

Imperialism, Sovereignty and the Making of International Law

This book examines the relationship between imperialism and international law. It argues that colonial confrontation was central to the formation of international law and, in particular, its founding concept, sovereignty. Traditional histories of the discipline present colonialism and non-European peoples as peripheral concerns. By contrast, Anghie argues that international law has always been animated by the 'civilizing mission' - the project of governing non-European peoples. Racial discrimination, cultural subordination and economic exploitation are constitutively significant for the discipline, rather than aberrations that have been overcome by modern international law. In developing these arguments, the book examines different phases of the colonial encounter, ranging from the sixteenth century to the League of Nations period and the current 'war against terror'. Anghie provides a new approach to the history of international law, illuminating the imperial character of the discipline and its enduring significance for peoples of the Third World.

ANTONY ANGHIE is Professor of Law at the S. J. Quinney School of Law, University of Utah. He received his LLB (Hons.) and BA (Hons.) degrees from Monash University, Melbourne, Australia, and his SJD degree from Harvard Law School. He practised law for several years in Melbourne, and now teaches Contracts and various subjects in the International Law curriculum, including International Business Transactions and International Environmental Law. He has served as a tutor at Monash and Melbourne Universities, where he has taught Development Politics and International Relations; and as a Teaching Fellow at Harvard College where he has taught International Relations. He also served as Senior Fellow at Harvard Law School and a Visiting Professor at the University of Tokyo. He is a member of the Third World Approaches to International Law network of scholars.



CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN INTERNATIONAL AND COMPARATIVE LAW

Established in 1946, this series produces high-quality scholarship in the fields of public and private international law and comparative law. Although these are distinct legal subdisciplines, developments since 1946 confirm their interrelation.

Comparative law is increasingly used as a tool in the making of law at national, regional and international levels. Private international law is now often affected by international conventions, and the issues faced by classical conflicts rules are frequently dealt with by substantive harmonisation of law under international auspices. Mixed international arbitrations, especially those involving state economic activity, raise mixed questions of public and private international law, while in many fields (such as the protection of human rights and democratic standards, investment guarantees and international criminal law) international and national systems interact. National constitutional arrangements relating to 'foreign affairs', and to the implementation of international norms, are a focus of attention.

The Board welcomes works of a theoretical or interdisciplinary character, and those focusing on the new approaches to international or comparative law or conflicts of law. Studies of particular institutions or problems are equally welcome, as are translations of the best work published in other languages.

> Whewell Professor of International Law, Faculty of Law, and Director, Lauterpacht Research Centre for International Law,

University of Cambridge John S. Bell FBA

Professor of Law, Faculty of Law, University of Cambridge

Editorial Board Professor Hilary Charlesworth Australian National University

Professor Lori Damrosch Columbia University Law School

Professor John Dugard Universiteit Leiden

Professor Mary-Ann Glendon Harvard Law School

Professor Christopher Greenwood London School of Economics

Professor David Johnston University of Edinburgh Professor Hein Kötz Max-Planck-Institut, Hamburg Professor Donald McRae University of Ottawa Professor Onuma Yasuaki University of Tokyo

Professor Reinhard Zimmermann Universität Regensburg

Advisory Committee Professor D. W. Bowett QC

Judge Rosalyn Higgins QC Professor J. A. Jolowicz QC

Professor Sir Elihu Lauterpacht CBE QC

Professor Kurt Lipstein Judge Stephen Schwebel

A list of books in the series can be found at the end of this volume.



Imperialism, Sovereignty and the Making of International Law

Antony Anghie

S. J. Quinney School of Law, University of Utah





PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge, CB2 2RU, UK 40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011–4211, USA 477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa

http://www.cambridge.org

© Antony Anghie 2004

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2005

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeface Swift 10/13 pt. System $AT_EX 2_{\varepsilon}$ [TB]

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

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data Anghie, Antony.

Imperialism, sovereignty, and the making of international law/Antony Anghie.

p. cm. – (Cambridge studies in international and comparative law; 37) Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0 521 82892 9

1. International law. 2. Imperialism. 3. Sovereignty. 4. Indigenous peoples – Legal status, laws, etc. I. Title. II. Cambridge studies in international and comparative law (Cambridge, England: 1996); 37.

KZ3410.A54 2004 341 - dc22 2004049732

ISBN 0 521 82892 9 hardback

The publisher has used its best endeavours to ensure that the URLs for external websites referred to in this book are correct and active at the time of going to press. However, the publisher has no responsibility for the websites and can make no guarantee that a site will remain live or that the content is or will remain appropriate.



For my parents



Contents

	Foreword James C. Crawford	page xi
	Acknowledgements	xiv
	Table of cases	xvi
	Table of treaties	xix
	Introduction	1
1	Francisco de Vitoria and the colonial origins of	
	international law	13
	Introduction	13
	Vitoria and the problem of universal law	17
	War, sovereignty and the transformation of the Indian	23
	Conclusion	28
2	Finding the peripheries: colonialism in	
	nineteenth-century international law	32
	Introduction	32
	Elements of positivist jurisprudence	40
	Defining and excluding the uncivilized	52
	Native personality and managing the colonial	
	encounter	65
	Reconceptualizing sovereignty	100
3	Colonialism and the birth of international	
	institutions: the Mandate System of the League	
	of Nations	115
	Introduction	115
	The creation of the Mandate System	119

vii



V111	CONTENTS

	The League of Nations and the new international law	123
	The Mandate System and colonial problems	136
	The Mandate System and the construction of the	
	non-European state	147
	Government, sovereignty and economy	156
	The mandate and the dissolution of sovereignty	179
	The legacies of the Mandate System: toward the	
	present	190
	Conclusion	194
4	Sovereignty and the post-colonial state	196
	Introduction	196
	Decolonization and the universality of international	
	law	199
	Development, nationalism and the post-colonial state	204
	Development and the reform of international law	207
	Permanent sovereignty over natural resources and	
	the New International Economic Order	211
	The 1962 Resolution on PSNR	216
	The 1974 Charter of Rights and Duties Among States	220
	Colonialism and the emergence of transnational law	223
	Sources of law and international contracts	226
	Overview and conclusions	235
5	Governance and globalization, civilization	
	and commerce	245
	Introduction	245
	Good governance and the Third World	247
	Governance, human rights and the universal	254
	International financial institutions, human rights	
	and good governance	258
	International financial institutions and the Mandate	
	System	263
	Conclusions and overview	268
6	On making war on the terrorist: imperialism	
	as self-defence	273
	Introduction	273
	The war against terrorism	274
	The United States and imperial democracy	279



	CONTENTS	ix
Historical origins: war, conquest and self-defe	ence	291
Terrorism and the United Nations: a Vitorian	moment	298
Terrorism, self-defence and Third World sove	reignty	303
Conclusion		310
Bibliography		321
Index		342



Foreword

In this challenging book, Dr. Anghie examines a series of episodes in the legal history of the relations between the West and non-Western polities. He argues that they possess common features, reproducing at different epochs and in different ways an underlying pattern of domination and subordination – and doing so despite continued professions of idealism and universal values by the (Western) lawyers and leaders who have been dominantly engaged.

The first of these episodes dates from the earliest phase of international law. Of the five studied, it is the least institutional. Rather it is an episode of justification and apology – Vitoria's attempt to deal with the rights of the Amerindians faced with Spanish colonization. Of course, Vitoria was dealing with this problem after the event and he was teaching (a generation after Columbus) in the Catholic tradition of moral–religious theory and not as a self-perceived international lawyer. But his work, Anghie argues, inaugurated our subject. From the beginning, international law was not exclusively concerned with the relations between states but, and more importantly, with the relations between civilizations and peoples. Moreover these were relations of *domination*. Colonization and Empire were present at the creation, and the apologetic use of universalist ideals has never been abandoned, whatever new forms it may have taken.

The second episode is that of the 1884–5 Congress of Berlin and the final stages of colonial expansion. It was as a result of this process – or, as with Japan and Siam, of the pre-emptive adoption of Western techniques (including international law) by the few entities that managed to survive it without losing their independence – that international law became global. The ancient ideal of universality was realized as a result of and in the course of the substantial (and historically rather recent) suppression



xii FOREWORD

of the non-Western world. In the process the concept of 'civilization' was used as a form of the *exclusion* of non-Western values, of non-Western identity and even of legal personality. This process can be traced through writers such as Westlake just as much as through statesmen such as Bismarck or events such as the Maori wars.

The third episode is that of the Mandate System under the League of Nations, the beginning of the reversal of colonization that was effectively completed under the United Nations. Under the guise of a 'sacred trust of civilization', Western powers (and Japan) under nominal international tutelage applied the concept of the sacred trust to effect the reality of exploitation. The 1992 *Nauru* Case is an illustration, even if it is one for which a modicum of compensation was, uniquely, obtained after the event.¹

And when, after a long process, independence was achieved (for all but one of the mandated territories²) and extended beyond the original list of mandates to all colonial territories, the independence that was granted turned out to be less than it seemed. The newly independent states (this is the fourth episode) fought to develop new rules, even a new international economic order. But in the event the Bretton Woods Institutions triumphed, imposing their own view of development and a certain set of structures of governance on half the world's population and a majority of its governments. The outcome has been, on the whole, increased indebtedness and new forms of dependence.

Finally (for the time being) we have the war on terrorism, a new form of branding of a significant fraction of the world, in particular the Muslim world, as barbarian and as enemies. In Dr Anghie's words, 'law ... in the name of security, reproduces a new form of imperialism.' Moreover it is a new imperialism in which neo-conservatism vies with neo-liberalism in the assertion of control.

International lawyers have always assumed that their subject existed BC (before colonization), just as they have tended to assume its florescence, as yet open and undetermined, in our time of AD (after decolonization). Anghie's thesis is that we live still in a common era of Continued Empire (CE), albeit under new forms. Not everyone will agree with his argument, or that each of his chosen instances necessarily exemplifies it. Evidently there is a measure of generalization and simplification. There

¹ Certain Phosphate Lands in Nauru (Nauru v. Australia), ICJ Reports 1989 p. 15. Following the decision the claim was settled by Australia, with subsequent contributions from the two partner governments.

² Palestine is still the exception.



FOREWORD Xiii

are many differences among 'Third World' states, and we should resist equating 'Third World' with 'the countries that lack governance' or those in which 'development has failed'; otherwise debates about governance and development will become viciously circular.

It must be admitted that the general theme of the work – that '[t]he colonial history of international law is concealed even when it is reproduced' – is sobering. The book is not, however, unrelievedly pessimistic. In Anghie's view 'the Third World cannot abandon international law because law now plays such a vital role in the public realm in the interpretation of virtually all international events'. It may be doubted whether 'it is possible to create an international law that is not imperial', and faith in the future is hardly balanced by our recorded history of good works. But the fact remains that, although not under circumstances of their own choosing, people and communities do nevertheless make their own history; indeed they are condemned to do so. An understanding of those circumstances, we may hope, may help prevent their endless repetition under new forms. In this way, we can read Anghie as challenging us to think of ways of creating a non-imperial international law.

James Crawford

Lauterpacht Research Centre for International Law University of Cambridge



Acknowledgements

I have acquired many debts over the years it has taken me to write this book. My profound thanks are due to Nathaniel Berman, Abram Chayes, B. S. Chimni, Robert Chu, Karen Engle, James Thuo Gathii, Daniel Greenwood, Qadri Ismail, Susil Jayaratne, Karen Knop, Martti Koskenniemi, Mitchel Lasser, Karin Mickelson, Herbert Morais, Vasuki Nesiah, Celestine Nyamu, Liliana Obregon, Obiora Okafor, Onuma Yasuaki, Ileana Porras, Balakrishnan Rajagopal, Rhee Zha Hyoung, Annelise Riles, Kerry Rittich, Henry Steiner, Detlev Vagts and Robert Wai, who all contributed in different ways to my thinking on the issues I explore in this book. I owe a special debt to my colleagues in the Third World Approaches to International Law network of scholars who persuaded me that the lines of inquiry undertaken here were worth pursuing. This book originated as a SJD thesis which I completed at Harvard Law School, and I am grateful to K. Anthony Appiah and Duncan Kennedy, who were on my thesis committee, for their valuable guidance. Thomas Franck, one of my examiners, provided me with extremely acute, detailed and illuminating comments, the true significance of which, in some cases, I realised only years later. I have the great good fortune of being the student of two extraordinary teachers. Christopher Weeramantry inspired me by his example to take up the study of international law and he has been unstinting in his support and concern ever since I was his student. His vision of international justice, his integrity, his erudition and wisdom establish the standards to which I will always aspire but never attain. David Kennedy supervised my thesis, and his brilliance, support, encouragement and provocation were indispensable to the writing of this work. It was only gradually, as I embarked on my own teaching career, that I better appreciated the magnitude of the generosity, insight and understanding that he extended to me, and that made this work, for better

xiv



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

xv

or worse, possible. His vision and dedication created a remarkable SJD programme at Harvard Law School, which supported not only my own scholarship, but that of many other younger scholars whose important and innovative work was uniquely appreciated and encouraged. I am indebted to two institutions in particular. My colleagues at the S. J. Quinney School of Law, at the University of Utah, through their kindness and support, provided an ideal environment in which I could pursue my work, as did the Graduate Programme at Harvard Law School and all the people associated with it during the five years I spent there. Mike Truman and Aaron Jordan provided both superb research assistance and much-needed organization. John Bevan and Laura Ngai of the S. J. Quinney law library were indefatigable in locating and providing me with the most obscure and elusive materials. The University of Utah provided me with a Faculty Fellowship and sabbatical leave that made my research possible during the last stages of the writing of this work. The S. J. Quinney School of Law provided me with financial support through the Summer Stipend Program. My thanks to the University of Tokyo and Onuma Yasuaki for enabling me to spend three valuable months at the University of Tokyo. I am also very grateful to James Crawford who was kind enough to write the Foreword to this book, and who also made several valuable suggestions and corrections. At Cambridge University Press, many thanks to Finola O'Sullivan, Jane O'Regan, Mary Leighton and Barbara Docherty for their patience and professionalism. This book was completed in February 2004.

Parts of this book have been previously published, in somewhat different form, as 'Francisco de Vitoria and the Colonial Origins of International Law', 5(3) Social and Legal Studies, 321–336 (1996); 'Francisco de Vitoria and the Colonial Origins of International Law', in Laws of the Postcolonial, edited by Eve Darian-Smith and Peter Fitzpatrick, University of Michigan Press (1999), pp. 89–109; 'Finding the Peripheries: Sovereignty and Colonialism in Nineteenth Century International Law', 40(1) Harvard International Law Journal (Winter 1999), 1–80; 'Colonialism and the Birth of International Institutions: Sovereignty, Economy and the Mandate System of the League of Nations', 34(3) New York University Journal of International Law and Politics (Spring 2002), 513–633. Omnia pro deo.



Table of cases

Advisory Opinion No. 41, Customs Régime Between Germany	
and Austria, 1931 PCIJ Ser. A/B, No. 41	page 182
AMINOIL Case, see Award in the Matter of an Arbitration	
Between Kuwait and the American Independent Oil	
Company	
Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. Case (U.K. v. Iran), ICJ Reports 1952, p. 93	230
The Antelope, 23 U.S. (10 Wheaton) 5 (1825)	53, 54
Austria-Germany Customs Case, see Advisory Opinion No. 41	180
Award in the Matter of an Arbitration Between Kuwait and th	ne
American Independent Oil Company (AMINOIL) [1982] 21	
ILM 976	243
Case Concerning the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Project (Hungary	v.
Slovakia), ICJ Reports 1997, p. 7	237
Case Concerning Various Serbian Loans Issued in France (1929)	9),
PCIJ Ser. A No. 20	227
Certain Phosphate Lands in Nauru (Nauru v. Australia), ICJ	
Reports 1992, p. 240 (preliminary objections,	
judgement)	xii, 149
Duff Development Co. v. Kelentan Govt. [1924] A.C. 797	87
International Status of South-West Africa, ICJ Reports	
1950, No. 10, p. 128	147, 149
Island of Palmas, see U.S. v. Netherlands	76
Johnson v. McIntosh, 21 US (8 Wheat.) 543 (1823)	80,213,290
Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence	
of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa)	
Notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970),	
ICJ Reports 1971, p. 16	148, 154

xvi



TABLE OF CASES xvii

Advisory Opinion, ICJ Reports 1996, p. 226 273,293,305 Lighthouses in Crete and Samos (France v. Greece), 1937 PCIJ Ser. A/B, No. 71 181 Lockerbie Case, see Questions of Interpretation and Application of the 19th Montreal Convention Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v. United States), ICJ Reports 1986, p. 14 304 Nabob of Arcot v. The East India Company, 3 Bro. C.C. 292; 29 Eng. Rep. 544 (1791), reprinted in (1967) 6 British International Law Cases 281 68 Nicaragua Case, see Military and Paramilitary Activities in and
A/B, No. 71 Lockerbie Case, see Questions of Interpretation and Application of the 19th Montreal Convention Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v. United States), ICJ Reports 1986, p. 14 Nabob of Arcot v. The East India Company, 3 Bro. C.C. 292; 29 Eng. Rep. 544 (1791), reprinted in (1967) 6 British International Law Cases 281 68
Lockerbie Case, <i>see</i> Questions of Interpretation and Application of the 19th Montreal Convention Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v. United States), ICJ Reports 1986, p. 14 Nabob of Arcot v. The East India Company, 3 Bro. C.C. 292; 29 Eng. Rep. 544 (1791), reprinted in (1967) 6 <i>British International Law Cases</i> 281
of the 19th Montreal Convention Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v. United States), ICJ Reports 1986, p. 14 Nabob of Arcot v. The East India Company, 3 Bro. C.C. 292; 29 Eng. Rep. 544 (1791), reprinted in (1967) 6 British International Law Cases 281 68
Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v. United States), ICJ Reports 1986, p. 14 Nabob of Arcot v. The East India Company, 3 Bro. C.C. 292; 29 Eng. Rep. 544 (1791), reprinted in (1967) 6 British International Law Cases 281 68
(Nicaragua v. United States), ICJ Reports 1986, p. 14 304 Nabob of Arcot v. The East India Company, 3 Bro. C.C. 292; 29 Eng. Rep. 544 (1791), reprinted in (1967) 6 British International Law Cases 281 68
Nabob of Arcot v. The East India Company, 3 Bro. C.C. 292; 29 Eng. Rep. 544 (1791), reprinted in (1967) 6 British International Law Cases 281 68
Eng. Rep. 544 (1791), reprinted in (1967) 6 British International Law Cases 281 68
Law Cases 281 68
Nicaragua Case, see Military and Paramilitary Activities in and
against Nicaragua
Nuclear Weapons Case, see Legality of the Threat or use of
Nuclear Weapons
Petroleum Development Ltd. v. The Sheikh of Abu Dhabi (1951)
18 I.L.R. 144 226
Questions of Interpretation and Application of the 1971
Montreal Convention Arising from the Aerial Incident at
Lockerbie (Libya v. U.K.; Libya v. U.S.), ICJ Reports 1992, p. 114
(Order of 14 April) 299
R. v. Crewe, 2 Eng. Rep. 576 (K. B. 1910) Ruler of Abu Dhabi v.
International Marine Oil Co. (1953) 20 I.L.R. 534
Ruler of Qatar v. International Marine Oil Co. (1953)
20 I.L.R. 534 226, 227
South West Africa (Ethiopia v. South Africa; Liberia v. South
Africa), ICJ Reports 1962, p. 319 (preliminary objections,
judgement) 149, 154
South West Africa (Ethiopia v. South
Africa; Liberia v. South Africa) ICJ Reports 1966, p. 6 (second-phase
judgement) 149
S. S. Lotus (France <i>v.</i> Turkey), 1927 PCIJ Ser. A, No. 10
S. S. Wimbledon (U.K., France, Italy, Japan v. Germany),
1923, PCIJ Ser. A, No. 1 133, 234
Serbian Loans Case, see Case Concerning Various Serbian Loans
Texaco Overseas Petroleum Co. & California Asiatic Oil Co. v. The
Government of the Libyan Arab Republic, 53 ILR 389
(Preliminary Award 27 November 1975; Award on the Merits
19 January 1977) 221



xviii TABLE OF CASES

United States of America (North American Dredging Co. of	
Texas) v. United Mexican States, 4 U.N.R.I.A.A. 26 (1926)	209
U.S. v. Netherlands, 2 R.I.A.A. 829, 852 (1928)	76
Western Sahara, Advisory Opinion, ICJ Reports 1975, p. 12; 59	
ILR 30	112



Table of treaties

Bowering freaty, see freaty of Friendship and Commerce	
Between Her Majesty and the Kings of Siam	
Covenant of the League of Nations, Versailles, 28 June 1919), in
force 10 January 1920, (1919) 112 BFSP 13	page 116
International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights,	
New York, 16 December 1966, in force 23 March	
1976, 999 U.N.T.S. 171	206,217,254
International Covenant on Economic, Social and	
Cultural Rights, New York, 16 December 1966, in force	<u>.</u>
3 January 1976, 993 U.N.T.S. 3	217
Treaty Between His Britannic Majesty and His Majesty the	King
of Irak, Signed at Bagdad, 10 October 1922	287
Treaty of Friendship and Commerce Between Her Majesty a	ınd
the Kings of Siam, 18 April 1855	86
Treaty of Nanking, Treaty of Peace, Friendship, and	
Commerce Between Her Majesty the Queen of	
Great Britain and Ireland and the Emperor of China,	
29 August 1842, G. 8IrP.R.C., art. III, 93 Consoi.	
T.S.467	72-73, 85
Warsangali Treaty	88

xix