G. A., Chodorow, M. and Roy Harvey Pearce R. (Eds). 1982. *Progress and its Discontents*. Berkeley: University of California Press. [A collection of essays debating various aspects of the idea of progress].

Bagehot, W. n.d. [1875]. *Physics and Politics*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co. [A major work of social and political theory of the Victorian era].

Beisner, R. L. 1968. *Twelve Against Empire: The Anti-Imperialists, 1898-1900*. New York: McGraw-Hill. [Account of American politicians apposed to the U.S. joining the ranks of the imperial powers].

Bowden, B. 2004a. "The Ideal of Civilisation: Its Origins and Socio-Political Character." *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 7, no. 1: 25-50. [Summary of the origins of the idea of civilization].

Bowden, B. 2004b. "In the Name of Progress and Peace: the 'Standard of Civilization' and the Universalizing Project." *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 29, no.1: 43-68. [Explains how standards of civilization have been used to shape international states system].

Bowden, B. 2009a. *The Empire of Civilization: the Evolution of an Imperial Idea*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press. [Comprehensive account of how the idea of civilization has been used to shape imperial policy over a number of centuries].

Bowden, B. (Ed.). 2009b. *Civilization: Critical Concepts in Political Science*. Four Volumes. London and New York: Routledge. [Brings together more than ninety important contributions by leading thinkers on the idea of civilization in four thematic volumes].

Brandon, W. 1986. *New Worlds for Old: Reports from the New World and their effect on the development of social thought in Europe, 1500-1800*. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press. [Examines the impact of reports from the New World on social and political theorizing in the in the Old World].

Bury, J. B. 1960. *The Idea of Progress: An Inquiry into its Origin and Growth*. New York: Dover Publications. [Bury, a historian, undertakes one of the first major investigations of the idea of progress. He demonstrates the significance of the idea of progress as a motivating force in modern history].

Collingwood, R. G. 1992. *The New Leviathan: Or Man, Society, Civilization and Barbarism*. Ed. David Boucher. Oxford: Clarendon Press. [Collingwood, a philosopher, attempts to establish the multiple and complex connections between the levels of consciousness, society, civilization, and barbarism].

Condorcet, A. De. 1955 [1795]. *Sketch for a Historical Picture of the Progress of the Human Mind*. Trans. J. Barraclough. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson. [An early and important theoretical account of human social and political progress by a prominent French thinker of the Enlightenment].

Darwin, J.2000. "Civility and Empire." In *Civil Histories: Essays Presented to Sir Keith Thomas*. Eds. P. Burke, B. Harrison, and P. Slack, 321-336. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [An essay on the role of ideas about civility in the imperial enterprise].

Edelstein, L. 1967. *The Idea of Progress in Classical Antiquity*. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press. [In contrast to Bury presents an argument that the idea of progress dates back to Antiquity].

Elias, N. 2000. *The Civilising Process*. Trans. E. Jephcott. Revised Edition. Oxford: [Blackwell. Sociologist Elias traces the civilizing of manners and people in Western Europe since the late Middle Ages by demonstrating how the formation of states and the monopolization of power within them changed Western society forever].



Emerson, R. 1960. *From empire to nation: the rise to self-assertion of Asian and African peoples*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. [An account of the self-determination of colonized peoples by a political scientist who also served in U.S. government positions].

Engels, F. 1948 [1884]. *The Origin of Family, Private Property and the State*. Moscow: Progress Publishers. Follows Morgan's *Ancient Society* in arguing that the first domestic institution in human history was the matrilineal clan, not the family.

Fanon, F. 1967. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Harmondsworth: Penguin. Fanon, a psychiatrist, explores the traumatic psychological effects of colonization on the psyche of a nation and its people. [Demonstrates how building a national culture is critical to decolonization].

Ferguson, A. 1966. *An Essay on the History of Civil Society 1767*. Ed. D. Forbes. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. [Key Scottish Enlightenment text, Ferguson combines a subtle analysis of modern commercial society with a critique of its abandonment of civic and communal virtues].

Fiore, P. 1918. *International Law Codified and its Legal Sanction*. New York: Baker, Voorhis and Company. [Contribution to the foundations and force of international law among nations by an influential Italian jurist.]

Goddard, E. H. and Gibbons, P. A. 1926. *Civilisation or Civilisations: An Essay in the Spenglerian Philosophy of History*. London: Constable & Company. [Draws on Spengler's *Decline of the West* in outlining a philosophy of history].

Gray, J. 1995. *Enlightenment's wake: Politics and culture at the close of the modern age*. London and New York: Routledge. [A skeptical account of the spread of liberalism and associated values by eminent political theorist].

Guha, R. 2002. *History at the Limit of World-History*, New York: Columbia University Press. [Takes issue with the Hegelian concept of World-history by critiquing historiography that sidelines the histories of indigenous and colonized peoples].

Haase, W. and Reinhold, M. Eds. 1994. *The Classical Tradition and the Americas*. Berlin and New York: W. de Gruyter. [Collection of essays contextualizing the classical tradition in light of European encounters with the Americas].

Hankins, F. H. 1926. *The Racial Basis of Civilization: A critique of the Nordic doctrine*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. [A summary and critique of various race-based doctrines].

Hegel, G.W.F. 1975. *Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art. 2 Volumes*. Trans. T. M. Knox. Oxford: Clarendon Press. [Compilation of Hegel's lectures on aesthetics given in the 1820s based on his handwritten notes and those of his students].

Hegel, G.W.F. 1958. *Philosophy of Right*. Trans. T.M. Knox. Oxford: Clarendon Press. [A classic work of social and political thought in which Hegel seeks to systematize ethical theory, natural right, the philosophy of law, political theory, and the sociology of the modern state into his philosophy of history]

Hegel, G.W.F. 1956. *The Philosophy of History*. Trans. J. Sibree. New York: Dover Publications. [Hegel's lectures on history in which he lays down the principles and aims which underlie his philosophy of history, and provides an outline of the philosophy of history itself].

Herder, J. G. 1997. *On World History: An Anthology*. Eds. H. Adler and E. A. Menze. Trans. E. A. Menze and M. Palma. Armonk, N.Y. and London: M.E. Sharpe. [Anthology of the German Romanticist philosopher's writings on world history; an important contrast to the work of his one-time teacher Kant].

Hobbes, T. 1985 [1651]. *Leviathan*. Ed. C. B. Macpherson. Harmondsworth: Penguin. [An early example of social contract theory it is one of the great works of political philosophy on the organization and government of society].

Jahn, B. 2000. *The Cultural Construction of International Relations: The Invention of the State of Nature*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave. [A deconstruction of the nature/culture dichotomy in international relations].

Kant, I. 1963. *Kant on History*. Ed. L. W. Beck. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill. [A collection of Kant's important essays on history and the philosophy of history].

Lafitau, J. F. 1974 [1724]. *Customs of the American Indians Compared with the Customs of Primitive Times*. Two Volumes. Eds. And Trans. W. N. Fenton and E. L. Moore. Toronto: The Chaplain Society. [A detailed record of an early-eighteenth century Jesuit missionary].

Lauterpacht, H. 1947. *Recognition in International Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Important text by one of the twentieth century's leading international lawyers].

Locke, J. 1965 [1690]. *Two Treatises of Government*. New York: New American Library. [A classic work of political philosophy; the First Treatise attacks the patriarchalism of Filmer, the Second Treatise outlines a theory of political or civil society based on natural rights and social contract theory].

Lorimer, J. 1883. *The Institutes of the Law of Nations*. Two Volumes. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons. [A work of international law arguing for a more prominent role for natural law in international relations over prevailing legal positivism].

Lubbock, Sir J. 1870. *The Origin of Civilisation and the Primitive Condition of Man: Mental and Social Condition of Savages*. New York: D. Appleton and Company. [A work of anthropology/ethnography/archaeology by an associate of Darwin's in support of evolutionary theory].

Macklin, R. 1977. "Moral Progress." *Ethics* 87, no. 4: 370-382. [An essay raising questions about the notion of moral progress].

Mamdani, M. 1996. *Citizen and subject: contemporary Africa and the legacy of late colonialism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. [An important recent book on the legacy of colonialism in Africa].

Meek, R. L. 1976. *Social science and the ignoble savage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Explores the origins of the four stages theory of development and the impact of the discovery of American Indians on the theory].

Mill, J. S. 1962. "A Few Words on Non-Intervention." In *Essays on Politics and Culture*. Ed. G. Himmelfarb, 396-413. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company. [An essay on the circumstances in which one state might intervene in the sovereign affairs of another].

Mill, J. S. 1977. "Civilization." In *Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, Vol. XVIII: Essays on Politics and Society. Ed. J. M. Robson, 119-147. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. [An essay on the concept of civilization and its meanings].

Montesquieu. 1989 [1748]. *The Spirit of the Laws*. Ed. and Trans. A. M. Cohler, B. C. Miller and H. S. Stone. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [A key eighteenth century work of political philosophy advocating constitutionalism and the separation of powers, the abolition of slavery, the preservation of civil liberties and the rule of law].

Morgan, L. H. 1907. *Ancient Society: Or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilization*. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr and Company. [Influential anthropological work in part based on observations of the Iroquois Confederation].

Muthu, S. 2003. *Enlightenment against Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. [Outlines the work of Enlightenment thinkers opposed to imperialism].

Nisbet, R. 1980. *History of the Idea of Progress*. London: Heinemann. Nisbet, a sociologist, traces the idea of progress from its origins in Greek, Roman, and medieval roots to modern times].

Nkrumah, K. 1973. *Towards Colonial Freedom: Africa in the struggle against world imperialism*. London: Panaf Books. [A case for independence from colonialism and self-government from Ghana's first president].

Norgaard, R. B. 1994. *Development Betrayed: The end of progress and a coevolutionary revisioning of the future*. London: Routledge. [A strident critique of development, offers an alternative in which development is portrayed as a co-evolution between cultural and ecological systems].

Nussbaum, M. C. 1997. "Kant and Stoic Cosmopolitanism." *The Journal of Political Philosophy* 5, no. 1: 1-25. [Essay on the sources of cosmopolitan political thought].

Pagden, A. 1988. "The 'defence of civilization' in eighteenth-century social theory." *History of the Human Sciences* 1, no. 1: 33-45. [Essay on the idea of civilization in eighteenth century social and political thought].

Pagden, A. 1982. *The Fall of Natural Man: The American Indian and the Origins of Comparative Ethnology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [A study of the pre-Enlightenment methods by which Europeans attempted to describe and classify American Indians].

Robertson, W. 1812. *The History of America*. Four Volumes. Twelfth Edition. London: Cadell and Davies. [A large scale history of America by a leading historian of the Scottish Enlightenment].

Ryan, M. T. 1981. "Assimilating New Worlds in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 23, no. 4: 529-531. [Examines how peoples of the New World were situated in history by key thinkers].

Said, E. 1994. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage. Demonstrates that Western imperialism's most effective tools for dominating other cultures have been literary in nature as much as political and economic.

Schapiro, J. S. 1963. *Condorcet and the Rise of Liberalism*. New York: Octagon Books. [Examines Condorcet's place in Enlightenment thought and his role in the rise of liberalism].

Schiller, F. Von. 1972 [1789]. "The Nature and Value of Universal History: An Inaugural Lecture." *History and Theory* 11, no. 3: 321-334. [Essay on the philosophy of history and the place of different peoples in the narrative of universal history].

Schwarzenberger, G. 1955. "The Standard of Civilisation in International Law." In *Current Legal Problems*. Eds. G. W. Keeton and G. Schwarzenberger, 212-234. London: Stevens & Sons Ltd. Important contribution to international law on the development and role of standards of civilization in governing relations between societies of different international standing.

Smith, A. 1869 [1776]. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. London: T. Nelson and Sons. [A classic text in the history of Western thought by one of its most influential moral philosophers in which he outlines the most appropriate modes of government and economics for a prosperous society].

Snow, A. H. 1921. *The Question of Aborigines in the Law and Practice of Nations*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons: The Knickerbocker Press. [Outlines the status of indigenous peoples in international law and international relations, includes a collection of authorities and documents].

Spencer, H. 1892. *Social Statistics*. Revised Edition. London and Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate. [A work applying Lamarckian ideas of evolution to society by the man who later coined the term "survival of the fittest."]

Spengler, O. 1962. *The Decline of the West*. Trans. C.F. Atkinson. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. Expansive account of Western society and civilization by German historian that advances a world view based on the cyclical rise and fall of civilizations.

Starobinski, J. 1993. "The Word Civilization." In *Blessings in Disguise; or The Morality of Evil*. Trans. Arthur Goldhammer, 1-35. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. [French linguist explores the origins and shifting meanings of the word civilization].

Stephanson, A. 1995. *Manifest Destiny: American Expansion and the Empire of Right*. New York: Hill and Wang. [Historical account of American expansion and arrival as an empire to rival the powers of Europe].

Stevenson, J. R. 1967. "South West Africa Cases (Ethiopia v. South Africa; Liberia v. South Africa), Second Phase." *American Journal of International Law* 61, no.1: 116-210. [Documents an ICJ case contesting South Africa's Mandate over Namibia].

Turgot, A. R. J. 1973. *Turgot on Progress, Sociology and Economics*. Ed. and Trans. R. L. Meek. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Eighteenth century French thinkers thoughts on the idea of progress and the government of society; Turgot is considered an early advocate of economic liberalism].

Van Doren, C. 1967. *The Idea of Progress*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger. [A comprehensive survey of the idea of progress].

van Krieken, R. 1999. "The barbarism of civilization: cultural genocide and the 'stolen generations'." *British Journal of Sociology* 50, no. 2: 297-315. [Explores the impact of the idea of civilization and the things done in its name in the context of Aboriginal Australia].

Vattel, E. de. 1644. *The Law of Nations or the Principles of Natural Law*. Trans. C. G. Fenwick. New York: Oceana Publications for the Carnegie Institute. [Prominent work by Swiss jurist, including commentary on Wolff's *The Law of Nations According to the Scientific Method*, with focus on the rights and obligations of citizens and states].

Vitoria, F. de. 1493 [1539]. *De Indis et de Iure Belli Relectiones*. Ed. E. Nys. New York: Oceana Publications for Carnegie Institution. [Considered one of the earliest works of international law, makes a series of arguments justifying Spanish conquest of the New World].

Voltaire, 1755 [1776]. *The Philosophy of History*. London: Vision. [Thoughts on the philosophy of history by a prominent French writer, poet, historian and philosopher working during the Enlightenment].

Westlake, J. 1914. *The Collected Papers of John Westlake on Public International Law*. Ed. L. Oppenheim. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [The legal writings of a prominent English legal scholar working in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century].

Wolf, E. R. 1982. *Europe and the People without History*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press. [Carefully explores the myriad connections between different peoples and parts of the world since 1400].

### **Biographical Sketch**

**Brett Bowden** is an Associate Professor of History and Political Thought at the University of Western Sydney. He holds visiting appointments at The Australian National University, Canberra, and at the University of New South Wales at the Australian Defence Force Academy, Canberra. Brett has held visiting positions in the Centre for the Study of Democracy at the University of Westminster in London, and in the Centre for Interdisciplinary Research at Bielefeld University in Germany. He received his PhD from The Australian National University and his undergraduate degrees from Flinders University of South Australia. Brett is the author or editor of eight books and many articles and book chapters; his recent major publications include, *The Empire of Civilization: the Evolution of an Imperial Idea* (University of Chicago Press, 2009), which was awarded the 2011 Norbert Elias Prize, and the 4-volume edited collection, *Civilization: Critical Concepts* (Routledge, 2009). Brett is an Associate Editor of the second edition of the 6-volume, *Berkshire Encyclopedia of World History* (2010), edited by William H. McNeill