
ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation: MAPPING GERMANY'S COLONIAL
DISCOURSE:
FANTASY, REALITY, AND DILEMMA

Uche Onyedi Okafor, Doctor of Philosophy, 2013.

Dissertation directed by: Professor Elke P. Frederiksen
Department of Germanic Studies
School of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures

This project engages Germany's colonial discourse from the 18th century to the acquisition of colonies in East Africa during the period of European imperialism. Germany's colonial discourse started with periphery travels and studies in the 18th century. The writings of German scholars and authors about periphery space and peoples provoked a strong desire to experience the exotic periphery among Germans, particularly the literate bourgeoisie. From a spectatorial and critical positioning vis-à-vis the colonial activities of other Europeans, Germans developed a projected affinity with the oppressed peoples of the periphery. Out of the identificatory positioning with the periphery peoples emerged the fantasy of "model/humane" colonialism (Susanne Zantop).

However, studies in Germany's colonial enterprise reveal a predominance of brutality and inhumanity right from its inception in 1884. The conflictual relationship between the fantasy of "model/humane" colonialism and the reality of brutality and

inhumanity, as studies reveal, causes one to wonder what happened along the way. This is the fundamental question this project deals with.

Chapter one establishes the validity of the theoretical and methodological approaches used in this project – Cultural Studies, New Historicism and Postcolonialism. Chapter two is a review of secondary literatures on Germany’s colonial enterprise in general, and in Africa in particular. Chapter three focuses on the emergence of the fantasy of “model/humane” colonialism as discussed in Johann Reinhold Forster’s *Observations made during a Voyage round the World, 1778*, and its demonstration in Joachim Heinrich Campe’s *Robinson der Jüngere*, 1789.

Section one of chapter four discusses the constellations which provided the impetus for colony acquisition (Friedrich Fabri’s *Bedard Deutschland der Colonien?*, 1879), and the activities of Carl Peters, the founder of German East Africa as depicted in Balder Olden’s *Ich bin Ich. Der Roman Carl Peters*, 1927. Section two examines German colonists’ efforts to consolidate Germany’s hold on the colonial property (Frieda von Bülow’s *Der Konsul. Vaterländischer Roman aus unseren Tagen*, 1891, and *Im Lande der Verheißung: Ein deutscher Kolonialroman*, 1899). Chapter five discusses the concept of dilemma in the conflictual relationship between the fantasy of “model/humane” colonialism and the reality of colonialism. Chapter six summarizes the findings of the project.

MAPPING GERMANY'S COLONIAL DISCOURSE:
FANTASY, REALITY, AND DILEMMA

BY

UCHE ONYEDI OKAFOR

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE
SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE
PARK IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
2013

Advisory Committee:

Professor Elke Frederiksen, Chair
Professor Guenter Pfister
Professor Peter Beicken
Professor Rose-Marie Oster
Professor Ahmad Karimi-Hakkak

**©Copyright by
Uche Onyedi Okafor
2013**

Dedication

This Dissertation is dedicated to the following:

Mrs. ANIEFIOK NENE EUDOXIE-OKAFOR – my Queen

Prince FORTUNE IHUOMA MFONOBONG EUDOXIE-OKAFOR – my Son

Princess FAVOR IHEOMA UYAYI-ABASI EUDOXIE-OKAFOR – my Daughter

Prince FLOURISH IHENNA UTIBE-ABASI EUDOXIE-OKAFOR – my Son

These are the people who paid the real price for this Ph.D. degree, and to them it belongs.

Acknowledgement

As the saying goes, “no man is an island to himself,” and as an Ibo adage goes, “onye ji akanya we nie onwe ya, ofu aka ya aghaghi iputa n’enu ini” (he who buries himself will definitely have one hand sticking out from the grave). I would like to acknowledge the following individuals for their contributions towards making this degree come true: first and foremost, Professor Elke Frederiksen, who directed this project. Her guidance, insistence, patience, and belief provided the foundation upon which this project was started and completed. Prof. Guenter Pfister, whose encouraging remark “Hang in there, Son,” when the going was tough, kept reassuring me that someone cares. The Department of Germanic Studies, which saw something in me worth investing their resources in. The Office of Multi-Ethnic Students Education, which gave me the Graduate Assistantship that carried me to candidacy. SHUTTLE-UM, which, apart from offering me the job that took me to the finish line, became my family in all circumstances.

Mr. and Mrs. Vincent/Angelina Chukwuocha, who gave me their signature at a critical stage of my program to secure the student loan that rescued the program. May God almighty reward their labor of love multiple folds! Dr. and Mr. Femi Akinrinade, whose initial efforts brought me to the States in the first place, and who continued to stand by me in the thick and thin of it all. Bros., you people made the Ibo saying “Nwanne di na mba” (there is always a brother in the land of sojourn) a reality in my life.

The following people deserve a very special mention – Ose Ojeahere, Christina Grant and Neda Todorov. These are friends, who God brought into my life when I needed people to lean on. They never had a “no” response for me whenever I needed them. An extra appreciation for Neda Todorov, who did the proofreading for this project.

Mr. and Mrs. Akintoye, and Professor Sola Akinrinade. My siblings Dr. Chinwe J. Okafor, Mr. Chukwudi C. Okafor, and Mrs. Rose-Gillian Iwunze for their encouraging words and support to my family in my absence. Dr. George and Mrs. Onyinyechi Udeh.

Many people contributed in various ways to my successful completion of this program – Mr./Mrs. (Gloria) Ugochukwu, Chinyere Ugochukwu Ukaegbu, Dr. Jennifer Jackson, Amaka Joan Egemonu, Oluchukwu Jacinta Ndubuisi, Mike Okoro, Chisara Alimole, Uchenna Kaji Nwoko, Genevive Ibeh, David Anyaoha, Chukwuma Okereke, Jude Ogu, Chidimma Iwuji, Mr./Mrs. Silas Obasi, Mr./Mrs. David Anyaoha. I want to thank all these people, and all others who are not mentioned here, for their part in my achieving this milestone.

Table of Contents

Introduction and Background to the Study.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	8
Purpose of the Project.....	12
Scope of the Project.....	12
Justification for the Texts.....	14
 Chapter I. Theoretical Approach and Methodology.....	 17
Cultural Studies.....	17
New Historicism.....	27
Postcolonialism.....	39
 Chapter II. The Review of Secondary Literature: Germany’s Colonial Enterprise in Postcolonialism Discourse.....	 51
An Overview.....	51
Generating the “Model Colonizer” Mentality.....	69
 Chapter III. German Intellectualism and the Fantasy of “Humane/Model” Colonialism.....	 76
Section i. Conceptualizing “Humane/Model” Colonialism (Johann Reinhold Forster’s <i>Observations made during a Voyage round the World, 1778</i>).....	 78
Advocacy for Colonization.....	79
Reinhold Forster’s Humane Considerations.....	85
Presenting Germans as better colonizers.....	89
German Intellectualism and Instrumentalization for Colonialism.....	103

Section ii. Demonstrating “Human/Model” Colonialism in Fiction (Joachim Heinrich Campe’s <i>Robinson</i> , 1779).....	109
Configuration of the German “Model/Humane” Colonist.....	112
Germans in Search of Virgin Territories.....	120
“Humane/Model” Colonialism in Practice.....	136
 Chapter IV. Germany and Colonial Reality: Agitation, Acquisition and Consolidation.....	 141
Section i. Agitation for and Acquisition of Colonies (Friedrich Fabri’s <i>Bedarf Deutschland der Colonien?</i> , 1879; Balder Oldens <i>Ich bin Ich</i> , 1927).....	142
Domestic Circumstances Fabri’s (<i>Bedarf Deutschland der Colonien?1879</i>).....	146
Pioneering Activities in the East African Periphery (Balder Olden’s <i>Ich bin Ich</i> , 1927).....	166
The Emergence of the Pioneer German Colonist.....	168
Peters the Pioneer German Colonist.....	174
Berlin and Peters’ Pioneer Endeavors.....	185
 Section ii. Consolidating the Colonies (Frieda von Bülow’s <i>Der Konsul</i> , 1891; <i>Verheißung</i> , 1899).....	 199
Awakening “Germanness” (Frieda von Bülow’s <i>Der Konsul</i> , 1891....	204
Berlin and Konsul von Sylffa’s Program.....	216
Women and German Colonialism (Frieda von Bülow’s <i>Verheißung</i> , 1899).....	222
Summary.....	271
 Chapter V. Germany’s Colonial Enterprise: The Dilemma.....	 274
The Enlightenment in Germany’s Colonialism Discourse.....	275
The Dilemma of “Humane/Model” Colonialism.....	279
The Gender Dilemma.....	296
The Involvement Dilemma.....	307

The Power Dilemma.....	314
The Erasure Dilemma.....	322
Summary	349
Chapter VI. Conclusion.....	351
Definition of Terms.....	371
Bibliography.....	373

Introduction and Background to the Project

Although much has been written about the European colonization of the rest of the world, it was not until the 1980s that Germany became a serious point of focus in the discourse of colonialism. A myriad of factors account for this delayed attention - Germany's emergence as a unified nation through militaristic maneuvers in 1871; WWI and the consequential collapse of the imperial system; the post WWI interlude and the Weimar period, which generated multi-faceted issues of interest; and WWII and all the attendant realities such as the Holocaust, the partitioning of the nation, the Cold War, and more. All of these events dominated the efforts and attention of scholars for a long time, so much so, that Germany's periphery¹ enterprise did not command urgency.² As Zantop puts it, "The post-colonial situation in Germany after 1945 was radically different from that of other former colonial powers. The war experience and the Holocaust has eclipsed or repressed any recollections of previous relations with the colonized."³

In any case, since Germany's periphery enterprise became a subject of focus for scholars, much has been published. A common trend in the works of scholars on Germany's colonial past is the focus on widespread barbarism and inhumanity against the natives. David Kenosian states,

The story of German colonialism in Southwest Africa must be understood within the context of the history of violence as a political praxis. The German colonialist had a tense relationship to the

¹ See Konstanze Streese, "*Cric?*" – "*Crac!*" (Bern: Peter Lang, 1991) 3. Print.

² See Russel Berman, „Der ewige Zweite: Deutschlands Sekundärkolonialismus,“ *Fantasiereiche: Zur Kulturgeschichte des deutschen Kolonialismus*, ed. Birthe Kundrus (Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 2003) 19-32. Print.

³ Susanne Zantop, "Colonial Legends, Postcolonial Legacies," *A User's Guide to German Cultural Studies*, eds. Scott Denham, Irene Kacandes, and Jonathan Pettropoulos (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1997) 199. Print.

colonized African peoples. The Germans needed the Africans to serve as domestics, farmhands, and hunting guides, and to help build the railroad. Individual settlers resorted to beatings and whippings to discipline their native servants [. . .] When the head of the German Colonial Office, Dernberg [. . .] wanted to reduce the number of blows that could be inflicted by the authorities from 100 to 50, his proposal was successfully blocked by settlers.⁴

As Barbara Ann Shumannfang argues, “Despite this relatively small number of settlers, the German presence wrecked havoc with the indigenous populations, notably the Herero and Nama.”⁵ While the argument of Germany’s inhumanity and barbarism in Africa could have a propagandist undertone, placing the argument within the context of the legacies of National Socialism would tend to authenticate it. The argument could be that, a nation capable of the Nazi atrocities could also have been capable of colonial atrocities against the natives. Georg Steinmetz and Julia Hull present the kind of associations of Nazi terrorism with colonial atrocities,

For many the theme of colonial genocide appears to connect Namibia to Nazism. An influential older history of German Southwest Africa by historian Helmut Bley concludes with a section entitled ‘Growing Totalitarianism,’ which discusses Hannah Arendt’s argument about the continuity between imperialism and totalitarianism. . . . After all, Southwest Africa’s first German governor, Heinrich Goering, was the father of the Nazi Reichsmarschall Hermann Goering.⁶

General von Trotha’s prosecution of the German-Herero/Nama war has been classified as “genocidal.”⁷

⁴ David Kenosian, “The Colonial Body Politic: Desire and Violence in the Works of Gustav Frenssen and Hans Grimm,” *Monatshefte* 89.2 (1997): 182-95. Print.

⁵ Barbara Ann Shumannfang, *Envisioning Empire: Jewishness, Blackness and Gender in German colonial Discourse from Frieda von Bülow to the Nazi Kolonie und Heimat*, diss., University of Michigan, 1998, 26. Print.

⁶ George Steinmetz and Julia Hell, “The Visual Archive of Colonialism: Germany and Namibia,” *Public Culture* 18.1 [48] (2006): 171. Print.

⁷ Marcia Klotz, introduction, *Germany’s Colonial Pasts*, eds. Eric Ames, Marcia Klotz, & Lora Wildenthal (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005) xvii. Print.

Looking at Germany's colonial legacy in hindsight, and through the prism of the legacies of Nazism, there is the temptation to endorse the allegations of barbarism and inhumanity without questions. However, although violence is inherent in any form of colonialism, it would be naïve to assume or believe that Germany conceived of her imperialist dream on the bed of violence. This does not look obvious considering the fact that the spread of the Enlightenment thoughts of universal human values was being vigorously pursued by German intellectuals of the 18th century, such as Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, Immanuel Kant, and Gottfried Herder. Benjamin W. Redekop states thus on Lessing, “. . . in his dramatic and dramaturgical works particularly, Lessing advanced an ideal of sociability based upon the sympathetic, affective identification of social actors with one another: a united public sphere of sympathetically responsive and hence virtuous individuals.”⁸ This effort consequently contributed to the self-image among Germans of being more humane and cultured than other Europeans.

It is necessary to note that, even though Germany's colonial projections had ever-shifting configurations, as Zantop points out, the German polity never gave up the fantasy of “model/humane” colonialism.⁹ While various dimensions of Germany's colonial enterprise have been discussed, the interaction of the fantasy of “model/humane” colonialism, and the reality of colonialism, and how this generated Germany's colonial legacy, has not received much attention. Although Shumannfang discusses fantasy and reality in her work, her arguments, which relate to the racial gaze, focus on how these

⁸ Benjamin W. Redekop, *Enlightenment and Community. Lessing, Abbt, Herder, and the Quest for a German Public* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000) 58. Print.

⁹ See Definition of Terms.

two come together in both mutual enhancement and contradiction as characterizing elements of Germany's colonial discourse,

I argue that, especially when it comes to colonial images in the German context, an understanding of the colonial as both fantasy and reality is required. Fantasy and reality coexist, contradict each other and help create each other in ways that do not make it desirable, or even possible to select one over the other as the defining characteristic of German colonial discourse.¹⁰

How they interacted to determine Germany's colonial legacy was not discussed, and that is one of the issues to be discussed extensively in this project in the Dilemma section. The argument I am making is that the interaction of fantasy and reality generated a kind of dilemma within Germany's colonial enterprise, and this accounted for the portrait of the enterprise as we have it today as Germany's colonial legacy.

Considering the national consciousness of superior humane tendencies against the background of alleged colonial barbarism, one might ask what happened with the German polity that could have generated the platform for the possibility of colonial barbarism.

Historical evidence attests to the reforms that were going on in Prussia in the early 19th century. It was widely believed that a stronger Prussia would spearhead the liberation of the German people from French domination. Therefore, it can be expected that one aspect of reforms was military and, as Hertz observes in the writings of Karl Baron vom Stein (1757-1831), the Prussian Minister from 1807 – 1809, it was geared toward a specific purpose,

¹⁰ Shumannfang, p. 4.

These and other reforms aimed at the moral regeneration of a people oppressed by despotism and feudalism. The State was to receive a national character and thus be transformed into an organism animated by the spirit of a free people. In this way, he (Karl Baron vom Stein) hoped Prussia would grow strong enough to shake off the foreign yoke and make Germany independent.¹¹

The reforms in Prussia expanded to become a German affair through the astute politics of Otto von Bismarck, who was appointed Prime Minister of Prussia in 1862, and the national consciousness led to the founding of the Reich in 1871 through the defeat of France. It is necessary to note that the emergence of the German nation was not out of any legislative procedure, but rather, through militaristic maneuvers – the war against Denmark in 1864, against Austria in 1866, and against France in 1871. Hertz informs on Bismarck's machinations to provoke the Franco-German war, "The most probable explanation is that Bismarck was seeking an opportunity to provoke France's jealous concern for her prestige and thus unleash a war which would fire the hearts of the South Germans, who were very hostile to Prussia, and fuse them into one nation with the Germans of the North."¹² Otto von Bismarck became the chancellor of a unified Germany in 1871.

Prior to the founding of the Reich, Germans – scientists, merchants, mercenaries, doctors, and scholars – participated in other nations' periphery voyages as attachés.¹³ While on these voyages, Germans articulated a different attitude towards the natives of the periphery in their writings. As is evident in Johann Reinhold Forster's *Observations*

¹¹ Frederick Hertz, *The German Public Mind in the Nineteenth Century* (Totowa: Rowman and Littlefield, 1974) 21. Print.

¹² Hertz, p. 321.

¹³ Streese, p. 32.

made during a Voyage round the World (1778),¹⁴ Germans contemplated a more “humane” positioning towards the natives as opposed to the conquer-and-subjugate attitude of other European nations. Reinhold Forster uses an argument of the common ancestry of humanity to advocate for humane treatment of the natives,

Having stated the differences of colour, size, habit, form of body, and turn of mind, as observed in the various nations of the South Sea, it remains to assign the most probable and the most reasonable causes of these remarkable differences of the two races. This would be an easy task, by having recourse to holy writ only, and from thence laying it down as a fundamental position, that all mankind are descended from one couple; for it must then follow that all are of one species: and that all varieties are only accidental.¹⁵

This argument is further reinforced as he discusses the way Europeans interact with the natives, “Mankind ought to be considered as members of one great family; therefore let us not despise any of them, though they be our inferior in regard to many improvements and points of civilization; none of them is so despicable that he should not, in some one point or other, know more than the wisest man of the most polished nations.”¹⁶

Reinhold Forster’s humane considerations are possibly rooted in the advocacy for universal human values by German scholars referenced above. His disapproval of the European view and treatment of the natives, and his advocacy for a more humane approach, became cardinal in Germany’s colonial vision. Considering the allegation of brutal colonial legacy, one wonders what may have happened to this vision.

¹⁴ Note: For the purpose of easier reading, the titles of the primary texts will be shortened as follows: Forster’s text, *Observations*, Campe’s text, *Robinson*, Fabri’s text, *Bedarf Deutschland*, Olden’s text, *Ich bin Ich*, Bülow’s texts, *Der Konsul*, and *Verheißung*.

¹⁵ Johann Reinhold Forster, *Observations Made during a Voyage round the World*, eds. Nicholas Thomas, Harriet Guest, Michael Dettelbach (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1996) 172. Print.

¹⁶ Forster, p. 376.

In this project, I intend to explore the change of Germany's colonial dream from fantasy to reality. My aim is to determine the circumstances attendant to the metamorphosis of the fantasy of "humane/model" colonialism into brutal and barbaric colonialism as studies claim. Considering that the inception stage of Germany's colonial consciousness is linked to texts – literary and non-literary – on the periphery, I project that written texts are a significant repository of the circumstances of Germany's colonial discourse from fantasy to reality. On this basis, I shall use both literary and non-literary materials that thematize Germany's colonial enterprise at different stages.

For the fantasy stage, I shall use Johann Reinhold Forster's *Observations* (1778). This text is recognized as one of the texts foundational to Germany's conception and configuration of a colonial portrait.¹⁷ I am also analyzing Joachim Heinrich Campe's *Robinson* (1779). Germany's fantasy of "model/humane" colonialism with the ideals built into it seems to have the best demonstration in this text.¹⁸ I shall use Friedrich Fabri's *Bedarf Deutschland der Colonien* (1879), which is regarded as one of the most prominent colonial propagandist writings of the 19th century, for the agitation stage. For the acquisition and consolidation stage, I will discuss Balder Olden's *Ich bin Ich* (1927), and Frieda von Bülow's *Der Konsul* (1890). While Olden's text concentrates on Carl Peters operations as the founder of German East Africa, Bülow's text imagines the challenges of generating the needed collectiveness and commonality among the German Diaspora in East Africa for the pursuit of Germany's colonial ambition. Frieda von

¹⁷ See Johann J.K. Reusch, "Germans as Noble Savages and Castaways: Alter Egos and Alterity in German Collective consciousness During the Long Eighteenth Century," *Eighteenth Century Studies* 42.1 (2008): 111. Print.

¹⁸ Suzanne Zantop, *Colonial Fantasies. Conquest, Family, and Nation in Precolonial Germany, 1770-1870*. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997) 107. Print.

Bülow's *Verheißung* (1899) presents the gender dimension, which is a very significant component of Germany's colonial discourse. These texts thematize different stages of Germany's colonial enterprise and will offer a spreadsheet view for this project.

Statement of the Problem

It is not unusual for Germans to develop a fantasy of "humane/model" colonialism in the periphery, since the colonizing nations presented the exercise as a humanitarian/christo-civilizing endeavor. Ironically, the whole argument of humanitarianism and Christian civilization collapses before the atrocities committed against colonized natives. Herbert Lüthy recognizes the civilizing-mission claim as a deceptive trope used to lobby for public approval in the metropolis, „Doch wo immer Kolonialpolitik über die reine Machtausübung hinaus eine innere Rechtfertigung suchte, hat sie die Kolonisation als Erziehungswerk verstanden, das sein eigenes Ende anstrebt: die Emanzipation.“¹⁹ Robert Young argues against the civilization claim to present the enterprise for what it was,

Within its overall structure of domination, colonialism can be analyzed according to the distinction elaborated above between its two main forms of colonization and domination, motivated by the desire for living space and extraction of riches. All colonial powers tended as a result to have in practice two distinct kinds of colonies within their empires, the settled and the exploited, the white and the black, which would be treated very differently.²⁰

¹⁹ Herbert Lüthy, *Nach dem Untergang des Abendlandes* (Köln: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 1964/65) 363. Print.

²⁰ Robert J.C. Young, *Postcolonialism. An Historical Introduction* (Malden: Blackwell Publishers Limited, 2001) 19. Print.

Seth Quartey, drawing from the Berlin Conference of 1884, points out that the primary driving impetus for colonialism was economic benefits.²¹

In the case of Germany, where intellectual reawakening in the 18th century had emphasized the primacy of humanity in all politics,²² the humanitarian argument was a favorite trope. It was actually the major reason among the initial proponents of the enterprise, as they focused more on what would make Germany a better colonial nation in comparison to her neighbors. Marcia Klotz comments,

Unsullied by any colonial practice on the ground, Germans were free to imagine that they would be better, kinder, gentler colonizers than the Spanish or the Portuguese, the British and the French. . . . In her [Zantop's] analysis, the main content of these narratives revolve around a singular theme: Germany – understood as a loosely formed community of German speakers – developed a kind of ego-ideal through these colonial fantasies, coming to view itself as a kind and benevolent community dedicated to the well-being of colonial peoples and lands everywhere. . . . Germans would . . . behave as loving fathers to native children and as doting husbands to colonial wives, rather than the abusive and rapacious tyrants the Spaniards had turned out to be.²³

The afore mentioned intellectualism of Germans, which was gradually changing into an element of nationalist and racio-centric cultural identity, occasioned the claim of being different from other Europeans. Gayatri C. Spivak remarks on this positioning of Germans in relation to other Europeans,

Cultural and intellectual ‘Germany,’ the place of self-styled difference from the rest of what is still understood as ‘continental’ Europe and Britain, was the main source of the meticulous scholarship

²¹ Seth Quartey, “Representation of Africa and Politics of German Colonialism in Africa 1880 and After,” *Development and Colonialism: Africa in German Literature 1880 and After*. Web. Jan. 16th, 2010. <http://squatey.blogspot.com/2005/02/africa-in-german-literature-1880-and.html>.

²² Hertz, p. 29.

²³ Marcia Klotz, introduction, “The Weimar Republic. A Postcolonial State in a Still-Colonial World,” *Germany's Colonial Pasts*, eds. Eric Ames, Marcia Klotz & Lora Wildenthal (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005): xii.

that established the vocabulary of proto-archetypal . . . identity, or kinship, without direct involvement in the utilization of that other difference, between the colonizer and the colonized.²⁴

The humanitarian view of Germans is anchored in the vision to elevate the natives to the level of “culturedness,” which, as they argued, would be realized through an intermingling of the “superior/modern” German culture (and race) with the “inferior/savage” culture (and people) of the periphery. Sara Friedrichsmeyer, Sara Lennox, and Susanne Zantop (1998) comment,

Moreover predating German colonialism by centuries, colonial fantasies generated a colonialist predisposition and the ‘colonial legend’ of the moral, hard-working German colonizer of superior strength and intelligence who – unlike other colonizers – was loved like a father by his ever-grateful native subjects. As stories of benign patriarchal relations, these colonial fantasies reflected the fantasy of the *Vater Staat* who – through the *Landesvater* – would take care of his obedient ‘children.’²⁵

The projection of periphery colonialism as a humanitarian act was not peculiar to the Germans. It was a widely held trope among all the colonizing European nations. Britain, which was a prominent factor in Germany’s colonial configuration, also has this in the foundation of her colonizing rhetoric. Jeff D. Bass argues,

Few aspects of British imperialism have attracted as much critical attention as has the British idea of imperial responsibility or the obligation to expand British territorial boundaries in order to provide ‘just’ rule for those ‘less fortunate’ peoples of the earth. By the second half of the nineteenth century, belief in this moral imperative had become almost axiomatic for the British public as it was continually professed by British statesmen both at home and abroad as the primary justification for the existence and expansion of the empire.²⁶

²⁴ Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999) 8. Print.

²⁵ Sara Friedrichsmeyer, Sara Lennox and Susanne Zantop, eds., *The Imperialist Imagination: German Colonialism and Its Legacy* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998) 20. Print.

²⁶ Jeff. D. Bass, “The Perversion of Empire: Edmund Burke and the Nature of Imperial Responsibility,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 81 (1995): 208. Print.

Britain, a nation regarded within the discourse of periphery imperialism as the most prominent, used this trope of humanitarianism to legitimize her drive for the domination of periphery peoples. However palatable Britain's projected "imperial creed" (to use Bass' cliché) may have sounded, all it did was, as John Hobson argues, "to obfuscate imperialism's true nature as the cynical economic exploitation of the resources of foreign territories and the concomitant subjugation of the non-white peoples of these territories."²⁷

In comparison to other colonizing European nations, Germans saw themselves as superior and more humane, and saw the colonial field as the stage to prove it. Whether this vision became a reality or a mirage in colonial practice, and why, is one of the questions that will be investigated in this project.

The following questions will serve as a guide as this project progresses:

- I. Arguments hold that the intellectual activities of Germans in the 18th and early 19th centuries were oriented towards "pure research" for the enhancement of humanity, that is, German intellectualism was not intended for the "subalternation" of "otherness."²⁸ To what extent is this claim of non-instrumentalized intellectualism credible?
- II. To what extent are literary and non-literary texts a reliable mirror through which Germany's colonial episode could be viewed; and how does literature feature in Germany's colonial discourse as an impetus-generating medium for periphery colonialism?

²⁷ Bass, p. 208.

²⁸ See Berman (2003), p. 137.

III. Could an argument be made for historio-literary continuity in Germany's colonial discourse from the era of fantasy in the 18th century to the era of practical colonialism in the 19th century?

IV. What choices were open to Germany between the fantasy of "humane/model" colonialism and the reality of violence and brutality inherent in colonialism?

Purpose of the Project

The driving incentives for this project come from two temporal landscapes – the fantasy time and the reality time. I hope to add more dimensions to the discourse of Germany's colonial enterprise in the late 19th century, and thus deepen and broaden the understanding thereof. I will also search for a possible historio-literary continuity within Germany's colonial discourse from fantasy to reality. Furthermore, I will highlight the prominence of Germany's relationship with other European nations in her colonial legacy. Although her claim to equal status with other European powers was not taken seriously in Europe, her power status was not to be questioned by Africans. Considering this discordance in Germany's position and regard, she was faced with the task of authenticating her claim to being both a strong and the most cultured and humane nation. The compatibility of the different aspects of Germany's colonial projections, and the choices open to her, generated a great dilemma. The concept of dilemma and how it conditioned Germany's colonial legacy will be extensively discussed in this project.

Scope of the Project

This project is a historical cum literary investigation of Germany's colonial discourse. The main focus will be the literary representation of Germany's colonial

episode from fantasy to reality. Germany's practical colonial involvement officially started in 1884²⁹ and ended in 1919. This project does not intend to cover this whole stretch. Rather, it will map the developmental changes of Germany's colonial discourse from Reinhold Forster's *Observations* (1778) and the fantasy it inspired, to actual colonialism under Bismarck. Germany had the following colonies in Africa – German West Africa, which consisted of Kamerun 1884-1914, Togoland 1884-1914; German East Africa, which was made up of Tanganyika 1884-1919, Ruanda-Urundi 1885-1919, Wituland 1885-1890, and Kionga Triangle 1894-1916; German Southwest Africa, which is the present day Namibia 1884-1919.

German colonies in the Pacific were – German New Guinea (1884–1914), which comprised Kaiser-Wilhelmsland, Bismarck Archipelago, German Solomon Islands 1885–1899, Bougainville Island 1888–1919, Nauru 1888–1919, Marshall Islands 1885–1919, Mariana Islands 1899–1919, Carolina Islands 1899–1914); German Samoa 1899–1914), and in China Jiaozhou Bay 1898-1914, and Chefoo 190?-1914). This project does not aim to cover all these areas, but would use German East-Africa as the region of concentration. However, references will be made to other colonial possessions as needed when discussing the general portrait of Germany's colonial practices.

This project, being historical cum literary, will use any relevant materials across disciplinary lines. The merging of scholarly research on Germany's colonial past with primary literary texts, will underscore the historicity of the literary texts, and the

²⁹ See Michael Pesek, *Koloniale Herrschaft in Deutsch-Ostafrika. Expedition, Militär und Verwaltung seit 1880* (Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 2005) 163. Print.

literariness of history, and will enhance, I hope, the relevance of the literary texts as insurable communicators on Germany's colonial past on their own merit.

Justification for the selected Texts

I have selected the following texts for this project because of their strategic significance to Germany's colonial discourse:

Johann Reinhold Forster's *Observations Made during a Voyage round the World*, (1778)

This text was selected because of its primacy among periphery studies undertaken by Germans. The study awakened the interest of Germans and provided the impetus for paradisiacal literary configurations of the periphery. Furthermore, English presence in the voyage accounts for a prominent dimension of Germany's colonial discourse that would not disappear until the end of the enterprise in 1917 – the English factor. I am using the 1996 edition of the text, which is a scholarly edition with major introductory articles by four different scholars. Their introductory discussions offer a closer and deeper understanding of the text, the underlying impetus thereof, and its influence on Germany's periphery considerations.

Joachim Heinrich Campe's *Robinson der Jüngere. Ein Lesebuch für Kinder zur allgemeinen Schulencyklopädie Gehörig*, (1779)

This text was selected because of its significance to the German ideal of “model/humane” colonialism. It establishes a form of relay relationship with Reinhold Forster's text, by which it downloaded the idea of a “better” and “humane” colonizer articulated by Reinhold Forster, and demonstrates it in a fictionalized colonial setting,

inserting the German in the space as the “model” colonizer. This configuration suits the German fantasy of a different form of colonialism by reason of its humane-orientedness.

Friedrich Fabri’s *Bedarf Deutschland der Colonien. Eine politisch-ökonomische Betrachtung*, (1879)

This text was selected because of its impact on Germany’s colonial attitude. A propagandist text, it explores the domestic circumstances in Germany, and markets periphery colonialism as the only way out of a possible national cataclysm. Its impact on Germany’s attitude towards colonialism, as Eleanor Breuning and Chamberlain argue, was immediate and far-reaching.³⁰

Balder Olden’s *Ich bin Ich. Der Roman Carl Peters*, (1927)

This text is a focus on the person and personality of Carl Peters, Germany’s pioneer colonist as well as his activities as a colonial agent in East Africa. Moreover, Olden tailors his representation of Peters towards its significance in Germany’s whole colonial enterprise in Africa. Understanding Peters, the “father of German colonialism in East Africa,” as Olden presents him, will facilitate the understanding of why Germany’s colonial enterprise in East Africa, the colony of focus in this project, went the way it did.

Frieda von Bülow’s *Der Konsul. Ein vaterländischer Roman aus unseren Tagen* (1891)

This text is one of the colonial novels by Bülow, a woman writer. While it presents the foundational problem of inspiring the sense of collectiveness and communality among Germans of the East African Diaspora, it introduces the gender

³⁰ E.C.M. Breuning and Muriel Evelyn Chamberlain, introduction, *Bedarf Deutschland der Kolonien?/Does Germany need Colonies?* (New York: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1998) 28. Print.

factor in Germany's colonial activities as its subtext. *Der Konsul* (1891) presents the German Diaspora in East Africa (prior to formal colonizing activities), and emphasizes the consciousness of "Germanness"³¹ and unity among them as an indispensable ingredient for Germany's colonial ambition. It also introduces the tension between Germany and other established colonial powers, who looked at Germany as an interloper, and were unwilling to concede her any colonial space.³² Germany's colonial legacy was significantly influenced by her relationship with other European powers.

Frieda von Bülow's *Im Lande der Verheißung. Ein Kolonialroman um Carl Peters*, (1899)

This is a German colonial text that features a female protagonist. Although at the conceptual phase, colonialism was considered an exclusive business of the men, German women desired and fought for participation in the colonial field. The text, through the activities of the protagonist, depicts the determination and the challenges of German women in their search for agency on the periphery colonial field as well as how this drive complicates the whole colonial enterprise. Although the text was first published in 1899, I am using the 1907 edition due to the unavailability of the original edition when needed.

³¹ "Germanness." See Definition of Terms.

³² Alan L.C. Bullock, ed., *Germany's Colonial Demands* (Westport: Greenwood Press Publishers, 1975) 1. Print.

Chapter One

Theoretical and Methodological Approaches

To carry out this research, I will adopt both interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary research approaches. This means that I shall use materials from various fields of study and various dimensions of the life and living of the German people within the time in focus. The use of a broad-spectrum approach is necessitated by the fact that the quest for colonial possession in Germany cut across different segments of German society. The need to consult materials from these varied sections of Germany's existence at the time cannot be overemphasized. I will use three major theoretical/methodological approaches in this project: Cultural Studies, New Historicism, and Postcolonialism.

Cultural Studies

Cultural Studies is a novel paradigm that is oriented *inter alia* towards seeking the marginal; it asks questions beyond the conventional and seeks to bring into perspective every aspect of a society's way of life - culture. Eagleton defines culture as, "the unconscious *verso* of the *recto* of civilized life, the taken-for-granted beliefs and predilections which must be dimly present for us to be able to act at all. It is what comes naturally, bred in the bone rather than conceived by the brain."¹ Cultural Studies is a scholastic paradigm developed to study and interpret a people's way of life from all possible perspectives.

Cultural Studies operates from the position that literary productions and the social system have a symbiotic generative influence on each other. It is oppositional towards the

¹ Terry Eagleton, *The Idea of Culture* (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2000) 28. Print.

study of people and their ways of life through texts and ornaments. It is also oppositional to regimentation and compartmentalization, which does not allow for intermingling and cross-fertilization of knowledge and information. Lützel comments on the configuration of Cultural Studies, “Mit dem Terminus *Kulturwissenschaft* dagegen assoziiert man die neue multi-, inter- und transdisziplinäre Öffnung, die Überkreuzung und den Dialog der Forschungsrichtungen, das Pendeln zwischen den Fächern.”² Irene Kacandes argues, “Over the years, then, cultural studies has developed into a ‘bricolage,’ with no distinct methodology of its own, since it “draws from whatever fields are necessary to produce the knowledge required for a particular project.”³

A Cultural Studies approach advocates a “borderlessness” that would allow access to every necessary material irrespective of disciplines or departments. Caroline Levine acknowledges this as she argues that the use of Cultural Studies allows us to see the relational symbiosis between literary forms and social forms.⁴

The development of Cultural Studies has been attributed to the ascendancy of members of marginalized groups on the ladder of academia. Simon During, states, “Cultural Studies gained in visibility because more and more non-traditional groups acquired academic voice . . . on the PhD and Assistant Professorship rungs of the professional ladder.”⁵ Within Germanistics, the advent of Cultural Studies in its initial

² Paul Michael Lützel, “Die kulturalistische Wende in den Geisteswissenschaften,” *Akademie Journal. Magazin der Union der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaft* 1/2000. 17. Print.

³ Irene Kacandes, “German Cultural Studies: What is at Stake?” *A User’s Guide to German Cultural Studies*, Scott Denham, Irene Kacandes, and Jonathan Petropoulos (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1997) 7. Print.

⁴ Carolina Levine, “Strategic Formalism: Towards a New Method in Cultural Studies,” *Victorian Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Social, Political and Cultural Studies*. 48.4 (2006): 651. Print.

⁵ Simon During, quoted in J.E. Elliott, “Paradigms Retained: Cultural Theory, Critical Practice,”

form as *Volkskunde*, has been attributed to the works of the Grimm brothers, Jacob and Wilhelm. As Carsten Lenk argues, the collections of German folktales and artifacts from different historical periods and societies by the Grimm brothers opened the door to the study of people and culture.⁶ However, as pointed out by Lenk, the whole *Wissenschaft* was a text-based one that did not integrate field work.

On the evolution of Cultural Studies from the German perspective, Ansgar Nünning and Vera Nünning have tried to establish a distinction between the Anglo-American Cultural Studies on the one hand, and *Kulturwissenschaft* and *Kulturwissenschaften* on the other. According to them, Cultural Studies is characterized by „eine marxistische Gesellschaftstheorie, eine ideologisch geprägte Zielsetzung, und eine weitgehende Eingrenzung des Gegenstands auf die Populärkultur [. . .] der Gegenwart.“⁷ Although elements of Marxism exist in Cultural Studies by its populist orientedness, to see Cultural Studies as dominated by Marxist theory seems too extreme and tends to alienate Cultural Studies from other empirical considerations that are no less prominent in its constitution.

Cultural Studies extends beyond the canonized and classical onto the mass culture, and such an all-encompassing dimensionality earns Cultural Studies a reasonable measure of representative authenticity, which preceding society-study paradigms lacked. Although Nünning/Nünning consider *Kulturwissenschaft(en)* as German and Cultural

Comparative Literature 50.1 (1998): 57-91. Print.

⁶ Carsten Lenk, „Kultur als Text. Überlegungen zu einer Interpretationsfigur,“ *Literaturwissenschaft- Kulturwissenschaft: Positionen, Themen, Perspektiven*, eds. Glaser Renate und Matthias Luserke (Oplanden: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1996) 122. Print.

⁷ Ansgar Nünning and Vera Nünning, eds., *Konzepte der Kulturwissenschaften* (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler Verlag, 2003) 4. Print.

Studies as Anglo-American,⁸ they recognize the content, operational and methodological similarities between both.

Lenk links the development of Cultural Studies with Sociology in general and, in particular, with a new trend in the study of people and culture, „Mit den früheren achtziger Jahren begann sich in den Kulturwissenschaften (genauer: in den sich als solche verstehenden Disziplinen wie Volkskunde, Kulturanthropologie, Ethnologie) ein Verständnis von Kultur durchzusetzen, das verkürzt als ein kultursemiotisches bezeichnet werden darf.“⁹

Lenk credits the development of the semiological approach to Clifford Geertz. As Lenk argues, in *Dichte Beschreibung* (1987), Geertz did the groundwork on how a semiological approach could lead to a better understanding of an exotic culture.¹⁰ Using the *Empathie-Konzept*, which advocates a more or less intuitive *Sich-Einfühlen, Sich-Einlassen auf eine Kultur*, Geertz illustrates how a semiological approach would lead to a better understanding and appreciation of an exotic culture. Geertz writes, „Der Angelpunkt des semiotischen Ansatzes liegt, wie bereits gesagt, darin, daß er uns einen Zugang zur Gedankenwelt der von uns untersuchten Subjekte erschließt, so daß wir – in einem weiteren Sinn des Wortes – ein Gespräch mit ihnen führen können.“¹¹ Geertz advocates, instead of the study of just artifacts and/or texts, the study of social behaviors and actions, „Dem Verhalten muß Beachtung geschenkt werden, eine recht gründliche

⁸ Nünning & Nünning, p. 4.

⁹ Lenk, p. 116.

¹⁰ Lenk, p. 117.

¹¹ Clifford Geertz, „Dichte Beschreibung. Bemerkungen zu einer deutenden Theorie von Kultur,“ *Dichte Beschreibung. Beiträge zum Verstehen kultureller Systeme* (Frankfort/M: Suhrkamp Taschenbuch Wissenschaft, 1987) 35. Print.

Beachtung sogar, weil es nämlich der Ablauf des Verhaltens ist – oder genauer gesagt, der Ablauf des sozialen Handelns –, in dessen Rahmen kulturelle Formen ihren Ausdruck finden.“¹² Lenk reinforces Geertz position, arguing that, „In diesem Sinne sind Handlungen immer auch sinnhafte Kommentare, die gedeutet werden können, weil sie über sich selbst hinaus auf eine tiefer liegende Logik verweisen.“¹³

One of the implications of Geertz’ advocacy is the broadening of the scope of what accounts for and qualifies as cultural artifacts to be considered in the study of culture. Instead of focusing on concrete objects and textual documents, the general ways of life – objects, belief system, rituals, power, songs, family systems, folklores and practices, even their environment (climate, topography, vegetation) – of a people gain in significance as communicators of meaning.¹⁴ The semiological approach mandates a study of every dimension of a people’s way of life on the ground that every cultural *Handlung* of a people is a text having a meaning and a link to something bigger and deeper.¹⁵ Cultural Studies, as could be inferred from the foregoing, is oriented *inter alia* towards the recovery of the elements of a culture that have been relegated to the margin.

If the *Handlungen* of the people have become such a vital channel through which to understand and appreciate their culture, a firsthand observation becomes indispensable. Cultural Studies, applying the semiological approach, puts the researcher in the field where he would observe the subjects of his inquiry in their day-to-day life and living. This avails him the opportunity to enter the complex network of the subjects’ world in its

¹² Geertz, p. 25.

¹³ Lenk, p. 117.

¹⁴ Geertz, p. 30.

¹⁵ Lenk, p. 118.

bits and wholes to be able to correctly understand and properly interpret the cultural significance of their *Handlungen* both at the core and variable levels.

The semiological approach could be what Lützelzer has in mind as he talks about German postcolonial scholars and how they interact with the “third world” communities they are studying.¹⁶ The Cultural Studies researcher starts by dealing with his/her Eurocentric biases. S/he carries out her/his study within the socio-cultural and econo-political reality of her/his subject environment. S/he witnesses (by observation) and experiences (by participation) the different dimensions of the society’s life and living. Depending on the duration of the field exercise, s/he also witnesses any metamorphosis that may be taking place over time. Through the involvement, s/he gains knowledge, not only of what the people do, but also why they do it. The interconnectivity of overt and covert activities becomes clearer to her/him, and writing about them, s/he is more securely and comprehensively positioned to represent the whole constellation, barring any biases, as closest as possible to how it constitutes undeniable network of relevance within the environment. Discussing the position of scholars regarding on-site research, Jana Gohrisch states,

Cultural-exchange historians claim that scholars need to investigate the historical situation and the region in which cultural exchange is taking place. They need to locate the agents of cultural exchange and establish the interests that determine their actions and which, in turn, derive from the agents’ social, ethnic, racial and gendered affiliations. Only an analysis of these complex relations will allow scholars to explain why certain elements or a culture are being selected for

¹⁶ Paul Michael Lützelzer, introduction, *Schriftsteller und „Dritte Welt.“ Studien zum postkolonialen Blick*, ed. Paul Michael Lützelzer (Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag, 1998) 29. Print.

transmission, how they are changed in the process of being translated into a different context, and what functions they serve within their new surroundings.¹⁷

One of the goals of Cultural Studies is to present the target environment – people and culture – without any denigration out of personal aversion. Although the challenges of “disinterested” representation of a target environment is high, correcting the erroneous euro-centric and class-centric representation of the subaltern groups in time past, and reintegrating the marginalized, and recapturing the lost voices and patterns, constitute, as Levine states, the concern of Cultural Studies.¹⁸

A bid to understand the “politics of cultural production” demands not only an investigation of various aspects of the society’s contemporaneous existence, but also a retrospective investigation of the society’s past. Cultural Studies recognizes the role of power in the generation of culture and assumes that certain segments of the society – people, *Handlungen*, beliefs, ideologies and philosophies – may have been suppressed in the construction and presentation of culture. Discussing the role of power, Nünning & Nünning see it not only on the platform of politics and governance, but everywhere that voice and silence meet.

The power expresses itself in the right/privilege, the opportunity and the ability to speak. One of the implications of this is that, on the other side of the power to speak and what is spoken exists the absence of the power to speak and the omission of something spoken. As Said argues on the role of power in the ability to speak, “The power to narrate, or to block other narratives from forming and emerging, is very important to

¹⁷ Jana Gohrisch, “Cultural Exchange and the Representation of History in Postcolonial Literature,” *European Journal of English Studies* 10.3 (2006): 234. Print.

¹⁸ Levine, 631.

culture and imperialism, and constitutes one of the main connections between them.”¹⁹ Although this alternative remains unearthed for as long as power holds it down, it constitutes a prominent force in the emergence of culture. Whenever it surfaces in the society, it destabilizes the cultural/literary constitution, while offering itself as an authentic constituent of the official mainstream cultural/literary portrait.

Cultural Studies recognizes also that, in the representation of people, more especially in the case of colonial relations, power may have played a vital role. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman recognize this as one of the concerns of colonial discourse, “Colonial discourse ‘analysis’ has concerned itself with, among other things, the ways in which the ‘subaltern’ native subject was constructed within these discourses.”²⁰ The most elaborate early discussion of the construction of the subaltern by the western colonizer is found in Edward Said’s *Orientalism* (1978). Among the mission components of Cultural Studies is the de-masking of the improprieties of times past which are still held as sacred and authentic in various quarters. It goes without saying then that deconstructionist tendencies are inherent in Cultural Studies.

Lenk comments on the orientation of Cultural Studies towards the *Vergangenheit*, „Ist unsere ‘dichte Beschreibung’ von Lebenswelten nicht auch der Versuch, noch dort Sinn einzuschreiben, wo er für die Akteure selbst gar nicht mehr erfahrbar ist? Und wie läßt sich dann Sinnlosigkeit benennen, Deformation von Lebenswelten durch sich

¹⁹ Edward W. Said, introduction, *Culture and Imperialism*. (New York: Vintage Books, 1994) xiii. Print.

²⁰ Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman, introduction, *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory. A Reader* (New York: Columbia University Press) 16. Print.

beschleunigende Modernisierungs- und Transformationsprozesse?²¹ Cultural Studies is, thus, in search of that which was left behind consciously or unconsciously; it leaves nothing on the margins.²²

Cultural Studies is not, in a strict sense of the word, an independent, vertically oriented paradigm, which has its own exclusive methodology or target field of investigation. Rather, it is an horizontally oriented paradigm which, in order to thrive, largely depends on the interaction with other paradigms such as New Historicism, Postcolonialism, and Postmodernism, as well as the incorporation of research in other disciplines both in the humanities, the sciences, and the social sciences. It is through this openness that Cultural Studies achieves its inter-, trans-, and multi-disciplinarity.²³ Lützel further reinforces the importance of the multi-, inter- and transdisciplinarity of Cultural Studies by highlighting the impossibility of the respective departments to successfully and insurably deal with the realities of our postmodern day,

Fragen der postmodernen Gegenwart sind bezogen auf Gesellschaft, Umwelt, Politik, Familie, Rolle der Medien, Beziehung der Geschlechter, individuelle wie kollektive Identität und betreffen Probleme wie Migrationen, Globalismus, europäische Einigung, regionale Kriege, Fundamentalismus, Dritte-Welt-Relation, neuen Rassismus, Arbeitslosigkeit, Abbau des Sozialstaats, Marktgläubigkeit. All diese Themen lassen sich nicht mehr bloß aus dem engen Winkel eines Einzelfachs angehen, wenn es nicht zu grotesken perspektivistischen Verzerrungen kommen soll.²⁴

The inter-departmental/interdisciplinary interactiveness of Cultural Studies allows the researcher to access information and knowledge within other disciplines and

²¹ Lenk, p. 124.

²² See Nünning & Nünning, p. 150.

²³ Lützel (2000), p. 17.

²⁴ Lützel (2000), p. 17.

methodologies. As Lützel further argues, Cultural Studies, theoretically and methodologically, is not advocating the *Abschaffung* of departments or specializations, but rather its agitation is that „künstlich gezogene Grenzen durchlässig gemacht werden, wobei Weiterungen und neue Fusionsmöglichkeiten sich dann von selbst ergeben.“²⁵

The relevance of Cultural Studies to this project is self-evident. I will be consulting materials from various aspects of the social realities of the German society of the time in focus – political, civic, economic, military and more. This is because, at the time the colonial question resurfaced late in the 19th century, it was infused into every aspect of Germany’s societal life. Breuning & Chamberlain, discussing the exploits of German explorers, state, “Many of these men were prolific writers and their works naturally caught the attention of their fellow countrymen.”²⁶ This is due in part to colonialist literatures, by which the colonial appetite of Germans was kept alive; and the propagandist works of the *Kolonialverein*, which propagated the belief that Germany’s future lies in the acquisition of periphery colonies.

Using Cultural Studies methodology will open up other avenues beyond the literary. A declaration by Jan Assmann sums up the significance of Cultural Studies for this project, „Alles spricht dafür, daß sich um den Begriff der Erinnerung ein neues Paradigma der Kulturwissenschaften aufbaut, das die verschiedenen kulturellen Phänomene und Felder – Kunst und Literatur, Politik und Gesellschaft, Religion und Recht – in neuen Zusammenhängen sehen läßt.“²⁷ Working through the literary and non-

²⁵ Lützel (2000), p. 18.

²⁶ Breuning & Chamberlain, p. 14.

²⁷ Jan Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis, Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen* (München: C.H. Beck 1999) 11. Print.

literary materials, a Cultural Studies approach offers the leeway to follow any relevant link into any other field that may be necessary. Considering the fact that the subject matter of this project, colonialism, is a historical reality, the application of Cultural Studies methodology offers the platform for the combination of the literary and the historical for a more comprehensive outcome.

New Historicism

New Historicism is an approach to literary analysis developed in the 1980s. Among the prominent names associated with the advent of New Historicism are Stephen Greenblatt, Michel Foucault, Louis Montrose, Simon During and others. As stated by Jean E. Howard, the advent of New Historicism has its roots among scholars of the Renaissance, who “have grown weary . . . of teaching texts as ethereal entities floating above the urgencies and contradictions of history and of seeking in such texts the disinterested expression of a unified truth rather than some articulation of the discontinuities underlying any construction of reality.”²⁸

New Historicism arose as a contestatory paradigm on two fronts. On the one front, it challenges the notion of “authority” in discourses, discussions and content. In other words, it challenges discursive canonization while trying to infuse the heretofore marginalized constituents of the society as equal determinants of the societal portrait. In the words of Simon During,

²⁸ Jean E. Howards, “The New Historicism in Renaissance Studies,” *Renaissance Historicism: Selections from English Literary Renaissance*, eds. Arthur F. Kinney & Dan S. Collins (Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1987) 5. Print.

Marginalized social sectors who had traditionally been kept out of the business of the state re-found their past in the history of everyday existence and cultural production. Symbolic or 'representational' acts took on a new significance too, such acts forming the politics of the disempowered. And the jumbling of established discursive orders by the disenfranchised could now be told as a story of resistance to authority.²⁹

On the other front, it contests the position of other forms of literary studies, such as Formalism, Structuralism and Old Historicism, for either alienating the historical from the literary texts or, trying to locate a single, uniform socio-political order in the time and space of focus. These approaches presented a simple, linear, uninterrupted historiography of the society, a portrait that camouflages the labyrinthine nature of societies and histories. Commenting on the relationship of New Historicism and Poststructuralism, Lützel states, „Zu erkennen ist, daß der New Historicism den Poststrukturalismus der französischen Theorie verdrängt bzw. bis zu einem gewissen Grad aufhebt.“³⁰ Acknowledging the role of New Historicism in literary studies, he sees it not as a product, but rather as a background component of the return to historicized literary studies.³¹

New Historicism maintains that a text does not originate from or exist in a vacuum, but rather, it has an anchor in the space and time of its origin. David Gershom Myers, sharing the same view, states, “The New Historicist effort to assimilate the literary text to history is guaranteed by the poststructuralist doctrine of textuality, which

²⁹ Simon During, “New Historicism,” *Text and Performance Quarterly* 11.3 (1991): 175. Print.

³⁰ Paul Michael Lützel, “Der Postmoderne Neohistorismus in den amerikanischen Humanities,” *Geschichte als Literatur: Formen und Grenzen der Repräsentation von Vergangenheit*, eds. Lämmert Eberhard, Hartmut Eggert, Ulrich Profitlich & Klaus R. Scherpe (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1990) 67. Print.

³¹ Lützel (1990), p. 68.

states that the text is not aloof from the surrounding context, that there is a contiguity, an ebb and flow, between text and whatever might once have been seen as ‘outside’ it.”³²

Roland Taylor reinforces the text/space/time relation by emphasizing the bond between the author and his environment,

Inasmuch as an artist is as subject to the social realities of his day as his contemporaries from other works of life, and inherits the same constellation of social and cultural circumstances as they do, there is a necessary interaction between him and his environment, whether he eagerly seeks the raw materials of his art from this environment or whether he withdraws from it in fear, anger, despair, or in the name of realities of a different order.³³

From the above assertion, three possible author/space relationships could be identified – the position of alliance with the socio-political power structure; the position of antagonism, and, finally, the position of indifference. As could be gleaned from Taylor’s argument, even though the artist displays indifference towards the societal trends, her/his consciously electing to go extra-societal is nevertheless a reflection on the society in a way. The author’s aloofness only creates another relationship dimension to the society and generates a different discursive concern. Discussing the connection between the author/work and the time/space, Nünning/Nünning state,

Im *New Historicism* richtet sich der Fokus dagegen genau auf die Herkunft der sprachlichen, inhaltlichen und rhetorischen Elemente von Kunstwerken. Das Prinzip des *close reading*, der materialnahen, akribischen Lektüre wird dabei nicht aufgegeben, aber es richtet sich jetzt eher auf die ‚Fransen‘ des textuellen Gewebes, es verfolgt – so die Metaphorik – die ‚Fäden‘, die aus den unterschiedlichsten kulturellen Bereichen in einen Text hineinführen und auch wieder aus ihm hinaus. Diese Lektüre bleibt mikrologisch, aber sie richtet das textanalytische Mikroskop jetzt vorzugsweise auf jene **Webstellen, an denen das Kunstwerk mit seiner zeitgenössischen**

³² David Gershom Myers, “The New Historicism in Literary Study,” *Academic Questions* 2 (1988-89): 29. Print.

³³ Roland Taylor, introduction, *Literature and Society in Germany 1918-1945* (Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1980) ix. Print.

Kultur verwoben ist. Bei dieser Art näherer Betrachtung stellt sich heraus, daß viele Elemente nicht nur der Struktur des Kunstwerks angehören, sondern darüber hinaus auch noch Teile eines anderen, weiteren Textes sind, des Textes der Kultur.³⁴

The summary of the argument is that authors are a part of a cultural setting within a historical timeframe; they actively or passively participate in all the existential realities of the time and space; the experiences, aspirations, failures, disappointments, glories and everything that constitutes their lives originate from the socio-cultural and the economic-political configuration of the society they live in. It is these experiences that condition their psyche and *Weltanschauung*. As authors write to reflect, they are limited to the knowledge and experience the environment affords them; as they write to advocate, they are limited to the imaginative power they have been able to develop through their interaction with the environment. Their writings are, therefore, a direct or indirect reflection on the society and the time as it is or should be from their own perspective.

Edward W. Said argues,

No one has ever devised a method for detaching the scholar from the circumstances of life, from the fact of his involvement (conscious or unconscious) with a class, a set of beliefs, a social position, or from the mere activity of being a member of a society. These continue to bear on what he does professionally, even though naturally enough his research and its fruits do attempt to reach a level of relative freedom from the inhibitions and the restrictions of brute, everyday reality.³⁵

The text/time-space bi-directionality is summed up in the phrase “the historicity of texts and the textuality of history,”³⁶ which means, in a nutshell, that history is transmitted by texts and texts are generated by history. When Walter Ben Michaels

³⁴ Nünning & Nünning, p. 134.

³⁵ Edward W. Said, *Orientalism*. (New York: Vintage Books, 1979) 10. Print.

³⁶ Louis Montrose, “Professing the Renaissance: the Poetics and Politics of Culture,” *The New Historicism*, ed. Harold Aram Veenser (New York: Routledge, 1989) 23. Print.

asserts that, “nothing is more historically real than the literary texts,”³⁷ his thoughts are not divorced from the truth of the relationship between literary texts and history. On bi-directional relationship between text and history, Howard states,

Literature is part of history, the literary text as much a context for other aspects of cultural and material life as they are for it. Rather than erasing the problem of textuality, one must enlarge it in order to see that both social and literary texts are opaque, self-divided, and porous, that is, open to the mutual intertextual influences of one another.³⁸

Michaels puts it this way, “Every reading of a literary text is an interpretation of a historical act or acts, and every reading is an account of the effects of that act or those acts, even if the effects in question consist of nothing more than the critic’s response to the texts.”³⁹

New Historicism is applied to the investigation of literary materials with the goal of getting as close as possible to the environment of emergence of the material. Thus, it seeks and incorporates the historical – political, cultural, economic, religious – in the study of literary materials. In the words of Brian Rosenberg, “In some ways New Historicism attempts to fuse old historical and poststructuralist principles, reclaiming history for the literary critic while re-defining it as a ‘text’ whose meaning is inchoate and linguistically constructed.”⁴⁰

The argument of New Historicism does not stop at establishing the link between a text and society, but goes on to discuss the kind of relationship a text shares with its space

³⁷ Walter Ben Michaels, “The Victims of New Historicism,” *Modern Language Quarterly: A Journal of Literary History* 54.1 (1993): 114. Print.

³⁸ Howard, p. 15.

³⁹ Michaels, p. 113.

⁴⁰ Brian Rosenberg, “Historicising the New Historicism: Understanding the Past in Criticism and Fiction,” *Modern Language Quarterly: A Journal of Literary History* 50.4 (1989): 377. Print.

and time of origin. As we seek to establish the historicity of a text, what are we looking for – a unitary, linear, harmonious, uniform historiography or an undulating, multi-layered, disharmonious, conflict-laden historiography, which reflects the possibility of multi-valency in the society? New Historicism argues that the historiography of societies does not constitute itself in a single, uniform and harmonious linearity, but is a composite of a variegated conflicting socio-cultural and econo-political topography. Rosenberg articulates this property of New Historicism thus,

The New Historicism aims not merely at ‘putting the text back into the context from which it was generated,’ but at making the consideration of historical context the center or basis of all literary study – the condition without which other forms of study cannot meaningfully take place. Its understanding of context, however, distinguishes it dramatically from older forms of historical criticism, since it imagines, not a monological, objectively verifiable past reflected in unified works of literature, but a past of competing voices, values, and centers of power whose meaning is constructed, not discovered, by the interpretive critic or historian.⁴¹

That New Historicism is thus fighting a revolution on two fronts – that of deconstructing the formalist approach of immanent non-historicized or non-contextualized study of literature on the one front, and that of deconstructing the notion of a unitary historiography of literary contexts as upheld by the Old Historicism and Structuralism on the other – becomes obvious.

If New Historicism seeks to destabilize the episteme of historio-literary harmony established by earlier paradigms, it needs to do that by digging deeper into and searching wider in the spatial and temporal environment of the literary text. New Historicism holds that there are voices, values, tendencies and valencies that, owing to the prevailing

⁴¹ Rosenberg, p. 376.

circumstances at a particular time and space, may have been suppressed. The implication of this is the existence of “histories” instead of “the history.” Howard states accordingly,

Instead of evoking a monolithic and repressive ‘history’, one must acknowledge the existence of ‘histories’ produced by subjects variously positioned within the present social formations and motivated by quite different senses of the *present* needs and *present* problems which it is hoped will be clarified or reconfigured through the study of the past.⁴²

Given that there are various versions of history within a particular space and time, what exists as “the history” emerges as the permitted version of the privileged. The possibility of the existence of “the history” opens up the argument of power, privilege and opportunity as it relates to the construction of history. A person’s position in relation to these three factors determines whether s/he is a participating subject or a dormant object in the construction of history/text. Sebastian Conrad and Shalini Randeria argue, „Aus postkolonialer Perspektive erscheinen Wissen und Wissenschaft nicht als Instrumente neutraler und ‚subjektiver‘ Beschreibung, sondern sind von den Mechanismen der Macht nicht zu trennen.“⁴³

The nucleus of the argument of New Historicism regarding history and its objectivity/subjectivity is that it is constructed, and since it is constructed, the tendency for it to have been tailored along the specific interests and purposes of the privileged is most probable. Howards argues,

As a number of boundary cases make clear today, some texts are regularly treated as literature and as something else. While it is quite possible in practical terms to speak of a literary canon, it seems quite another matter to assume that the texts in that canon are there by virtue of some mysterious

⁴² Howards, p. 13.

⁴³ Sebastian Conrad, Shalini Randeria, „Geteilte Geschichte – Europa in einer postkolonialen Welt,“ *Jenseits des Eurozentrismus. Postkoloniale Perspektiven in den Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften*, eds. Sebastian Conrad und Shalini Randeria (Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 2002) 34. Print.

inner property which they all share. They are all there for a variety of reasons having to do with the privileging of certain artifacts by powerful groups, and their ‘properties’ are in large measure the result of the operations performed upon them by generations of critics. Hence, while it may be useful for strategic or practical purposes to retain the category ‘literature,’ it seems wrong to assign to the texts gathered under that rubric a single, universal stance towards the ideological.⁴⁴

The unique position of New Historicism vis-à-vis the other paradigms is its emphasis on the reintegration of the historical in the reading of texts, though not as a completed and inviolable segment of existence, but rather as an open still metamorphosing continuum. The opening of the past by New Historicism approach avails scholars the opportunity to, in the words of Wai-Chee Dimock, “recover those uneven velocities and shifting densities, to deconstruct its spatial unity into a virtual (and uncharted) sequence, a momentary conjunction of temporal traces, with no particular center of gravity and no particular teleology.”⁴⁵

New Historicism’s contestatory stance towards canonization of literary texts, coupled with its interest in the splintery nature of societies, predisposes new historicists to investigate beyond the literary and the documented historical. To be able to advance the contextual knowledge of the literary text, for it to recover the “uneven velocities and shifting densities” as argued by Dimock, New Historicism has to investigate every aspect of the time and space the functioning of which generated the text. Howard argues this view further,

The most illuminating field of reference may not be just other literary works. To return to the example of the representation of women: in order to understand the ideological function of, say, certain plays for the public theater, it may be important to see their representations of women in

⁴⁴ Howards, p. 19.

⁴⁵ Wai-Chee Dimock, “Feminism, New Historicism, and the Reader,” *American Literature: A Journal of Literary History, Criticism and Bibliography* 63.4 (1991): 601-622. Print.

the light of the representations offered in masques, in conduct manuals, in medical treatises, and in Puritan polemics all written at approximately the same time.⁴⁶

The ingredients that constitute the life of a society are embedded in the principles and practices of the society's social, political and economic culture and ideology. It is not feasible to reflect all these in a literary text (looking at a text as representation). Recognizing this situation, Howard argues that, "literature is one of many elements participating in a culture's representation of reality to itself, helping to form its discourse on the family, the state, the individual, helping to make the world intelligible, though not necessarily helping to represent it 'accurately'."⁴⁷ What is reflected in a literary text, and the way it is reflected depends interpretively on the biases of the author and those of the reader. Focusing on the text alone in search of insurable information on a society becomes a short circuit. Drawing from the reading of a Renaissance text, Howards lends more credence to this argument,

To understand how women were made intelligible in the Renaissance, one cannot look only to social 'facts', such as how many children they had, or of what diseases and at what age they died. One must also consider how the medical, legal, and religious spheres functioned to provide a discourse about women which may have represented them in ways quite at odds with what we see as the apparent 'fact' of their situation.⁴⁸

The need for the new historicist to consult diverse dimensions equally mandates its *inter-, multi- and transdisciplinarity*. New Historicism is not a strictly discipline-oriented theory or research methodology, but embraces various fields of discipline in the pursuit of its

⁴⁶ Howards, p. 20.

⁴⁷ Howards, p. 17.

⁴⁸ Howards, p. 17.

goals. Simon During, one of the principal theorists of New Historicism, succinctly acknowledges the *interdisciplinarity* of the paradigm as its strength and not a weakness.⁴⁹

Discussing the interdisciplinarity of New Historicism, Lützel states, „‘New Historicism’ ist der Sammelbegriff für eine wissenschaftliche Richtung mit im einzelnen durchaus unterschiedlichen Methoden. Was diesen verschiedenen Methoden gemeinsam ist, ist ihr interdisziplinärer Ansatz. Keinem der Fächer, von denen hier die Rede ist, kommt dabei ein privilegierter Status zu.“⁵⁰ Thus, it is not appropriate, as in the case of earlier theories, to talk of New Historicism as an approach with clearly defined and characteristically bordering properties relative to a specific disciplinary pattern, but rather, as a methodology that is still in continuous metamorphosis, highly flexible and adaptable to various disciplines.

The all-encompassing nature of New Historicism as a research approach, further to underscoring its *interdisciplinarity*, posts the argument of the intertextuality of a written text. Intertextuality recognizes the possibility of a text emerging from different aspects of the society as well as from already existing texts. The implication of the intertextuality argument is that, if a text is considered an independent and autonomous creation, it fences off the various possible interactions with the societal splinters that may have contributed to its emergence. A typical example of the intertextuality of a text is in Louis Montrose’s discussion of Sir Walter Raleigh’s *The Discovery of Guiana* (1596) in “The Work of Gender in the Discourse of Discovery” in which he gave an account of his exploration travel in the Americas.

⁴⁹ During, p. 171.

⁵⁰ Lützel (1990), p. 69.

Using a new historicist approach, Montrose elucidates how class issues, power politics, court intrigues, gendering patterns and the likes were the determining factors behind Sir Raleigh's voyage, and how these court realities registered their prints in the narration. Montrose illustrates this in his discussion of the naming of Virginia, "Having authorized her subjects' act of discovery and symbolic possession, the English monarch assumes the privilege of naming the land anew, and naming it for herself and for the gender-specific virtue she has so long and so successfully employed as a means of self-empowerment."⁵¹ In what seemed like a simple act of recognizing the sovereignty of the Queen, Montrose recognizes some behind-the-stage driving forces that may have informed the act. This style of reading is what Lützelers terms horizontal reading as against vertical reading, which excludes the textualized environment. According to Lützeler, in horizontal reading,

Der Begriff des Textes wird dabei neu und weiter gefaßt als bei früheren Methoden. Der Textkorpus einer 'autonomen Disziplin' . . . wird abgelöst durch den Text eines 'kulturellen Systems'. Der Blick der New Historicists ist entsprechend weniger auf die Vertikale eines diachronisch strukturierten Einzelfachs gerichtet als auf die Horizontale und auf die Synchronie einer gesamt-kulturellen Situation.⁵²

New Historicism sees all the attendant circumstances to the emergence of the text as constituting its intertextuality, and if the text is read "vertically," a reasonable percentage of its intertextual richness will be lost. The need to consult other materials in order to have a more insurable knowledge and understanding of the time and space of a text's origin, as argued by Howards, is corroborated by Jonathan Gill Harris in the paper,

⁵¹ Louis Montrose, "The Work of Gender in the Discourse of Discovery," *Representations* No. 33, Special Issue: *The New World* (1991): 8. Print.

⁵² Lützeler (1990), p. 75.

“The New New Historicism’s *Wunderkammer* of Objects.”⁵³ Harris, among other things, criticizes the tendency to regard the “object” just as a constitution that emerges from nowhere “susceptible to the dialectic of renunciation and allure, but without history of production, whether it be economic production of the object as commodity . . . or discursive production of the very category of the ‘object’.” He contends that the “object,” just like the subject, has its environment of emergence.⁵⁴ In New Historicism’s search for the historicity of texts, the marginal emerges as the central point of focus.

New Historicism is a necessity for this project. Since it extends its investigative approach to other documents that may have originated in the time in focus both from the palaces and from the popular spheres in search of a more authentic and more complete representation, it offers me the leverage to go as far as is needed retrospectively. New Historicism’s acceptance of non-literary materials, its interest in the historicity of a text, and its position of skepticism towards the canonized further make it relevant to this project, which does not take off from a position of unquestioned consent to everything that has been said about Germany’s colonialism in Africa, but rather, intends to delve more deeply into the possible circumstances that may have generated the history associated with Germany’s colonialism.

The relevance of New Historicism is also expressed in the investigation of the bi-directionality that exists between the social system and the literary text. Considering the fact that this project will investigate some of the literary works that thematize Germany’s

⁵³ Jonathan Gil Harris, “The New New Historicism’s *Wunderkammer* of Objects,” *European Journal of English Studies* 4.2 (2000): 111-123. Print.

⁵⁴ Harris, p. 116.

colonial enterprise, the application of a New Historicism approach makes room for the needed horizontal reading in order to have a firmer grip on how the texts, time, space and people interacted multi- and bi-directionally to generate Germany's colonial discourse.

Postcolonialism

Postcolonial Theories emerged as a counter-discursive paradigm in the second half of the 20th century. Various scholars such as Edward Said, Frantz Fanon, Albert Memmi, Gayatri Spivak, Hamid Dabashi, Homi Bhabha, Susanne Zantop, Sara Lennox, Vijay Mishra and a host of others have been recognized as renowned scholars in the field of Postcolonialism. However, its advent is credited to Edward Said, Frantz Fanon and Aimé Césaire, whose works – *Orientalism* (1978), *The Wretched of the Earth* (1961) and *Discourse on Colonialism* (1950) respectively launched what could be called an insurgent epistemic challenge to the hegemony of western episteme vis-à-vis non-European nations.

The development of Postcolonialism as an academic discourse follows the dissatisfaction with the metropolitan representation of the subaltern. The dominant portrait of the subaltern as subhuman has continued to thrive and to condition the perception and the reception of the members of the formerly colonized peoples in some quarters.⁵⁵ So, with the increased number of members of the subjugated groups entering the class of academic elites, the dubiousness of the representations of the colonized became more obvious. These subaltern scholars saw a need and undertook the responsibility to revisit the whole gist of colonialism. Postcolonialism is, thus, born out of

⁵⁵ See Christa Knellwolf, "The Exotic Frontiers of the Imperial Imagination," *Eighteenth Century Life* 26.3 (2002): 10-30. Print.

the undertaking to set the record straight. Friedrichsmeyer et al. state accordingly, “Once colonized people had cause to reflect on and express the tension which ensued from this problematic and contested, but eventually vibrant and powerful mixture of imperial language and local experience, ‘post-colonial theory’ came into being.”⁵⁶ It could be argued that the postcolonial theory and discourse is an offspring of the awakening of the subaltern, what could be rightly termed a continued enlightenment.⁵⁷

Since, according to Immanuel Kant, „Aufklärung ist der Ausgang des Menschen aus seiner selbst verschuldeten Unmündigkeit. Unmündigkeit ist das Unvermögen, sich seines Verstandes ohne Leitung eines anderen zu bedienen,“⁵⁸ the effort to break the yoke of colonialism (anti-colonialism movement), and subsequent effort to correct its falsities (postcolonial discourse), qualify as manifestations of *Aufklärung*. Although enlightenment in this sense does not follow the principles and precepts of the European Enlightenment, it nevertheless emerges from the fundamental precept of seeking and applying knowledge for the purposes of self-emancipation. Williams and Chrisman recognize the effect of the Enlightenment on the anti-colonialism thinkers of the African continent, „Taking just Southern and West Africa as examples, it can be seen that late nineteenth and early twentieth-century nationalist black intellectuals [such as Kwame Nkurumah, Nnamdi Azikiwe, Patrice Lumumba], were engaged both in instrumentalising

⁵⁶ Friedrichsmeyer et al. introduction, p. 2.

⁵⁷ See Uche O. Okafor, “Anti-Kolonialismus Literatur Afrikas als afrikanische Aufklärung: Eine komparatistische Analyse der deutschen literarischen Epoche der Aufklärung und der literarischen Anti-Kolonialismus-Epoche in Afrika,” *Foreign Languages Studies in West Africa: Nigeria and Benin*, eds., Adeleke, Joseph Ajibola, Festus Ayodeji Soyoye and Flavian Gbeto (Benin: Presses Scolaires et Universitaire du Benin, 2004) 140. Print.

⁵⁸ Immanuel Kant, „Was ist Aufklärung?“ *Berlinische Monatsschrift* Dezember-Heft (1784): 481-494. Print.

and immanently critiquing Enlightenment cultural forms . . . political forms . . . ethical and political emancipatory values.“⁵⁹

Lützeler, arguing that, „Der Postkolonialismus setzt auf modernisierte Weise den antikolonialen Diskurs früherer Jahrzehnte fort,“⁶⁰ recognizes the relay-relationship between anti-colonialism and Postcolonialism. Robert Young, acknowledging the contiguity that exists between the anticolonial and the postcolonial, states,

Postcolonial critique is therefore a form of activist writing that looks back to the political commitment of the anti-colonial liberation movements and draws its inspiration from them, while recognizing that they often operated under conditions very different from those that exist in the present. Its orientation will change according to the political priorities of the moment, but its source in the revolutionary activism of the past gives it a constant basis and inspiration: it too is dedicated to changing those who were formerly the objects of history into history’s new subjects.⁶¹

Using the political realities of Francophone African countries as a case study, Pius Adesanmi reinforces the argument of the overlapping temporality of the colonial and the postcolonial. In his words, “The entanglement of colonial and postcolonial temporalities is maintained in the power *durée* novel by the shadowy presence of France, whose representatives function as ‘advisor’ (to the governments).”⁶²

The prefix “Post-” usually suggests something happening after something else has come and gone. In such concepts like Post-modernism, Post-structuralism, Post-War and others, the prefix is a demarcatory periodizing marker, which suggests that the headword,

⁵⁹ Williams & Chrisman, p. 15.

⁶⁰ See Paul Michael Lützeler *Postmoderne und postkoloniale deutschsprachige Literatur. Diskurs – Analyse – Kritik* (Bielefeld: Aisthesis Verlag, 2005.) 23. Print.

⁶¹ Robert J.C. Young, *Postcolonialism. A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003) 10. Print.

⁶² Pius Adesanmi, “Of Postcolonial Entanglement and *Durée*: Reflections on the Francophone African Novel,” *Comparative Literature* 56. 3 (2004): 233. Print.

modernism for instance, is concluded and a new course, which leads away from its principles and claims, is being charted. However, in the case of Post-colonialism, the prefix Post- suggests a new epistemic paradigmatic approach to a concept which had existed and still exists but in a different form. Stuart Hall argues, “So, *postcolonial* is not the end of colonisation. It *is* after a certain *kind* of colonialism, after a certain moment of high imperialism and colonial occupation—in the wake of it, in the shadow of it, inflected by it—it is what it is because something else has happened before, but it is also something new.”⁶³ As could be gleaned from Stuart Hall’s statement, it is a concept the effects and properties of which still reverberate in and condition the present with its focus on the future.

Hall’s statement gives an impression of segments in a phenomenon that has a long duration. Colonialism becomes, thus, a wholesome but segmented concept, constituting, as Berman argues, of the age of discovery, when European voyagers organized global space into a single cartographic system, the high imperialism, marked by the direct political domination of much of the globe by a small number of European states, and the postcolonial, the era of political independence, in spite of the prevalent economic dependence.⁶⁴ Berman’s categorization takes into account the period of contact, leaving off the pre-contact period as perhaps insignificant in the whole constellation. However, the discourse of postcolonialism and postcoloniality would have no basis if the pre-contact era is not brought into focus. This is because, any discussion on how imperialism

⁶³ Stuart Hall, interview by Julie Drew, *Cultural Composition: Stuart Hall on Ethnicity and the Discursive Turn*, Race, Rhetoric, and the Postcolonial, eds. Gary A. Olson and Lynn Worsham (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999) 230. Print.

⁶⁴ Russell Berman, *Enlightenment or Empire: Colonial Discourse in German Culture* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998) 6. Print.

impacted on the societies involved – colonizing and colonized – that does not consider their pre-contact state would be lacking in comparative referents.

The bi-directional temporal transcendence of the postcolonial is thus a commonly recognized ingredient of Postcolonialism, which requires us to investigate the past while living in the present without removing our attention from how both – the past and the present – combine to determine the future. Mishra and Hodge explain the functional nature of Postcolonialism thus,

‘Postcolonialism’ is a neologism that grew out of older elements to capture a seemingly unique moment in world history, a configuration of experiences and insights, hopes and dreams arising from a hitherto silenced part of the world, taking advantage of new conditions to ‘search for alternatives to the discourses of the colonial era,’ creating an altogether different vantage point from which to review the past and the future. That situation . . . demanded a name. The name it claimed was ‘postcolonial,’ and hence ‘postcolonialism.’⁶⁵

Williams and Chrisman, considering the continued influence of former colonizing nations on the governance of the former colonies, contend that colonialism still thrives.⁶⁶

Postcolonialism should also investigate how colonialism affected and still affects both the colonizer and the colonized societies. This line of reasoning argues for the possibility of racio-cultural cross-breeding between the colonized and the colonizers.

Williams and Chrisman comment,

What has been less explored is the extent to which the subaltern may have played a constitutive rather than a reflective role in colonial and domestic imperial discourse and subjectivity. Rather than being that other onto which the coloniser projects a previously constituted subjectivity and knowledge, native presences, locations, and political resistance need to be further theorised as

⁶⁵ Vijay *Mishra* and Bob Hodge “What was Postcolonialism?” *New Literary History* 36.3 (2005): 378.

⁶⁶ Williams and Chrisman, p. 3.

having a determining or primary role in colonial discourses, and in the attendant domestic versions of these discourses. In other words, the movement may have been as much from ‘periphery’ to centre as from centre to ‘periphery’.⁶⁷

Williams and Chrisman, discussing the resistance of the colonized people, state, “There is a possibility that this resistance engendered defensiveness and fear within the colonial subject and that . . . the colonized Other came to serve as a template for self-construction, being a model of the martial power to which the colonist aspired.”⁶⁸ A typical example of the bi-directionality of colonial influence is the linking of the Holocaust with the genocide of the Herero and Nama in 1904-08.⁶⁹ The argument here is that the mentality of annihilative erasure practiced by Nazism, was developed within the context of colonial encounters, imported and applied in the metropolitan setting.

Another aspect of Postcolonialism is its multi-dimensionality, by which it is associated with diverse discourses within different disciplines. Discussing the multi-dimensionality of Postcolonialism, Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin argue,

Postcolonial theory involves discussion about experience, of various kinds: migration, slavery, suppression, resistance, representation, difference, race, gender, place, and responses to the influential master discourses of imperial Europe such as history, philosophy and linguistics, and the fundamental experiences of speaking and writing by which all these come into being. None of these is ‘essentially’ post-colonial, but together they form the complex fabric of the field.⁷⁰

The multi-dimensionality of Postcolonialism has generated the platform for questions on homogeneity vs. heterogeneity of racial, ethnic and cultural identities,

⁶⁷ Williams and Chrisman, p. 16.

⁶⁸ Williams and Chrisman, p. 17.

⁶⁹ See Steinmetz and Hell, p. 2.

⁷⁰ Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, eds., introduction, *The Post-Colonial Reader* (London: Routledge, 1995) 2. Print.

authenticity/purity vs. hybridity of culture, the fluidity vs. the firmness of geo-political borders, gendering and more. These terms grapple with the societal realities that have emerged out of the enterprise of colonialism and have persistently continued to alter the configurations of societies on every front. While colonialism and *coloniality* were perceived or represented as having affected the colonized, postcolonialism/*postcoloniality* more obviously applies to both the colonized and the colonizer. Lützel shares the view of the postcolonial being a bi-directional phenomenon which responds to the deep and bold socio-cultural print which colonialism has left on both societies,

Der Begriff des Postkolonialen impliziert die Abkehr vom Modell eines asymmetrischen Sender-Empfänger-Kulturtransfers von der hegemonialen westlichen Kultur zu der der kolonisierten Länder. Die Leistung des postkolonialen Diskurses besteht nach Hall gerade darin, zu verdeutlichen, daß der Prozeß der Kolonisierung die kolonisierenden europäischen Nationen so stark geprägt habe wie die Gesellschaften der ehemals kolonisierten Länder. So bezeichnet Postkolonialismus eine neue Lesart der Kolonisierung als transkulturellen globalen Prozeß.⁷¹

With all the paradigmatic derivatives of Postcolonialism, it consolidates its position and portrait as a temporality defying paradigm. As long as the discourses that have arisen out of Postcolonialism continue to thrive, its temporality will continue to expand retroactively and proactively. Acknowledging the temporality defying nature of the postcolonial discourse, Spivak argues that, temporalizing it as an investigation of the past would have made it an alibi.⁷²

The Postcolonial paradigm has generated a lot of doubts, discomfort, uncertainties and disharmonies within the discourse of colonialism. One major example of this is the crisis going on in Namibia between descendants of immigrant German families and

⁷¹ Lützel (2005), p. 24.

⁷² Spivak, p. 1.

indigenous Namibians over colonial memorials.⁷³ Texts – pictorial, monumental, documental and others – that had been accepted and preserved as containing and communicating the truth of colonialism, everything that was developed and applied to the enterprise of colonialism as well as everything that was generated by colonialism, have become subject to intense investigation in the court of Postcolonialism. Under Postcolonialism, the authenticity of canonized history and literature; the credibility of classical literature; the truth of scholarly research and pronouncements, and the acclaimed veracity of colonial politics all become questionable and vulnerable. Postcolonialism lays the totality of the western episteme on colonialism on the court of renewed investigation from diverse perspectives.

While Postcolonialism discourse has focused on the other colonizing nations for a long time, Germany, which tried to present itself as uncontaminated by periphery colonialism, remained out of focus till the 1970s. Postcolonialism has pried open the casket of Germany's colonial past, and has unearthed a tremendous amount of information. Cindy K. Renker states, "The theory of post-colonialism has become more influential over the past twenty years. German colonial literature, which had been ignored and forgotten, had also gained new momentum in the two decades providing its readers and critics with a new understanding of Germany's colonial attitude and politics."⁷⁴ Courtesy of Postcolonialism, the question on Germans' mind should no longer be whether or not, but rather, how Germany features as a periphery colonial power.

⁷³ See Steinmetz and Hell, p. 147-83.

⁷⁴ Cindy K. Renker, "Imperial Motherhood: The German Civilizing Mission in Bülow's *Im Lande der Verheißung*," thes. Brigham Young University, 2004, 69. *The Sophie Journal*. Web. Dec. 24th, 2011. <http://sophieold.byu.edu/sophiejournal/thesis/renker0.pdf>.

The postcolonial non-Eurocentric remapping of the colonial discourse has forced colonizer nations such as Britain, Germany and France, to revise the way they relate to colonial immigrants. It could be argued that, apart from the effort to decolonize, Postcolonialism has vitally contributed to multi-faceted hybridization of identities – racial, cultural, and more – both at group and individual levels. Adesanmi acknowledges the hybridization of global societies resulting from the colonial and the postcolonial (in which the neocolonial is subsumed) situations in Africa.⁷⁵ Marcia Klotz endorses the claim of the mutual fertilization of the global society resulting from colonialism. She credits the highlighting of this reality to postcolonial discourse,

Postcolonial studies is generally understood as a history and theorization of the oppressed. It focuses on the places and peoples who were on the receiving end of the colonial stick, and it generally traces their struggles to develop economic, psychological, and national sovereignty in the wake of the extreme brutality of colonial relations yet, discussions of postcoloniality also include the histories of colonizing powers. The rich, though often conflictual, multiculturalism of contemporary Paris or London certainly finds its place in postcolonial discussions, because it is clearly incomprehensible outside of the historical context of empire.⁷⁶

It is also fair enough to emphasize the fact that the project of Postcolonialism is in no way an exclusive business of subaltern scholars. Several Western scholars such as Robert J.C. Young, Dirk Göttsche, Horst Gründer, Russell Berman, Christa Knellwolf and many others are involved in the discourse of Postcolonialism. Lützel, one of the very prolific German Postcolonialism scholars, presents an example of the contemporary trend in Postcolonialism/*postcoloniality* writings by German writers,

Sie reisten eigentlich alle in die Staaten der Dritten Welt, um zu lernen und um durch ihre Berichte zu einem genaueren Verständnis der Interrelation zwischen Erster und Dritter Welt in den

⁷⁵ Adesanmi, p. 238.

⁷⁶ Klotz, p. 135.

Bereichen von Politik, Kultur, Gesellschaft und Ökologie beizutragen. Nicht mit dem überlegenen, besserwässerischen, ausbeuterischen und missionarischen kolonialen, sondern mit dem offenen, wißbegierigen, solidarischen und gleichwohl kritischen postkolonialen Blick wollen sie das kulturell Andere verstehen.⁷⁷

This marks one of the significant differences between colonialism and Postcolonialism. While colonialism was dominated by the voice of the colonialists and the voicelessness and “absence” of the colonized, Postcolonialism emphasizes the voice and “presence” of the colonized. The majority of the works generated in this field have the thread of accusatory questioning running through them. The authenticity of the western representation of the colonized remains an issue of investigation. Young states,

Since the early 1980s, postcolonialism has developed a body of writing that attempts to shift the dominant ways in which the relations between western and non-western people and their worlds are viewed. . . . It means turning the world upside down. It means looking from the other side of the photograph, experiencing how differently things look when you live in Baghdad or Benin rather than Berlin or Boston, and understanding why. It means realizing that when western people look at the non-western world what they see is often more a mirror image of themselves and their own assumptions than the reality of what is really there, or of how people outside the west actually feel and perceive themselves.⁷⁸

The return to the question of colonialism focuses, among other things, on what the colonized have to say for themselves, about themselves and about the colonizers; what some members of the colonizing nations, operating from a non-Eurocentric perspective as much as possible, are saying; and how nation, politics, culture, episteme and the likes relate to the politics of colonialism and anti-colonialism.

Using a Postcolonialism approach in this project is justified on the grounds that, first, the subject of this project, broadly speaking, is colonialism. Being a retrospective

⁷⁷ Lützeler (1998), p. 29.

⁷⁸ Young (2003), p. 2.

engagement of materials that relate to colonialism, it is grounded in Postcolonialism. Secondly, owing to the fact that this project is going to take a contestatory stance vis-à-vis some established views about Germany's colonial past, it fits in the paradigm of Postcolonialism, which is *inter alia* contestatory. The project shares in the temporal transcendence of Postcolonialism based on the way it is structured. It draws from the past by analyzing the environment of Germany's colonialism in Africa.

The three theoretical and methodological approaches – Cultural Studies, New Historicism, and Postcolonialism – share a reasonable measure of compatibility with each other. In the first place, they are paradigms oriented towards the redemption and enhancement of the status of the subaltern from the fallacies of western colonial episteme. Secondly, they are contestatory in their stance towards the established episteme. They are always asking questions not only about what is included and how it is represented, but also about what is excluded and why it is excluded, while making efforts to locate its place within the societal macrocosm. Thirdly, the advent of all three paradigms is mainly attributed to subaltern scholars whose discomfort with the western-oriented episteme on the subaltern's world pushed into the development of insurgent paradigms.

The exclusion of the “other” (marginalized group either by class, racial or other forms of segregation) or the vitiation of the same in any representation formed the focus of the three paradigms. Fourthly, in response to the confirmed non- or misrepresentation of the subaltern, the three paradigms share the mission of exposing the falsities of western-centric, class-centric or power-centric knowledge on the one hand, while on the

other hand, making efforts, through the incorporation of the marginalized, to present a more authentic representative version of the deposed or contested episteme.

Within the context of Germany's colonial discourse, the combination of the three paradigms will broaden the scope of the resources available for investigation in this project, and will facilitate a cross-disciplinary approach.

Chapter Two

Review of Secondary Literature: Germany's Colonial Enterprise in Postcolonialism Discourse

An Overview

The discourse of Postcolonialism in the German context began with the controversy over Germany's participation. The average German needed to be convinced of the nation's participation. While the presence of colonial subjects in the former colonizing nations has been an ever-abiding evidence of their involvement in periphery colonial enterprise, this reality was lacking in Germany owing to conscious efforts made to eliminate that. Under National Socialism, steps were taken to deal decisively with the presence of Blacks in Germany. As Joeden Forgey states,

Despite the availability of film and theater jobs, many African Germans, especially those categorized as *Mischlinge*, were forced into concentration camps, and it would be wrong to assume that the Africa Show* members escaped this fate. One performer was executed in 1942 for alleged 'attempted rape.' Another was imprisoned in the Sachsenhausen concentration camp in 1941 for '*Rassenschande*.' . . . He died there in 1944. . . . In total about two thousand blacks died in Nazi concentration camps. Despite the space created for Africans in Germany by the Africa Show, the Nazi state still reserved the power to murder them on an individual basis as unwanted race aliens.¹

Hitler's measures led to the near-zero presence of Blacks in Germany during WWII and thereafter. Apart from the African-American and African soldiers among the French troops, who were in the occupying army at the end of WWII, black were not readily

¹ Elisa von Joeden-Forgey, "Race Power in Postcolonial Germany. The German Africa Show and the National Socialist State, 1935-40," *Germany's Colonial Pasts*, eds. Eric Ames, Marcia Klotz and Lora Wildenthal (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005): 181. Print.

*Africa Show was a propagandist stage show organized by the Nazi Regime, where African immigrants displayed. They are made to express pro-German sentiments in praise of Germans as "wonderful" colonizers, and thus, deserve to have their colonies returned.

visible in Germany as members of the civilian society. The implication of this was that, even when Germans would look within, they would not see evidence of colonialism via the presence of colonial subjects. Therefore, the belief in Germany's innocence of colonial involvement had some delusionary validity.

In the colonized nations, the presence and interest of the former colonizers are a testimony that stayed with the colonized. This is most prominent in their present culture, their national/official language, and the involvement of the metropolitan governments in their local econo-political affairs.

While the British, French, Belgian, Portuguese and Spanish see aspects of their respective cultures replicated in their former colonies as a part of their legacy, a German does not expect to hear German spoken in any African country for instance. So, what is there to convince him/her of German participation in colonialism. Against the absence of obvious evidence, the first task of applying Postcolonialism discourse to Germany was to convince Germans of their involvement in the enterprise of colonialism. Lützeler reflects on the German attitude towards colonialism,

Was den postkolonialen Diskurs im deutschen Kontext betrifft, stößt man ständig auf zwei abwehrende Argumente: erstens habe Deutschland so gut wie keinen Anteil an der europäischen Kolonialgeschichte gehabt, weswegen es auch keine postkolonialen Bürden gebe; und zweitens – damit zusammenhängend – spiele das Kolonialthema in der deutschen Literatur kaum eine Rolle, und die Behandlung der Dritten Welt in der Gegenwartsliteratur sei eine marginale Angelegenheit. Dem ist allerdings entgegenzuhalten, dass es eine deutsche Kolonialgeschichte mit entsprechender historischer Hypothek durchaus gegeben hat.²

² Paul Michael Lützeler, "Postkolonialer Diskurs und deutsche Literatur," *Schriftsteller und "Dritte Welt". Studien zum postkolonialen Blick.*, ed. Paul Michael Lützeler (Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag, 1998) 22. Print.

The ignorance or the denial by the average German of Germany's participation in colonialism has been attributed to various factors. First, the loss of WWI in 1918. The defeat transformed Germany from a colonizing into a colonized nation. Even though the form of dominance was not similar to periphery colonization, it was still a form of colonization in so far as the victorious powers dictated terms to Germany, including the forced abdication of the emperor, Kaiser Friedrich Wilhelm II, and the mandatory democratization that followed. Germans did not lose just the war, but their rights, their self-esteem, their economy, the imperial system of government and their freedom along with it. Hunger, sickness, depression and delusion descended on the German people and any means by which these problems could be solved became a welcome alternative.³

The crafting of the Treaty of Versailles and the absence of Germany at the deliberations is in a way reminiscent of the Berlin Conference of 1884, where Africa's future was being discussed, but without any African representative. Justifying the African absence, the conferees argued that "indigenous Africans did not need to be represented, since they could not, as barbarians, be treated as legal subjects."⁴ Baron Auguste Lamermont, the delegate from Belgium, was succinct in his argument to justify the absence of blacks at the conference,

With respect to these populations, who for the most part cannot be considered as being outside the community of the rights of man, but who in the present state of things are hardly suited to defending their interests themselves, the conference must assert the role of an official protector. The necessity of insuring the preservation of the indigenous people, the duty of helping them to reach a higher political and social status, and the obligation of instructing them and of initiating

³ Bundestag Publication, *Fragen and die deutsche Geschichte* (Bonn: Bundestag Publication, 1989) 256. Print.

⁴ David Simo, "Colonization and Modernization. The Legal Foundation of the Colonial Enterprise: A Case Study of German Colonization in Cameroon," Ames et al., p. 99.

them into the advantages of civilization are unanimously recognized. Africa's future itself is at issue.⁵

It is possible for the conferees to be vehement about the absence of Africans at the conference because Africans were conceived as having no right to determine their future. At the time that the allied nations were discussing the fate of Germany, Germans were conceived as having no right to determine their future. It was like saying "Germany's future itself is at issue."

Secondly, the premature end of Germany's colonial enterprise at the end of WWI. Germany was forced to forfeit her periphery colonies on charges of barbaric treatment of natives, which was interpreted as a betrayal of civilization, culturedness and the principles of universal humanity. Thomas Schwarz argues on the barbarism of the German colonial administration in Africa,

Verschwiegen wird dagegen, was so ein Angriff der deutschen Kolonialarmee für die einheimische Bevölkerung eigentlich bedeutete. Zwischen 1891 und 1897 gab es in Deutsch-Ostafrika allein 61 solcher Unterwerfungsfeldzüge. Die Niederschlagung des Maji-Maji Aufstands im Jahr 1905 dezimierte die unterdrückten Stämme um 75.000. Niemand wäre auf die Idee gekommen, die kolonialen Menschenschlächter hinter Gitter zu bringen. Unbehelligt blieben auch die deutschen Pflanzer Kameruns, obwohl brutale Behandlung und katastrophale hygienische Bedingungen auf ihren Plantagen die Sterblichkeitsziffern bei den einheimischen Arbeitskräften auf rund 30% steigen ließen.⁶

With German colonies under the control of other nations, there was an effort to re-orient the natives away from German influence. So, as contemporary Germans look into Africa, they see the impressions of other European nations, but no German impression. As

⁵ Simo, Ames et al., p. 99.

⁶ Thomas Schwarz, "Die Kultivierung des kolonialen Begehrens – ein deutscher Sonderweg," *Kolonialismus als Kultur: Literatur, Medien, Wissenschaft in der deutschen Gründerzeit des Fremden*, eds. Alexander Honold und Oliver Simons (Tübingen: A. Francke Verlag, 2002) 89-90. Print.

Friedrichsmeyer et al. argue, while there are today African literature in French, in Portuguese, in Spanish and in Afrikaans, there is no “Germanophone” literature anywhere in Africa.⁷ With the absence of such relics, there is the tendency for the average German to deny that German colonialism ever happened.

Thirdly, the humiliation that came with the loss of WWI, which was the culmination of Germany’s belligerence and aggressiveness. Germany’s colonial quest and activities is regarded as the nursery ground for the perfection of her culture of militarism and belligerence that was to be seen during the World Wars. Mihran Dabag comments,

Eine zunehmende Militarisierung des Deutschen Kaiserreichs war gerade im Ausland diskutiert und kritisch beobachtet worden. Dabei haben jüngere Studien aus dem Bereich der Militärgeschichte deutlich gemacht, daß die ‚Militarisierung‘ um die Jahrhundertwende vor allem aus der Entwicklung einer neuen Stellung des Militärs innerhalb der Gesellschaften erklärt werden kann: das Militär rückte in die Mitte der Gesellschaft, als zentrale Basis im Frieden und Krieg, als Verkörperung von Identität, Einheit, Stärke und Stolz der Nation. Mit dem Militär rückt aber auch der Krieg selbst in den Horizont der Handlungsmöglichkeiten für die Zukunft der Nation – und es ist diese Entwicklung, vor der die rückhaltlose Vernichtung der Herero und Nama gelesen werden muß.⁸

Having lost the two Wars, any reminiscence of the colonial era became a reminiscence of the humiliations of the Wars. So, the efforts made to suppress the realities of the embarrassing past affected the colonial discourse. After all, they belong to the same chain of continuity. The loss of the colonies was to Germany like the loss of nationhood, since

⁷ Friedrichsmeyer et al., introduction, p. 3.

⁸ Mihran Dabag, “National-Koloniale Konstruktionen in politischen Entwürfen des Deutschen um 1900,” *Kolonialismus, Kolonialdiskurs und Genozid*, eds. Mihran Dabag, Horst Grunder and Uwe-Ketelsen (München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2004) 51-52. Print.

the acquisition of colonies was marketed as an evidence of national vibrancy, greatness and continuity. This *Haltung* was most clearly articulated by Heinrich von Treitschke,

Alle großen Völker der Geschichte haben, wenn sie stark geworden waren, den Drang gefühlt, Barbarenländern den Stempel ihres Wesens aufzudrücken. Und heute sehen wir die Völker Europas drauf und dran, weit über den Erdkreis eine Massenaristokratie der weißen Rasse zu schaffen. Wer bei diesem gewaltigen Wettkampf nicht mitwirkt, wird später einmal eine klägliche Rolle spielen. Es ist daher eine Lebensfrage für eine große Nation heute, kolonialen Drang zu zeigen.⁹

Against such a mindset, the loss of their colonies translated into a return to political mediocrity relative to other European nations, and to the threat of suffocating in Germany's '*ohne Raum*' (to use Hans Grimm's term).

Fourth, after the war, the monitoring French troops in the Rhine region had black soldiers among them. This was a great humiliation to the racial and national ego of Germans, whose scientists and philosophers had been preaching, among other things, the inferiority of the Black race to the White race, and the Blacks being human-animal hybrids – humanoids, and thus uneducable.¹⁰ So, for Blacks to be in Germany as respectable soldiers on equal status with white soldiers, exercising control over Germans, and having affairs with German women, was a bitter pill for Germans to swallow.¹¹ So, it was more convenient to keep quiet on the colonial enterprise as a strategy of leaving the "Rhine Question" buried.

⁹ Heinrich von Treitschke, „Politik: Vorlesungen gehalten an der Universität zu Berlin, Leipzig 1899“ Erster Band, p. 121. Print.

¹⁰ Knellwolf, p. 23.

¹¹ Camp, Tina, Pascal Grosse, and Yara-Colette Lemke-Muniz de Faria, “Blacks, Germans, and the Politics of Imperial Imagination, 1920-60,” Friedrichsmeyer et al., 205-229.

The whole episode of colonialism became an embarrassment for Germany, and, as argued by Berman, there was a conscious effort to eliminate it from Germany's historiography,

Im Allgemeinen aber haben Deutschlandhistoriker das Thema vermieden. In *A concise History of Germany* von Mary Fulbrook . . . taucht die Kolonialgeschichte gar nicht auf. Auch der viel detailliertere und umfangreichere Band *Germany 1866—1945* von Gordon Craig gibt nur wenige Hinweise auf die *Deutsche Kolonialgesellschaft* und den *Kolonialverein* als Teil der wilhelminischen politischen Landschaft, ignoriert jedoch ansonsten den deutschen Kolonialismus; im Register sucht man vergeblich nach Hereros, Togo oder China.¹²

As Konstanze Streese argues, „In der Literatur der Bundesrepublik sind Arbeiten, die explizit an die Wunde Kolonialismus oder an die Situation der ‚Dritten Welt‘ rühren, keineswegs eine durchgängige Erscheinung.“¹³

Lora Wildenthal identifies the “repression of [the colonial] past” as the basis for Germany's belief in a “Germandom” which has escaped the contaminating contact with Africans, Asians and Pacific Islanders.¹⁴ Pascal Grosse identifies a conscious effort among Germans to dismiss issues of Germany's colonialism as a mere temporal interlude in the historiography of Germany,

Whereas National Socialism has been the historical watershed for Germany's collective memory and political culture ever since 1945, until the last decade, with few significant exceptions, German historiography tended to dismiss German colonialism as an ephemeral phenomenon with little or no residual meaning for German society and culture.¹⁵

¹² Berman, 2003, p. 19.

¹³ Streese, p. 14.

¹⁴ Lora Wildenthal, “Race, Gender and Citizenship in the German Colonial Empire,” *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*, eds. Frederick Cooper and Ann Stoler (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997) 281. Print.

¹⁵ Pascal Grosse, “What Does German Colonialism Have to Do with National Socialism?” Ames et al., p. 116. Print.

A fifth factor was the immensity of the shock of the Nazi regime on the global society. The legacy of National Socialism was a great embarrassment to the whole world, and Europe especially. There was a desperate effort to recover from or walk away from it, and this prompted silence and “intentional forgetting”¹⁶ in some quarters. Linked with the silence on the Nazi regime was also the silence about Germany’s colonial involvement, which could easily be factored into the logistical constellation that produced the Holocaust. Friedrichsmeyer et al., discussing the reason why Germany’s colonial past did not receive early attention, link Nazism to Germany’s colonialism, “The German focus on the Holocaust as the central and unavoidable fact of German history may also have occluded Germans’ view of European colonialism and their own complicity as Europeans in it. To be sure, various traditions of German thought insist on connections between colonialism and National Socialism.”¹⁷

The sixth factor was the extent to which the atrocities of WWII dominated the stage of academic discussions. The monstrosity of the Nazi atrocities generated a great challenge for scholars who struggled to investigate, research and document it from every dimension possible – historical, literary, philosophical, psychological, socio-cultural and more. Dealing with the whole scenario of the war and its attendant realities engaged the world for so long that other issues about Germany, including her colonial past, receded to the background.¹⁸ So, while this continued, the memory of Germany’s colonial involvement continued to fade away among the older generation that experienced or witnessed it, but who would rather forget it happened. At the same time, the younger

¹⁶ See Definition of Terms.

¹⁷ Friedrichsmeyer et al., p. 4.

¹⁸ See Streese, p. 14.

generation of Germans was not being informed about it. There emerged as a result a chasm in the historiography of Germany.

In his work, “The Talk of Genocide and the Rhetoric of Miscegenation,” Helmut Walser Smith complains about how they (accounts of the Herero/Nama Genocide) are “inexplicably absent from mainstream accounts of the *Kaiserreich*, both those written from a critical perspective as well as those written in a tone more empathetic with the past, or, to be more precise, with Germans of the past.”¹⁹ The Herero/Nama episode is a very significant subject in Germany’s colonial discourse, and in the *Kaiserreich*. So, its absence from the account, as observed by Smith, is explicable only within the frame of a general silence over Germany’s colonial past.

The above reasons constituted a wall around Germany’s colonial past until the advent of postcolonialism scholarship, which generated interest in that field. Cindy K. Renker states, “The theory of post-colonialism has become more influential over the past twenty years. German colonial literature, which had been ignored and forgotten, had also gained new momentum in the two decades providing its readers and critics with a new understanding of Germany’s colonial attitude and politics.”²⁰ As Streese informs, with the publication of Franz Fanon’s *The Wretched of the Earth* (1963) in German, German academics in the social sciences assumed contestatory position towards the effort to suppress Germany’s colonial history.²¹

¹⁹ Helmut Walser Smith, “The Talk of Genocide, the Rhetoric of Miscegenation: Notes on Debates in the German Reichstag Concerning Southwest Africa, 1904-14,” Friedrichsmeyer et al., p. 107. Print.

²⁰ Renker, p. 69.

²¹ Streese, p. 68.

In any case, Germany's involvement is no more questionable. Even though no African nation speaks German as a national or official language, there still remain some relics of Germany's presence in their former colonies. This is most evident in Namibia, which was an *Ackerbau-Colonie* designate.²²

The quest to recover, highlight and deal with Germany's immediate historical past after WWII came as a protest movement in 1968 by a postwar generation of German students – the 1968 Students' Movement. The protests and agitation of this group led to excavations in the “cemetery of history” which the older generation of Germans had created for the nation's ugly past – colonialism and National Socialism. As Lützeler communicates,

Während der Zeit der Studentenbewegung, als die neue Generation die Verbrechen des Nationalsozialismus und seine Folgen in der jüngsten deutschen Geschichte nicht mehr verdrängte, sondern zum wichtigsten Thema ihrer Gesellschaftskritik machte, fing man an, diese Zusammenhänge (zwischen dem Kolonialismus der Bismarck-Ära und dem kolonialistischen Projekte Hitlers) zu erkennen.²³

Out of the Students' Movement emerged „was man . . . das postkoloniale Projekt nennen wird und ein Gespür für neo-kolonialistische Zwänge im Verhältnis zwischen Dritter und Erster Welt.“²⁴

The discourse of Germany's colonial activities in the periphery offers a broad and undulating literary topography, even though historically speaking, it is temporally insignificant and evidently inconsistent in comparison to the rich records of other

²² See Steinmetz and Hell, p. 147-183.

²³ See Lützeler (2005), p. 98.

²⁴ Lützeler (1997), p. 99.

European nations. Although Germans had many years as colonial dreamers and armchair conquistador²⁵ than actual colonial powers, it was the fantasies of more than a century that constituted the pedestal for the actual launching of her colonial enterprise in the 19th century. Susanne Zantop delineates Germany's colonial discourse from its inception,

Throughout the debates about the need or drive for colonies and Germany's 'colonial mission,' the myths and fantasies . . . played a major role. They formed the cultural residue from which colonialists could fabricate their arguments, or to which they would resort in their appeals for support. The impact these fantasies had had on the German subconscious was recognized by colonial propagandists such as von Philippovich, who in 1887 called on Germans to prove their superiority as men of action, after centuries of dreaming.²⁶

Germans had been involved in periphery activities almost for as long as other European nations have been, if not for longer. Lützelers traces Germany's periphery activities back to the Middle Ages, arguing that the wars and conquests of Charles the Great were colonial,

Wo immer sich den Deutschen eine Gelegenheit bot, beteiligten sie sich an kolonialen Projekten. Im Mittelalter waren es vor allem die Deutschen, die kolonialistisch tätig waren: von Karl dem Großen bis Karl IV. reicht die jahrhundertelange Geschichte der Eroberung und Kolonisation jener slavischen Gebiete, die man später den deutschen Osten . . . bzw. Österreich nannte.²⁷

Historically speaking, the age of discovery was a period regarded as the subtle beginning of what metamorphosed into imperialism. Although the activities of the early adventurers in the periphery was not necessarily classified as colonialism in the sense that the concept emerged in the 18th century, such activities have been deemed colonial by some scholars, and Germans have always been there.

²⁵ Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 17.

²⁶ Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 193.

²⁷ Lützeler (1998), p. 23.

Heinrich von Treitschke states that the “eastward expansion of the Teutonic knights in the thirteenth century” was the earliest manifestation of Germany’s colonial destiny.²⁸ If imperialism is regarded as a neatly packaged and outfitted econo-political phenomenon in the 19th century, as “temporality” and “intentionality” theories maintain, then the activities of Germans described above would not qualify as colonization.²⁹ However, when the activities are evaluated in juxtaposition with the acts that characterize colonization, such as forceful imposition of self in the space of another group, disenfranchisement of the group, appropriation of the resources of the group to oneself, wielding power and authority over the group without their consent, they qualify as initial stages of colonialism. While some scholars have tried to exploit the absence of certain conditions to declare earlier European interactions with periphery peoples as non-colonialist, I maintain, as I have argued in an earlier paper,³⁰ that colonialism emerges from the acts and conditions that are prevalent in inter-group interactions, and does not dissolve following the absence of any of such acts or conditions. It is not codification or definition, but rather acts and experiences out of which colonization emerges.

Further from the activities of German individuals and groups in the periphery, which, in this project, are regarded as colonizing activities, the premier act of territorial acquisition in Africa was undertaken by the Great Elector of Brandenburg-Prussia, who, by the late 17th century, had established a few trading forts in Africa - Großfriedrichsburg

²⁸ Treitschke, p. 13.

²⁹ See definition of terms.

³⁰ Uche Onyedi Okafor, “Aggressivity and Oppressiveness in Germany’s Colonial Enterprise in Africa: An Action or a Reaction.” 2007. Typescript. Department of Germanic Studies, University of Maryland, College Park. 22-23.

in the Gold Coast (1683–1718),³¹ Arguin in Mauritania (1685–1721), and Whydah in Benin (ca. 1700). Germans also had colonial holdings in the Americas, Saint Thomas by lease from a Danish company (1685–1720), Island of Crabs by annexation (1689–1693), Tertholen by occupation (1696).

However, because of a weak political, economic and resource base, these early efforts did not last. The Great Elector of Brandenburg-Prussia favored the internal restructuring of the state to sustain her emerging status as a dominant power in the German confederacy over possessing overseas territories.³² In any case, the sale of these territories did not bring the periphery activities of Germans to an end, instead, as Steinmetz and Hell communicate, “Individual Germans sailed with Russian vessels of imperial exploration in the Pacific or enlisted with the Dutch East Indies Company. German missionaries worked in the colonies of other European powers: Cape Colony, Hong Kong, India.”³³

Zantop discusses other German colonial activities in the Americas,

Indeed, the ‘New World’ had offered Germans their first opportunity at overseas colonization when Charles V. granted the Welser merchant company the right to appropriate and explore vast territories on the South American continent, in what is now Venezuela and parts of Colombia. This first attempt at establishing a German colony was ill fated and badly executed: the Welsers were deprived of their possessions after long court battles in which they were charged with mismanaging finances and committing atrocities. The failed venture became, however, a kind of colonial primal scene, an *Urerlebnis*, that would haunt generations to come.³⁴

³¹ Friedrichsmeyer et al., p. 9.

³² Steinmetz and Hell, p. 148.

³³ Steinmetz and Hell, p. 148.

³⁴ Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 12.

There was not much that Germans could have done at this time due to the lack of a cohesive and significant national identity. Existing as a political appendage of the Holy Roman Empire, with numerous autonomous states, it was impossible to muster the energy required to operate a colony successfully. Inge Stephan comments,

Die Reichsgewalt des Heiligen Römischen Reiches Deutscher Nation . . . lag zwar bis zum Jahr 1806 beim deutschen Kaiser, sie war aber auf ganz wenige Rechte beschränkt und hatte eine mehr symbolische Bedeutung. Die wichtigen politischen Entscheidungen lagen bei den einzelnen Territorialstaaten, die ihre Gesetzgebung, Gerichtsbarkeit, Landesverteidigung, Polizeigewalt . . . usw. unabhängig von der Reichsgewalt ausübten.³⁵

The prevalent socio-political structure in Germany then has been described as unfit to support any reasonable economic program, “In the late eighteenth century, when France and England were amassing their colonial empires, there were no similar ventures in German-speaking lands, in part because their ‘particularist’ forms of government offered no political or economic base for large-scale overseas acquisitions.”³⁶ Apart from the *Zersplitterung*, the Princes and the Kaiser, as Streese observed, were constantly engulfed in internal wrangling over power and religious issues.³⁷ However, although Germany’s involvements were through individual or group undertakings, they were no less colonial. It was these participatory activities and the literary and non-literary texts that they generated that held the colonialist “tradition” of Germans aglow until the 19th century when, under new aegis, the agitation for colonies began. Coincidentally, periphery literatures started to emerge at a time when, as Tipton states, “the reading

³⁵ Inge Stephan, „Aufklärung,“ *Deutsche Literaturgeschichte*, eds. Beutin et al., p. 148.

³⁶ Friedrichsmeyer et al., p. 9.

³⁷ Streese, p. 31.

public was expanding steadily, continuing a development that had begun in the late eighteenth century.”³⁸

Considering the absence of national consciousness and identity, there was no platform for Germans involved in periphery activities to pursue any dream of a German colony. It could then be argued that the founding of the Reich was both an impetus to as well as partly a response to an underlying desire for periphery colonialism. The founding of the German nation was an undeniable evidence of military prowess and national greatness, and the acquisition of periphery colonies emerged as contiguous to this national posture.³⁹ As Zantop puts it,

The shift of focus to an aggressive expansionism legitimized by past abstention characterizes the German colonial movement of the 1870s and 80s. The foundation of the empire in 1871 not only crowns the unifying nationalist effort, it also marks the beginning of concerted colonialist activity on many fronts. . . . Now, the presence of a strong national leadership in Berlin provided at least the preconditions, if not the will, for catching up with the European neighbors in the matter of territorial expansion.⁴⁰

The nostalgia over the lost territories (Großfriedrichsburg and Venezuela), as Zantop observes, occasioned the assumption of the position of observers and judges over the activities of other nations,⁴¹ and by constantly monitoring, analyzing and classifying the colonial activities and images of other European nations, Germany’s own colonial image and projected colonialism emerged, though in abstraction.⁴² It could be argued that Germany’s colonial fantasies, policies, principles and practices were not developed out of

³⁸ Frank B. Tipton, *A History of Modern Germany Since 1815* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003) 47. Print.

³⁹ See Pesek, p. 164.

⁴⁰ Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 192.

⁴¹ Friedrichsmeyer et al., p. 20.

⁴² Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 6.

a consciously crafted legislative procedure within Germany, but rather out of a negative interpretation of the colonial image and activities of other European nations. In reality, Germans developed what I term a “bounce-off” colonial image. They picked up the “dirty” image of the other nations, dusted and polished it and created their own image out of it, insuring that the derived image, which is now German, reflects something directly opposite to the original image. As Zantop remarks,

Like other German observers of his time, Herder overlooks the cruelties committed by the ‘animales alemanes,’ the German animals, in the sixteenth century . . . focusing instead on the moral depravity of the other European colonial powers. By insisting on German industry and private virtues, by criticizing above all the crimes committed by others, Herder unwittingly creates a separate role for morally superior Germans whose lack of aggressive nationhood becomes a virtue in and of itself.⁴³

The arguable implication of the “bounce-off” image is the possibility of Germans not being necessarily better than other nations, but simply exploiting their trumpeted colonial evils to arrogate a “better than thou” status to themselves. Hertz, discussing Ernst Moritz Arndt’s characterization of the typical German, states,

Arndt assumes that every nation has its own special character and is distinguished primarily by its language. . . . Arndt describes the German spirit in the words: Industry, frugality, sobriety of understanding, slowness without cowardice, honesty mixed with a little climatic awkwardness. . . . Simplicity, loyalty, love and truth – that is their character . . . strength, manliness, bravery, honesty, piety, integrity and friendliness.⁴⁴

It is necessary to note that this characterization came at a time when agitation for nationhood was gaining great momentum. The emphasis on “Germanness” at this time was a continuation of the effort to generate a socio-cultural commonality that the German

⁴³ Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 96.

⁴⁴ Hertz, p. 30.

people could aspire to. Scholars such as Natalya Baldyga, have argued that, in his *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* (1767-1769), Lessing had the vision of creating a cultural path for a non-existent national Germany as a strategy for engineering a German cultural portrait. The vision, as the argument continues, was that, as the people would begin to orient themselves along the lines of set cultural and behavioral patterns, a socio-cultural uniformity would gradually and unconsciously emerge that could serve as a reference for the classification of the German people as a collective group.⁴⁵ So, at this stage of the discourse of “Germanness,” the people have been able to develop and more or less subscribe to some individual and group character traits that could now be accepted and associated with the concept of a “true” German. As Geoff Howard Eley argues, “In this second sense – the formation of nationalist ideology – the German nation was conceived in the minds of intellectuals and realized in a political movement.”⁴⁶

One issue of note in Germany’s pursuit of a socio-cultural collectiveness and commonality, which would eventually lead to political unity, is that the project was established on a contestatory platform. Always engaged in a protest or aggression against an “other,” there was always the strong drive to instigate the sentiment of being collectively victimized, subjugated or threatened by an identified “other.” The envisioned result was to stir up a collective determination to resist or eliminate the threat – real or imaginary – posed by the “other.” The belief among the agitators was that the collectiveness that would eliminate the threat, will definitely lead to the emergence of a

⁴⁵ Natalya Baldyga, “Political Bodies and Bodies Politic: Cultural Identity in G.E. Lessing’s *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*,” *Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation* 43.3 (200): 257. Print.

⁴⁶ Geoff Howard Eley, *From Unification to Nazism. Reinterpreting the German Past* (Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1986) 72.

strong and vibrant nation. This position proved right in 1871 as Germany emerged as a unified nation out of the successful war against France. Germany never gave up this strategy of creating enemies, imaginary or real, as a means of enlisting the unreserved loyalty and support of the citizenry. This was evident, as Eley states, in the handling of crises in her colonies.⁴⁷

The pursuit of collectiveness was also integrated in the literatures that thematize German colonial desires. An example of such works is August von Kotzebue's *Die Sonnen-Jungfrau* (1779) which, as discussed by Zantop, among other things, has the aim of promoting spectatorial and arbitrating collectiveness among Germans in a time when political and socio-cultural particularism stood as a hindrance to periphery colonial activities.⁴⁸ As the unfitness of other European nations as colonizers was played out before Germans, they collectively saw and believed themselves as would-be-better colonizers than the rest.⁴⁹

It should be noted that the development of a national consciousness on the political front, and the effort to develop a German national character brought with it the tendency to establish borders. The definition of "German" politically, culturally and racially from a nationalistic perspective presupposed the establishment of strong demarcatory parameters. Tipton comments on the popular agitations that were going on in Germany at the time, and how they received valency from the common targeting of specific groups,

⁴⁷ See Eley, p. 68.

⁴⁸ See Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 127.

⁴⁹ See Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 127.

They yearned, but they were not really sure what for. They opposed the conservative reaction, and they opposed French domination. They sought reform and purification, but they also rejected universalist Enlightenment values and celebrated inherited “historical” traditions seen as typical of the German *Volk*. . . . For some this became a celebration of German ‘blood,’ an explicit religious and ethnic chauvinism directed against Catholics and Jews.⁵⁰

The effect of this was the fencing out of groups who had heretofore considered themselves German, but who were nevertheless considered marginal by the socio-political system. Poles and Jews constituted the bulk of the marginal in the configuration of the term “German.” Out of the desire to deal with the marginal emerged the term “The Jewish question” and “The Polish question.”

Although over the years, legislative procedures and agitation from progressive elites have been advocating for the integration of Jews into the mainstream German society, the project was again under threat from the new fervor of nationalist consciousness following the founding of the German Reich. After the founding of the Reich, anti-Semitism assumed a more institutionalized status and became a factor in German politics.⁵¹

Generating the “Model Colonizer” Mentality

Susanne Zantop’s groundbreaking work, *Colonial Fantasies* (1997) dominates the discussion on Germany’s colonial past, more especially, at the conceptual phase. Zantop coined the expression “colonial fantasies” from the evaluation of Germany’s attitudes towards colonialism prior to practical involvement. It stretches from the abstinence position, from which Germans considered and condemned colonizer nations as evil,

⁵⁰ Tipton, p. 55.

⁵¹ Hertz, p. 359.

through the time of self-imagining as the salt that would “salten” the rest of the world. Streese comments on this attitude of Germans, „Die Idee, eine Großmacht zu sein . . . und die gigantomanische Phantasie, ‚am deutschen Wesen könne die Welt genesen‘ . . . ermöglichten auf ideologischer Ebene, dem Kolonialismus für das Deutsche Reich Entlastungsfunktion zuzuschreiben.“⁵²

Germany’s colonial fantasy of racial enhancement was set on course by the early German Diaspora in Africa. Most of these men, who emerged as imperial patriarchs, married native women, and had *Mischlinge* with them. They viewed miscegenation as an effective strategy of furthering German rule among Africans. Wildenthal presents an argument made to the Foreign Office by Carl Büttner, a colonial missionary, “As Germans’ in-laws, Africans would ‘feel secure and happy as genuine subjects and denizens of the German Empire.’ The children of such marriages would be good workers [. . .] consider themselves white, use the German language, and consume German-made products [. . .] intermarriage would aid German rule by strengthening the ties between colonizer and colonized.”⁵³ As German colonialism was formally launched in 1884, the philosophy of miscegenation was challenged by the discourse of racial purity and preservation, and this led to racial parallelism in the end.

The action of the imperial patriarchs and the difference that exists between them and the formal colonists generates the platform for me to identify two kinds of fantasies in Germany’s periphery discourse. The one I term “paradisaic” fantasy, and the other

⁵² Streese, p. 35.

⁵³ Lora Wildenthal, *German Women for Empire, 1884-1945* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2001) 86. Print.

fanatical fantasy. The first kind of fantasy I associate with the earlier act of projecting the periphery as a paradise in contrast with Europe. It was a fantasy associated with the bliss of freedom, naturalness, and the opportunity for self-expression, application and determination. Although colonialism is inherent in it, it was a form of going in, identifying with, and becoming a part of the space and people of the periphery. Reusch states,

Through the literary consumption and hermeneutic reception of the poetic as well as the historical figure of the noble savage as an aesthetic experience, the reading public was able to escape traumatic circumstances through the ‘entry into another world beyond every-day-reality,’ one created through the syncretic synthesis of fact, fiction, and imagination.⁵⁴

It was this fantasy that privileged miscegenation between the colonizers and the colonized. According to literatures, Germany’s imperial patriarchs, who followed pursued their paradisaic fantasies, practiced miscegenation in German Southwest Africa and East Africa successfully. As Wildenthal states,

The residency of the ‘imperial patriarchs’ in the German colonies often dated from precolonial and early colonial years. They acquired their land, cattle, or trading connections before such wealth became scarce and regulated, often through marriage to women from locally prominent indigenous families. These German men usually spoke a local lingua franca, such as English, Pidgin, Swahili or Afrikaans . . . and they applied local agricultural or commercial methods.⁵⁵

The second kind of fantasy, fanatical fantasy, I associate with the patriotic fervency that developed in the second half of the 19th century and transposed to the periphery. This is the fantasy generated by the belief that Germany would achieve greatness only through periphery colonialism. This fantasy considered neither the

⁵⁴ Reusch, p. 100.

⁵⁵ Wildenthal (2001), p. 80.

integration nor identification with periphery space and people as a component of the *Begegnungen*. Rather, its aim is subjugation, dominance, and exploitation.

The fantasy nevertheless expected that the periphery natives would welcome the German colonists, and willingly submit their sovereignty to them, and the German colonists, on the other hand, will work towards elevating the native peoples to the level of cultured humanness through *Arbeitskultur*. Fanatical fantasy, however, did not rule out the possibility of violence and confrontations with the natives or other European nations. However, the fantasy does not recognize these as obstacles that could constitute a major hindrance to Germany's global ambitions. Fabri's downplaying of the British threat to Germany's colonial ambition is a perfect example of this fantasy, which was also rife among periphery colonialism enthusiasts.⁵⁶

Germany's colonial discourse predominates more in fantastic abstractions than in historical reality. While the duration of her periphery colonial involvement is less than one hundred years altogether (Weslers in Venezuela 1528-55, Großfriedrichsburg 1683-1717, modern 1884-1919), periphery colonialism was present in her literature for more than two centuries. As already pointed out, the centuries of armchair colonialism, approvingly clichéd "Colonial Fantasy" by Zantop, prepared the ground for practical colonialism that would last little more than three decades. Zantop comments on the persistence of colonial fantasies even after WWI,

The colonial fantasies did not only persist during Germany's brief colonial period; they outlasted it. Even after the nation had lost its colonial possessions in 1919, the myth of Germans' exceptional ability to establish a *Heimat* abroad, in paternal alliance with grateful 'natives', was

⁵⁶ See Fabri, p 57-58.

alive and well. . . . Like no other people, the Germans are predestined to colonize, the Nazi mythmakers maintain, and ‘the colonies are waiting.’⁵⁷

The concept of goodness has been made to seem so German that the only bad German is the one who mixed with the British or Spanish and got corrupted. Daniel J. Walther, citing a case of homosexuality involving a German in the colony, attributes such “moral flaw” to the German’s interaction with “questionable Englishmen.”⁵⁸ In Daniel’s own words, “One judge even noted that Jochen (the accused homosexual) had been influenced by English traders.”⁵⁹ The national differentiation that Jochen’s trial highlights suggests that the bad German is bad because he has come into contact with the bad “other.”

With a Germano-centric mentality of the “other” being a corrupting and defiling influence on the “good” German, a parallel co-existence of natives and Germans (separation of races) appears to be a characteristic component of Germany’s approach to relations with the “other.” The gist of miscegenation and “familial” relationship, stories of sexual conquest and surrender, love and blissful domestic relations between colonizer and colonized, set in colonial territory, stories that made the strange familiar, and the familiar “familial,” is thus truncated.⁶⁰

Yes, it may have been argued, as Berman observes, that Germans had a heterophilic attitude towards other cultures and peoples.⁶¹ However, on what practical or

⁵⁷ Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 200.

⁵⁸ Daniel J. Walther, “Racializing sex: same-sex relations, German colonial Authority, and Deutschtum,” *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 17.1 (2008): 16. Print.

⁵⁹ Walther, p. 23.

⁶⁰ Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 2.

⁶¹ Berman (1998), p. 235.

realistic evidence is this heterophilia based? Many alterity encounters in Germany's historiography present evidence of heterophobia. The "Jewish Question," the "Polish Question," the "Slavic Question." All these "questions," which reflect national concerns, emerged on the various stages where Germans encountered alterity, and these "questions" contained considerations on how to rid the Germans of the presence of alterity. It is, therefore, not a surprise that, after WWI there emerged the "Rhein Question" oriented towards dealing with the presence of Blacks and *Mischlinge* in Germany.

The discussion on Germany's periphery colonialism has shifted from whether they participated to how they participated. Within the spectrum of "how," three major discursive phases emerge – the fantasy phase, the reality phase, and the postcolonial phase. Inasmuch as these three major phases have been discussed by various scholars, the concept of dilemma has not been identified and discussed as a significant factor in Germany's colonial legacy. The concept of dilemma, as I conceive it, is generated by the copulation of fantasy and reality. I see dilemma as the force that generated the richness of Germany's colonial discourse, and as the fulcrum that sustains its multi-dimensionality.

On the platform of reality, Germany's humane considerations, her nationalist orientation, her militaristic appetite, and her desire for periphery colonies, are more or less a constellation that would hardly strike a chord of compatibility. In a situation where all these projections fail to harmonize with each other, what options were open to Germany? Considering the fact that most of the periphery had been charted by other nations, one begins to wonder how Germany would handle any resistance from other European nations or the natives. Would Germany return to the drawing board to refine her approach towards periphery colonialism? Would she redesign her periphery

ambitions to accommodate the reality of having to contend with rival nations and natives? Would she try to drive her colonial machine forward ready to crush any opposition that may arise? This scenario generates a state of dilemma, and how Germany handled the situation is part of the subject of this project.

Chapter Three

German Intellectualism and the Fantasy of “Humane/Model” Colonialism

Intellectualism, which is a key component of Germany’s historiography, and how it touches on other aspects of history has been discussed extensively by scholars such as Frederick Hertz (*German Public Mind in the Nineteenth Century*, 1974), Andrew Zimmerman (*Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany*, 2001), Russell Berman (*Enlightenment or Empire*, 1998), and Hans J. Hahn (*German Thought and Culture*, 1995). According to research, nationalist issues, economic wellbeing, collective identity of Germanness, periphery activities, and other concerns found expression through the intellectual activities of the time.¹ It has been argued that Germans intended their intellectual activities for the enrichment of knowledge and for the wellbeing of humanity in general.² This could mean that German intellectualism was not considered an instrument for racio-cultural differentiation and subjugation.

This view is referenced in Bülow’s novel *Im Lande der Verheißung* (1899) as Dr. Krome and Maleen discuss missionary Beta’s ethnographic collections, which were not being put to any use. Maleen refers to him, sarcastically though, as a true German, “Ein echter Deutscher. . . . Ich liebe das Wagnersche Wort: ‚Deutsch sein heißt: eine Sache um ihrer selbst willen tun.‘ Nie ist uns ein schöneres Lob erteilt worden“ (36). Konsul Krome interjects, „Damit wäre aber gesagt, daß wir keine Politiker seien, und keine Menschen von weitausschauendem Blick und fernen Zielen. Wenn Wagner Recht hat mit seinem Ausspruch, so kann ich mich nicht unter die ‚echten‘ Deutschen zählen“ (36). Dr.

¹ See Hans J. Hahn, *German Thought and Culture. From the Holy Roman Empire to the present Day* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995) 110. Print.

² Hertz, p. 29.

Beta, thus, epitomizes the German practice of uninstrumentalized intellectualism. However, to Krome and Maleen, he belongs to the old school sitting on a treasure that could be turned into an asset for colonial enterprise.

As a result of Germany's renown in intellectual activities, Germans were usually involved in the periphery voyages of other European nations for expert investigations. One of such voyages was Johann Reinhold Forster's participation in Captain Cook's voyage to the South Seas, which generated Reinhold Forster's *Observations* (1778). In the course of time Germans were no more satisfied with being just the researchers for the rest of Europe. They wanted to benefit from the fruit of their labor by participating in periphery enterprise as a nation. Germany's fantasy of a "model/humane" colonialism, the practical implication of which was colonialism established on the tenets of a humane relationship with the colonized,³ found an elaborate expression in Campe's *Text Robinson der Jüngere* (1779).

In this chapter, using Reinhold Forster's and Campe's texts, I will seek to establish if, and how both texts can be read as an ideological and philosophical basis for Germany's colonial projections. I will also engage German intellectualism to establish whether or not it was instrumentalized for colonial purposes, and if so, how. This chapter will be in two sections. Section one will focus on Reinhold Forster's text, while section two will discuss Campe's text.

³ See Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 2.

Section i. Conceptualizing “Human/Model” Colonialism (Johann Reinhold Forster’s *Observations*, 1778)

In 1879, Friedrich Fabri, one of Germany’s colonial propagandists stated,

Man hat die Gegenwart wohl auch ein Zeitalter der Reisen und geographischen Studien genannt. In diesen Stücken sind wir Deutschen in letzter Zeit denn auch wacker an der Arbeit. In allen Welttheilen sind Landsleute auf wissenschaftlichen Forschungsreisen thätig. Die Zahl unserer meist recht züchtigen geographischen Zeitschriften, wie unserer geographischen Gesellschaften ist in stetem Wachsen; der Sinn für geographische, ethnographische und anthropologische Studien ist durch wissenschaftliche Forschung und populäre illustrierte Darstellungen kräftig geweckt und heute ungleich weiter, als in früheren Jahrzehnten, unter uns verbreitet. Das ist gewiß erfreulich. Aber sollen wir auch in diesen Gebieten nur die für alle Welt sammelnden und forschenden Theoretiker sein und bleiben? Sollen wir fortwährend von der Studirstube aus in allen Welttheilen wohl zu Hause sein, ohne irgendwo in überseeischen Gebieten ein nationales Heim wiederzufinden? Ist das eine Lage, die, wir wollen nicht sagen, mit unserer nationalen Ehre, sondern mit dringenden nationalen Bedürfnissen sich auf die Dauer verträgt?⁴

With this statement Fabri not only invokes anew the foundational developments that inspired Germany’s colonial appetite – *Reisen und geographischen Studien . . . geographische, ethnographische und anthropologische Studien . . . wissenschaftliche Forschung* (periphery activities) – but also presents the argument that makes colonial enterprise mandatory – *nationale Ehre . . . dringende nationale Bedürfnisse* (situation at home). Although, as pointed out earlier, Germany had been involved in colonialism, her 19th century renewed quest for colonies was partially founded on information from periphery research and earlier travelogues. Johann Reinhold Forster’s *Observations* (1778) is a typical example of documents that provided a wealth of information about the South Sea periphery.

⁴ Fabri (1879), p. 11.

Advocacy for Colonization

From the very first page of the text, Reinhold Forster makes a declaration that references one of the background factors behind imperialism – territories for settlement. Reinhold Forster sees the settlement needs of European nations provided for in the South Pacific region,

It must be allowed, that New-Holland is at present the most backward of all the lands called Continent, in point of population, and utility to Europe; but this objection is of little weight, since it may perhaps, in future ages, become as populous as any of the other continents, and equally useful; as I believe it to be very likely to supply the wants of European colonies. (23)

Seeing the wealth with which the region was endowed, Reinhold Forster considers it suitable for European migration,

These would invite European settlers; especially such as would be willing to withdraw themselves from the oppressions of growing despotism in Europe. To such sons of liberty this continent [South Pacific] would offer a new and happy asylum: by which means it might become the seat of sciences and arts, happy in its cultivation, the riches of its productions, and the number of its inhabitants. (24)

Looking at the socio-political situations in Europe, and Germany in particular, citizens, more so, from the lower rung of the social strata, were living under suffocating conditions, seeking a place of refuge and freedom.⁵ The (e)states controlled every aspect of the life of the citizenry. As Richard van Dülmen informs, “Nobody was able to choose their estate; they were born into it. This fact controlled both private and professional lives. Individual needs were subordinated to collective norms. The estates were not professional organizations: they were lifelong communities controlling every aspect of

⁵ See Reusch, p. 95, 108.

religious, family and economic life.”⁶ Reinhold Forster’s statement above suggests an alternative to the European society, and people responded to Reinhold Forster’s advocacy. The response (undertaking voyages to the periphery) was the subtle beginning of Germany’s colonial involvement.⁷

It is necessary to point out here that the initial desire for escape to the periphery among Germans was spurred simply by the search for asylum space. While this does not remove the colonizing dimension from it, it is different from the conscious drive for periphery territories for the fatherland. As Reusch states in his study, “The South Pacific island thus was seen as a viable alternative and exchange for the corrupted Germany. This corruption was perceived not only as synonymous with the effects of civilization on the natural environment, but also with the social hierarchies that economically and physically enslaved entire populations.”⁸ So, the earlier emigrants from Germany were asylum seekers. It was the persecution of these earlier emigrants by other colonizing European nations,⁹ and the danger of the emigrants dissolving in the multi-national pool of the Americas dominated by the British and the French,¹⁰ that prompted the agitation for *Ackerbau-Colonien* (proposed by Fabri in the 19th century). The *Ackerbau-Colonien* were to become a colonial territories, where German emigration could be channeled to facilitate their preservation of their *Deutschtum*.

⁶ Richard van Dülmen, introduction, *The Society of the Enlightenment. The Rise of the Middle Class and Enlightenment Culture in Germany*, trans. Anthony Williams (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1992) 7. Print.

⁷ See Streese, p. 33-34.

⁸ Reusch, p. 95.

⁹ Mary Evelyn Townsend, *Origin of Modern German Colonialism 1875 – 1885* (New York: Howard Fertig, 1974) 57. Print.

¹⁰ See Fabri, *Bedarf Deutschland der Colonien?* (1879)

Reinhold Forster's discussion of the population is another indication of his advocacy for colonization. He describes boundless masses of lands lavishly adorned and enriched by nature. He presents the elements of nature very romantically so that one could not help but fantasize about them. He paints a world endowed with limitless riches, and prepared for habitation and cultivation by humanity. However, when he talks of the inhabitants of these lavish nature-endowed lands, he depicts a people disappointingly wretched in spite of the plenty. This contrasting land/people relation betrays an opinion of the unfitness and unworthiness of the natives to "possess" the land.

Reinhold Forster's advocacy for colonization is further expressed in the landmass/population ratio discussion in which the islands are either sparsely populated or emptied out,

Several of the larger isles of this kind are regularly inhabited; some are only resorted to, now and then by the inhabitants of the neighbouring high isles, for the purposes of fishing, fowling and turtling; and some others are absolutely uninhabited, though they are furnished with coco nut-trees and are often resorted to in great flocks by man of war birds, boobies, gulls, terns and some petrels. (26)

Still on population, Reinhold Forster conjures a socio-economic cum political analysis of the metamorphosis of societies that lead to hierarchization. He identifies insufficiency of natural resources as the stimulus for communal agricultural ventures and mutual enhancement (152). While this partly accounts for Europe's advanced and more rewarding agricultural practices, he does not see the same metamorphosis taking place among the Islanders because, as he argues, "Food and raiment, the two great wants of the human species, are therefore easily supplied, and the inhabitants are hitherto fortunate

enough to have none of the artificial wants, which luxury, avarice, and ambition have introduced among Europeans” (146).

Linking the metamorphosis of the society with population increase, civilization, cultivation and other attendant developments, Reinhold Forster makes the intervention of Europeans inevitable. It could be seen that Reinhold Forster’s view of European intervention goes beyond the mercantilist interaction with the natives. He envisions occupational intervention, which would provide the platform for population increase and civilization. This will bring with it ownership and cultivation of the land, commercialization of agricultural practices, creation of wealth, and the emergence of vertical and horizontal economic-political stratification.

It could be seen that Reinhold Forster has already privileged the Europeans regarding the improvement of the region. The factors that would transform the region are in the Europeans’ hands, and as they come into the land equipped with their civilization/culture, they will automatically assume a position of superiority and power over the natives. A component of the civilization, the effectiveness of which Reinhold Forster does not hesitate to introduce in the discussion of occupation, is the gun. He gives an account of how the gun worked in favor of the Europeans, “They (the natives) seem to be valorous in encountering enemies, who are equal to them in arms; nay, before they perfectly knew how far our arms were superior to, and more destructive than theirs, a single man with a dart or sling would often stand in the path, and hinder a party of eight or ten of us from going higher up into the country” (164).

How did they get to know about the power of the European weapon? Reinhold Forster gives an account,

Wherever we came, though the inhabitants had not the least idea of the execution our fire arms were capable of making, they behaved very friendly towards us: nay, after we had killed a man at the Marquesas, grievously wounded one at Easter-Island, hooked a third with a boat-hook at Tonga-Tabu, wounded one at Namocka, another at Mallicollo, and killed another at Tanna; the several inhabitants behaved in a civil and harmless manner to us, though they might have taken ample revenge, by cutting off our straggling parties; all which, in my opinion, sufficiently establish the friendly disposition of these several nations. (252)

The process of colonization begins with a friendly attitude from the prospective colonizer towards the natives. However, as the intentions of the colonizer begin to show, the natives get apprehensive, resistant and, as the colonizer persists, hostile. At this point, the colonizer resorts to the ultimate symbol of his superiority, the gun. The gun communicates the relational hierarchy between Europeans and the natives, and subalternates the natives forthwith. With the natives cowed, the colonizer has the enabling environment to move in and establish himself and unpack his colonization tools.

Projecting into the future of European occupation, Reinhold Forster criticizes the civilizing approach and method applied by colonizing nations so far,

Human nature is capable of great improvements, if men only knew how to proceed in order to effectuate this great and noble purpose. The greater part of them are too unreasonable in their wishes, too rapid and violent in their proceedings, and too sanguine in their expectations. They wish this change should take place immediately, their methods for bringing it about are contrary to human nature, and sometimes they overlook the progress of improvement, because it is slow. (199)

In this criticism Reinhold Forster condemns the prevalent pattern, while advocating for another. On the one hand, he distances himself from the kind of men described above

and, on the other hand, seeks to identify with the men who would carry out this mission of transforming the natives using the right approach and method.

Reinhold Forster likens the process of changing the natives to parental nurture of a baby from infancy to the stage of self-determination, and recommends the same approach for colonists. He accuses the Europeans of impatience and intolerance in their dealings with the natives, while advocating a nurturing approach that will gradually guide the natives towards civilization and culture (199). While Forster's argument here suggests a failure of the Europeans in the "*mission civilisatrice*," it hints at the consideration of a new pattern of colonial approach, and probably a new set of colonizer to implement it.

This argument also hints at "familial" relationship between colonizer and colonized which Zantop deduced from Germany's colonial fantasies.¹¹ To nurture from infancy to maturity requires a familial, caring, protective, providing and sacrificial relationship. It is only in a family setting that this can take place. So, when Reinhold Forster advocates a kind of nurturing relationship with the natives, he consequently advocating a familial relationship.

Reinhold Forster's representation of the natives as needing a nurturing intervention provides a cushion for the colonizers' claim of humanitarian mission, whereby colonization was considered an undertaking to save the natives from and for themselves. Kristin Kopp, discussing Gustav Freytag's *Soll und Haben* (1855) recognizes this positioning as one of the arguments upon which Germany's colonial ambition was based,

¹¹ Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 2.

[. . .] for it is a text replete with the figures and tropes characteristic of the genre: self-proclaimed ‘colonists’ travel into wild, empty landscapes and bring them into fruition through their hard labor and advanced technical know-how. Primitive natives, meanwhile, are disciplined, tamed, and brought into the time of European modernity through the civilizing undertakings of these colonists.¹²

Reinhold Forster is convinced that the natives he encounters will not be able to make any progress in life without the intervention of the European. Hence, his advocacy for the colonization of the space and people.

Reinhold Forster’s Humane Considerations

Reinhold Forster is disappointed with the European classification and treatment of the natives as non-humans. So, in his account, he emphasizes the humanity of the native Islanders, not on the basis of mere philosophical or scientific pronouncements, but rather on the “holy writ” according to which humanity is descended from one couple (172). His interest in the humanity of the Islanders sets his report apart from the norm of numerization and datarization that characterized periphery research reports. Reusch comments, “Indeed, Forster presented a *locus amoenus* couched in many of the literary metaphors of longing. He chose a poetic prose that allowed room for imagination by avoiding the citation of facts. . . . Cook used the matter-of-fact language of colonial mapping, Forster the poetic language of narrative description.”¹³ Discussing almost every aspect of their life, and how they relate with their physical and spiritual environment recognizes their humanity. Berman highlights the distinction between Cook’s and Reinhold Forster’s reports,

¹² Kristin Kopp, “Reinventing Poland as Germany Colonial Territory in the Nineteenth Century: Gustav Freytag’s *Soll und Haben* as Colonial Novel,” *Germans, Poland, and Colonial Expansion to the East*, ed. Robert L. Nelson (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2009) 12. Print.

¹³ Reusch, p. 109.

For Cook, Dusky Bay is a cartographic fact, a latitudinal item to be entered in the charts and, at best, a way station of solely logistical import for the continuation of an exploratory undertaking that moves along lines drawn from point to point in an empty sea. For Forster, it is aesthetic experience as well as a natural fact—and more too, since at Dusky Bay an epochal human encounter would transpire. The scientist Cook measures geometric space whereas Forster encounters a life world.¹⁴

Reinhold Forster's humane considerations opened the way for him to show some appreciation for the natives' way of life. In comparison to the European way of life, he tries to show, as Nicholas Thomas observes, some ambivalence in the face of human diversity, and avoid the ethnological hierarchization that dominate in periphery narratives (xxxix).

However, operating from the consciousness of European drive for colonization, and being an agent of colonialism, he had to create a vacuum that would necessitate European intervention. There is therefore a duality in his role, which he achieved by presenting the natives in two ways. When he locates them within their native environment as a people having a complete and wholesome life, and having the right to it, he presents them as pure humans who do not lack anything that life and living requires in simplicity (199). His discussion of how they relate with their environment – climate, vegetation, health, food production, and more – suggests a people that possess the mastery of their environment and living in an enclosed state of satisfaction,

The foregoing account of the many islands mentioned by Tupaya is sufficient to prove that the inhabitants of the islands in the South Sea have made very considerable navigations in their slight and weak canoes; navigations which many Europeans would think impossible to be performed, upon a careful view of the vessels themselves, their rigging, sails, &c. &c. (318)

¹⁴ Berman (1998), p. 26.

In the majority of the islands Reinhold Forster discussed, he saw evidence of the inhabitants being knowledgeable enough in arts and science to live happily in their environment. In such a state, there is no need for European intervention.

However, the twist comes as Reinhold Forster changes the perspective of his observation, and assumes the position of a European colonialist. From such a Eurocentric perspective, he criticizes the way of life of the people by pointing out its inherent malaise and insufficiency, which could serve as a necessitating factor for European intervention (199). These two perspectives harmonize with each other on the platform of humane colonialism. While Reinhold Forster is not blatant in his advocacy for colonization, his argument of the insufficiency of their state of existence for guaranteed happiness mandates European intervention. He wraps his endorsement of colonial intervention in a garb of “humane” concerns. Typical of such thinking is his final statement on “Principles of Society,” where he presents the natives as unfit for further progress on their own (238).

This consideration is probably rooted in the mentality of the dichotomy between light/good and darkness/evil as contained in the Manichean Principle.¹⁵

Reinhold Forster’s humane consideration of the natives stems from two main factors. First was the status of Germans at the time as colonial outsiders. From this position, Germans could attempt a perspective of “objectivity” from which their regard and representation of the natives would be different. Second was the influence of Enlightenment thinking that was going on among German intellectuals at the time.

¹⁵ See Luca Doninelli, “The Manichean Abstraction. The Reality of Desire,” 22 Oct. 2012 <<http://www.traces-cl.com/july03/themanich.html>>.

Commenting on the position of Germans, Zantop states, “In their attempt to be ‘objective’ and ‘moral,’ enlightened German commentators of the late eighteenth century tended to side demonstratively with the indigenous populations, whose unfair depiction by first explorers they lamented.”¹⁶

Reinhold Forster, therefore, was looking at and reporting on the natives keeping German “objectivity” and “morality” in mind. His humane representation of the natives is also a solicitation for corresponding humane treatment. Reinhold Forster becomes a kind of bridge between prospective humane colonizers and the human natives. In his condemnation of the methods and approaches of the other nations, as discussed above, he creates room for another nation that would be different. This thinking, as pointed out by Zantop, dominated the thoughts of Germans regarding colonialism, “Not directly involved in colonial activity at the time, they engaged in international comparisons, in pitting colonial competitors against each other, in weighing the atrocities committed by others against the probity of the colonial onlookers.”¹⁷

Against the background of Europeans’ claim to racial superiority and its attendant inhuman treatment of the natives, Reinhold Forster advocates a new pattern of consideration that condemns the predatory interracial relations while promoting the thought of simple intra-human, non-racialized relations

But I found likewise on this occasion, what a great and venerable blessing benevolence is; when it is no longer the fashionable cant, borrowed from a favourable poet, or a moral romance, and dwelling only on mens lips; but when this best gift of heaven sits enthroned in the heart, fills the soul with gracious sensations, and prompts all our faculties to expressions of good-nature and

¹⁶ Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 41.

¹⁷ Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 39.

kindness: then only does it connect all mankind as it were into one family; youths of distant nations become brethren, and the older people of one nation, find children in the offspring of the other. All those distinctions which ambition, wealth, and luxury, have introduced, are leveled, and the inhabitant of the polar region, finds a warm and generous friend in the torrid zone or in the opposite hemisphere. (223)

The above quote finds a seamless anchor in the German fantasy of racial mixing with the natives of periphery lands to facilitate the elevation of the races through miscegenation.¹⁸

By the time all mankind is connected “into one family, youths of distant nations become brethren and the older people of one nation, find children in the offspring of the other,” the differentiating markers would have collapsed and there would be no limitation to the intermingling that would take place among peoples of different racio-cultural identities.

Juxtaposing the above statement with Berman’s thoughts on Enlightenment’s universalist valuation of mankind, and relativized valuation of cultures, it suggests the influence of Enlightenment’s humane views on Reinhold Forster’s work, and how that presented Germans as the potential bearers of the new colonial paradigm – the “humane/model” colonialism. Hahn comments on the impact of Enlightenment on some German thinkers such as Goethe, “Some of the aspects of the Enlightenment which attracted Goethe were tolerance towards other cultures and nations, the notion of truthfulness and humanity.”¹⁹

Presenting Germans as Better Colonists

Throughout Reinhold Forster’s text, while the Portuguese, French, British, and Spanish were mentioned, no reference was made to Germany or Germans in relation to

¹⁸ Schwarz, p. 85-103.

¹⁹ Hahn, p. 86.

colonialism. The reason could be that Germans, lacking a unifying political/national identity, were still outsiders to periphery colonial enterprise.

The fact that Germans were not actively involved in colonialism in the 18th century does not translate into colonial innocence. Germany's colonial past has been pointed out in the earlier part of this work. It is important, however, to note that their colonial past, which could be described as historically insignificant, played a very vital role in their conception of colonial ambition in the era of modern imperialism. As Zantop informs, writings on the colonial past of Germans, such as Bartolomé de Las Casa's *Brevísima Relación* (1542), which reported negatively about Germans as colonial masters in South America, spurred fervent nationalist reactions from German writers. The majority of them, such as Karl von Klöden, Karl Klunzinger, and Viktor Handzsch, started off by vehemently contesting the accounts given in *Brevísima Relación*, and in the course of time the German response metamorphosed into a defense and praise of the early German colonists – the Welsers.²⁰ The agitation against the negative portrayal contributed to the emergence of the nationalist fantasies of the German as a “model” colonist, a standpoint that characterized German colonial thought throughout the enterprise.

The absence of a “German Nation” notwithstanding, Germans had distinguished themselves as a people of superlative intellectual expediency, and this was going to become a useful tool in periphery voyages. Lowood reports on the evolution of intellectualism in Germany,

²⁰ Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 27.

Reports from correspondents gave locally active natural historians access to the world. Where in the economic societies one judged knowledge exclusively by its local application, the members of a naturforschende Gesellschaft welcomed the chance to fit local knowledge into a larger scheme. This was an important step towards the extra-regional societies of foresters, mining experts, and physicians that would begin to appear during the 1790s and led eventually to the professional scientific societies of the nineteenth century in Germany.²¹

The emergence of intellectualism as a German sphere of dominance generated a patriotic fervor, and spurred exploratory adventures involving Germans under the flag of other nations. Nicholas Thomas' remark highlights the absence of German interest in Reinhold Forster's voyage, "The principal purpose of the voyage was the investigation of the postulated great southern continent, long an object of geographical speculation, but of special interest in the late eighteenth century as a bountiful land of prospective settlement; its quest was a matter of imperial rivalry between Britain and France."²² Although the voyage was British, Reinhold Forster's text features as one of the cornerstones of Germany's conception of colonial ambition. How does the text speak to the German people?

That Reinhold Forster had Germans in mind as he composed his report is traceable. Reusch shares the same opinion, "Comparing Forster's and Cook's accounts of the same events, it becomes apparent that their texts aimed at decidedly different

²¹ Henry Ernest Lowood, *Patriotism. Profit. And the Promotion of Science in the German Enlightenment: The economic and scientific Societies, 1750-1815*, diss. U. California, Berkeley, 1987. 212. Print.

²² Nicholas Thomas, introduction, "Johann Reinhold Forster and his Observations," *Observations made during a Voyage round the World*, by Johann Reinhold Forster, eds. Nicholas Thomas, Harriet Guest and Michael Dettelbach (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1996.) xxii. Print.

audiences.”²³ As would be seen later in the text, the view of Germans as better colonists, and better suited to possess the territories in the periphery, would become obvious.

The significance of the Forster voyage and report to Germany is accentuated by the reception they were given on their return to Germany. Reinhold Forster was appointed to a professorial seat at the University of Halle in late 1779.²⁴ It could be argued that, having to serve under a foreign flag, which was the only option open to Germans then, did not extinguish their sympathy and patriotism towards “Germany.” So, while Forster condemned other nations’ colonial practices, he was highlighting a malaise that needed to be cured, and at the same time, creating a vacuum that needed to be filled. Considering the fact that the nations have proved themselves unfit (in Forster’s views) for colonialism, it becomes obvious that Forster’s judgment was creating a space and a challenge for Germans, who alone might possess the qualities to implement a “model/human” colonialism.²⁵

There is a strong consonance between Forster’s attitude and convictions regarding colonialism and the discourse of colonialism within German intellectuals at the time. Drawing from Meiners’ arguments, Zantop presents an example of what German intellectuals felt about colonialism, Germany’s place therein, and other European nations,

Meiners, in his 1791 essay on the degeneration of Europeans in the New World, unwittingly corroborates Herder’s critique of the colonial practices of other Europeans. He reiterates his idea that all colonizers have become ‘more like Negroes and Indians; in the colonies, that is, ‘phlegmatic,’ ‘lazy,’ ‘cowardly,’ desirous of riches, of sensuous enjoyments and luxury. In both

²³ Reusch, p. 109.

²⁴ See Thomas, introduction, *Observations*, p. xxii.

²⁵ Reusch, p. 93.

cases the missing party is the ‘industrious German bee’ who [. . .] gathers honey and knows not for whom.²⁶

Reusch informs succinctly on this,

Suffering in commerce and politics and incapable of joining the colonial powers in their exploits, Germans deeply felt a heightened sense of European cultural polarization. Of the colonial powers, most Germans perceived France as a longstanding historic enemy, and Spain and England as competitors, if not threats, because of both their dominance of the seas and their negative effect on Germany’s international trade.²⁷

Apart from scientific speculations about rich deposits of minerals waiting to be exploited, he uses very romanticized adjectives to describe the flora and fauna making it appetite-whetting for the European traveler. From such descriptions with romantic sentimentality, as in *Society Isle*, it seems that Forster was trying to incite some craving among his audience; a craving that would only be quelled by experiencing the object or place so described. The reference to the “traveller” invited by the springs lends credence to the supposition. The captivating effect of the springs on Forster does not exist for the natives, who see the springs just as mere provisions of nature to satisfy some existential needs. They do not attach any aesthetic value to it. It is only for the “traveller” like Forster (the European) that the springs would hold such awe. This further underscores Forster’s colonization advocacy.

The British Admiralty accepted Captain Cook’s report as the official one while Forster’s was considered “a curious mate for Cook’s volumes.”²⁸ Apart from the poor English of Forster’s report, the narrative pattern he used deviates from the conventional

²⁶ Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 95.

²⁷ Reusch, p. 99.

²⁸ Thomas, introduction, *Observations*, p. xx.

style of data and cartography. The identified peculiarity of Forster's text is not just its multi-dimensionality, but also the depth of his observations, the details of his report, and the deviation of the same from the usual pattern of representation of the natives. Thomas comments on this,

What . . . Forster did was make these observations merely the empirical materials for elaborate arguments concerning the progress of happiness, education, and civility. If what was at stake in not writing a narrative was a lapse into an 'unconnected' sequence of remarks, Forster can be seen to have introduced thematic, moral, and developmental progressions, which supplied some coherence in place of a chronological order.²⁹

The approach adopted by Forster, in my view, could only be explained against the background of the humane concerns about periphery peoples. Reinhold Forster's text, which, as I have pointed out in the preceding section, emphasizes the humanity of the natives, indicts other Europeans, which have been viewing and treating them more or less as non-humans. If the treatment of periphery natives as non-humans has its basis on the representation of the natives in literatures, Reinhold Forster's text challenges such a positionality, as well as the European's claim to being enlightened. As Reinhold Forster presents it, the colonists are irredeemably corrupted and that the "redemptive" colonial enterprise, which Forster considers a necessity, calls for a new approach and a new breed of colonizers. From all indications, Reinhold Forster's new breed would be the Germans, who, as their position indicates, had not been corrupted by the materialist greed of self-centric colonialism. They also emerge as the hope for Reinhold Forster's "humane/model" colonialism.

²⁹ Thomas, introduction, *Observations*, p. xx.

Reinhold Forster's German colonial leaning is further highlighted as he discusses the richness of the region,

And this circumstance likewise shews, how much that immense part of our globe, India, with its isles, wants the labours of a new, accurate, and modern observer, accompanied by a faithful draughtsman, used to drawings of natural history, in order to make us better acquainted with the rich treasures of these extensive regions; and it raises a wish in each patriotic heart, that, as the British empire in India is so extensive, so much respected, and its subjects there so wealthy, and powerful, that some of them would engage men capable of searching the treasures of nature, and examining the several objects of sciences and arts in these climates. (126)

The phrase, "it raises a wish in each patriotic heart, that, as the British empire in India is so extensive, so much respected, and its subjects there so wealthy, and powerful, . . ." raises the question, who are "the patriotic hearts" mentioned here? The British, Portuguese, French, Dutch and Spanish have been involved in periphery enterprise for a while now, and that from a patriotic standpoint, since they fly their national flags and, in some cases, like in Captain Cook's expedition, undertake the voyages in the name of the crown. It is, therefore, out of place to associate these nationals with the expression "it raises a wish." The only Europeans the statement suitably apply to are the Germans, who, as at the time, were still in the stage of 'wishful colonialism.' Zantop identifies the effort by Germans to create a space into which they could slip themselves whenever the domestic circumstances would permit that.³⁰

Reinhold Forster's reference to India above necessitates a brief highlight on the empire. India was one of the first major empires established by the British. It provided the platform for the development, testing and refinement of Britain's colonial policies and approach. It also provided the British the forum to trumpet the humanitarian

³⁰ Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 7.

propaganda in condemnation of the inhuman activities of the charter company that was running the colony. However, such arguments as, “power exercised over a native race ought to be employed ultimately for the welfare of this race,” present the ambivalence of the politics of imperialism.³¹ Such an argument, while apparently fronting the welfare of the natives, approves the use of force against them. Where force fails, violence often follows.

The system of entrusting the running of the colony to charter companies (the East India Company in this case), with no interference from the government, created room for a colonial relationship defined by capitalist greed. This facilitated the application of all forms of exploitative measures against the natives. There is no wonder then why the British colonists became so wealthy to the point of constituting a reference point for Forster (in his remark above) in spite of his humane leanings. Forster fails to take into account the practice of inhumanity that had generated that wealth. Bass states, “In that servants were expected to carry on the Company’s business as well as oversee their new political responsibilities, corruption and irresponsible government were virtually assured. By the early 1770s, reports were reaching England of numerous instances of Company corruption and ill-treatment of their Indian subjects.”³²

The fact that the British Empire in India is mentioned and used as a comparative referent eliminates the British as the referents of “patriotic heart.” Considering also the fact that the question of patriotic European was not existent due to the rivalries and

³¹ See Archibald Paton Thornton, *The imperial idea and its enemies* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1966) 37. Print.

³² Bass, p. 216.

hostilities between the nations, it is unreasonable to assume that Europeans are the referents of “patriotic heart.” It is probable then that, by “patriotic heart,” Forster was alluding to Germans.

It is noteworthy that the romantic representation of the exotics as a paradise of inviolate naturalness accounted for the German craving for the periphery. Appetite-whetting descriptions like Forster’s struck a harmony with the advocacy by German scholars for the return to nature as the only means to human perfection. Hahn comments on Herder’s position regarding the return to nature,

While maintaining a critical distance from the absolutist ideas of the political philosophy of the early Enlightenment, Herder seems to follow Rousseau in the notion that humankind has to return to nature, to a more primitive state of society in order to find the precondition for human perfection. The further human society stray from the state of the *Naturvölker*, the more extreme will society become, posing a severe threat to the integrity of the individual.³³

Considering the overt political and colonialist ambition of the British, which encouraged a dry scientific cataloguing of facts and figures, it is not out of place to argue that Forster’s romanticized account, as Reusch acknowledges, had Germans as the audience.

The romanticized description of the periphery as the “exotic” opened up a new wave of obsession with the “unknown” world. In Christa Knellwolf’s words, “exotic” “corroborates abstract boundaries between inside and outside, while encouraging the imagination to roam without restraint.”³⁴ The designation of the periphery as the “exotic” was very significant in the desire for young European males to escape into the unknown. This argument becomes evident in Campe’s *Robinson der Jüngere*. The “exotic” became

³³ Hahn, p. 62.

³⁴ Knellwolf, p. 11.

conceived as the other side of the Enlightenment, an extraterrestrial realm in juxtaposition with the ageing, suffocating European world. George Sabastian Rousseau and Roy Porter developed the cliché, “Enlightenment exotic,” which they define as, “The fantastic realized beyond the horizons of the everyday world the European knew.”³⁵

Knellwolf criticizes the romanticized description of the exotic as a manipulation that tended to play down the inhumanity of deportation of citizens from European nations by presenting the “penal territories” as a kind of paradise. Based on this, she sees the works of naturalists as in collaboration with the governments’ design for socio-political stability at home and colonial ventures abroad. Knellwolf exemplifies her views by critiquing a cartoon on Botany Bay,

Interpreting the name ‘Botany Bay’ literally as a paradise and suppressing the eyewitness account of its bleak and hostile quality, this cartoon from the 1810s describes the human tragedies behind deportation in terms of a simple transfer of mindless organisms. As such it makes us aware how closely colonial politics is enmeshed with the naturalist’s project of ordering and classifying the world.³⁶

On such romanticized representation of the periphery, Knellwolf declares, “my main concern is with the blurred boundaries between factual knowledge about the New World and fantasies about the exotic.”³⁷

Forster condemns the activities of other Europeans (199). Among other things, he accuses them of introducing the greed and avarice of European materialism, thereby corrupting the simplicity of the natives’ way of life (146); blames them for the moral

³⁵ George Sabastian Rousseau & Roy Porter, eds., *Exoticism in the Enlightenment* (Manchester: Manchester University, 1990) 15. Print.

³⁶ Knellwolf, p. 14.

³⁷ Knellwolf, p. 16.

decay, which has gotten to the point of their prostituting their daughters and wives to procure European goods,³⁸ and accuses them for introducing sexually transmitted disease among the natives.³⁹ Forster sees sexual intercourse as something that must happen owing to the state of degeneracy that the European had slid into as a result of commercial enterprise. Harriet Guest, interpreting Forster's view on sexual contact between native women and Europeans, sees a link between commercialization, materialism and promiscuity.⁴⁰

The Europeans that Forster accuses of having mistreated the natives are not Germans. However, at every criticism, there is a suggestion of a better approach to the relationship with the natives. The question then is, which Europeans are being criticized here and which ones are to initiate the better approach that Forster advocates. As Thomas remarks, Forster condemns the British seamen for their corruption, which he links to the corruption of their government.⁴¹ The indictment of the governments as being the reason the seamen are corrupted suggests that the seamen cannot be redeemed, and the pattern of interaction with the natives cannot be improved. This situation presents the need for a new government and seamen with a new approach.

Zantop presents the image colonial literatures created of Germans in their advocacy for German colonialism, “. . . colonial novels and tales from Frieda von Bülow to Hans Grimm, continued to maintain that ‘German chivalry, German diligence, German

³⁸ Harriet Guest, introduction, “Looking at Women: Forster's Observations in the South Pacific,” *Observations*, p. xlv.

³⁹ Guest, p. xlv.

⁴⁰ Guest, p. xlv.

⁴¹ Thomas, introduction, *Observations*, p. xxi.

labor, the German sense of justice, German honesty, and German education' predestined Germans to rule over racially and culturally 'inferior,' yet eternally grateful and loyal peoples."⁴² The colonization that will fulfill Forster's humane wishes for the periphery natives will require the crop of people described above to be "realizable."

The Enlightenment thoughts, as they relate to alterity, emphasize the humanity of all mankind and recognize diverse cultures and traditions as inherently authentic and valuable to the people and place it belongs to. Discussing some of the ideals that were being propagated in German Enlightenment, Gregory Jusdanis states,

Informing these Enlightenment thinkers was a universalism of human values and an awareness of the distinctiveness of human societies. . . . The more political thinkers treated the universal category of humanity as socially embedded, the more likely they were to accord non-Europeans the respect of fellow humans (123–24). This attitude was built on a bedrock belief in the incommensurability of cultures that we find among these thinkers, particularly with Herder. . . . He propounded the idea that all human groups were unique, that they possess their own measure of happiness, and thus could not be judged by the standards of another society or age.

Herder's contention stood as a rebuke to the other, sanguine, and ultimately imperialistic Enlightenment view of European values as superior and hence exportable to the rest of the world, by force if necessary—a notion that holds sway with some people today.⁴³

Forster's sympathetic positioning vis-à-vis the natives of the South Pacific is arguably influenced by this discourse of universal humanity among Germans.

While Germans still remained armchair colonists, they perceived themselves as having the best thoughts, the best ideas, the highest level of humane considerations, as well as the most liberal position towards cultural and racial alterity. They were very much involved in periphery activities, but not with a unifying national identity as Germans.

⁴² Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 203.

⁴³ Gregory Jusdanis, "Enlightenment Postcolonialism," *Research in African Literatures* 36.3 (2005): 141. Print.

The argument that Germany's intellectualism was not meant to be an instrument of subjugation could be substantiated by Lowood's remark on the economic societies that sprang up in the *Spätaufklärung*. As he argues, the societies portrayed themselves as "springboards for promoting activities conducive to cooperation, mutual encouragement, and fellowship. As a result, they attached the greatest importance to those sciences which linked knowledge to the market place and economic production, where experience and scholarship were on par."⁴⁴ Lowood's observation suggests that the promotion of knowledge by the societies was for the benefit of mankind, and as knowledge grew, mutuality and symbiotic enrichment was being emphasized. Practitioners of science and Natural History endeavored to introduce local farmers and peasant to new and improved varieties and methods of farming all in the bid to promote the wellbeing of all.

Richard van Dülmen furthers this argument in his discussion of the societies in the 17th century,

The societies were the focus of articulation for a great variety of interests, depending on the respective phase of the Enlightenment and the social status of its champions . . . However, the Enlightenment's claim to universality, and the achievement of social reform through the dissemination of knowledge and self-education were common to them all.⁴⁵

Andrew Zimmerman furthers the emphasis on universal humanity by German intellectuals, "The defenders of humanism emphasized the utopian potential of hermeneutic interpretation, in which the humanity of both interpreter and subject of interpretation is recognized and elevated."⁴⁶ However, as Lowood informs, from 1770 the

⁴⁴ Lowood, p. 4.

⁴⁵ Dülmen, p. 2.

⁴⁶ Andrew Zimmerman, *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001) 1. Print.

orientation of the societies shifted from *Menschenliebe* to *Vaterlandsliebe*. This new orientation encouraged regional sciences and restriction.⁴⁷

The paradigmatic shift swivels around two principal perspectives, that of *Menschenliebe*, which is more of a universalist humane approach, and *Vaterlandsliebe*, which is a more nationalistic approach. Looking at German intellectualism from a *Menschenliebe* perspective, mankind is at the center irrespective of geo-political or racio-cultural identities. It is fair enough to concede Germans the claim of uninstrumentalized knowledge when they operated from a universalist *Menschenliebe* position. Regarding racial identities within the context of the German *Menschenliebe*, it could be argued that “human exotics” had not become a considerable component of the knowledge and racial repertoire of Germans. Andrew Zimmerman expresses the same view,

European expansion made possible the natural scientific transformation of the humanities that anthropologists proposed. As the founders of the Berlin Anthropological Society [1869] explained to the Prussian minister of culture: ‘A science called forth by the needs and born by the currents of our time is that of the human, which in the inductive sense of natural science was previously unknown. It also could not have been undertaken earlier, until modern voyages of discovery had brought the necessary comparative materials from the newly opened regions of the world.’⁴⁸

The “necessary comparative materials” meant here definitely include human beings from the newly opened regions of the world. It is possible that, with the emergence of racial alterity, the discourse of universal humanity among German intellectuals adopted a new posture.

⁴⁷ Lowood, p. 196.

⁴⁸ Zimmerman, p. 6.

When the paradigm changed from *Menschenliebe* to *Vaterlandsliebe*, their intellectualism became an econo-political cum racio-geographic instrument in the service of the *Vaterland*. It is not farfetched to propose that, with the *Vaterlandsliebe* came *Ausgrenzung* and *Eingrenzung*. The interests of the *Vaterland* began to take predatory primacy over the interests of general mankind. The long term result of this was, as Knellwolf observed, the ordering and classification of humanity and societies using knowledge.⁴⁹

German Intellectualism and Instrumentalization for Colonialism

As I have already pointed out in the previous section, the quest for knowledge came as a new realm of significance for Germans, within which they could express themselves without limitations. Germans gradually gained renown in intellectual exercise, prompting their being drafted by other nations for periphery research voyages.⁵⁰ While German intellectualism served the needs of other nations, the switch from the foundational paradigm of *Menschenliebe* to *Vaterlandsliebe*, as discussed above, occasioned the transformation of intellectualism into a racio-political tool in the service of nationalist interests.

Historically, at the time German intellectualism had become instrumentalized for nationalist politics through the *Vaterlandsliebe*,⁵¹ Germans became vassals to Napoleon in 1806. The occupation became an ever-present evidence of the weakness and

⁴⁹ Knellwolf, p. 14.

⁵⁰ The participation of scholars such as Georg and Johann Reinhold Forster, Alexander von Humboldt, and Maximilian zu Neuwied-Wied in periphery studies under foreign national flags attest to the German intellectual renown. See Reusch, p. 111.

⁵¹ Lowood, p. 196.

subjugation of Germans in Europe. So, during the Napoleonic occupation, a period that Germans consider the most humiliating prior to the loss of WWI, intellectualism became a kind of recourse to compensate for that weakness. Hertz quotes the King of Prussia, “the state must offset its losses in physical strength by reinforcing its intellectual resources.”⁵² This is instrumentalization emanating from the citadel of German political structure. Lowood informs of how working in the societies – collecting minerals and botanical specimens, exhibiting mechanical models of new inventions – featured as a retreat for German elites during the travail of Napoleonic domination.⁵³

Forster’s affinity with and sympathy for German intellectualism and his preference for German colonialism is subtly alluded to in his advocacy for better qualified men to be involved in the periphery enterprise (376). Having discredited the other nations, Germans emerge as the future colonists informed enough, humane enough and scientifically curious enough to initiate and administer a “humane” colonial system that would not make colonized subjects “sacrifices” of European ignorance. If “ignorance” here refers to Europeans involved in the periphery enterprise, then conjecturally, the well-informed, better skilled Europeans are those still to come. As Meiners argues, the Germans are the “missing party.”⁵⁴

Using various tactics, Forster tries to justify the European invasion of the periphery. Yes, he paid attention to every aspect of the space – its hydrosphere, biosphere, atmosphere and lithosphere – and had elaborate descriptions of all of these as

⁵² Hertz, p. 26.

⁵³ Lowood, p. 90.

⁵⁴ See Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 95.

he perceived them or would want them to be perceived. In various places he presented the natives as animals, though without saying that directly. He said of the natives of Society Isles, “they being skillful in jumping from one large stone to another, and sometimes carrying at the same time a burthen on their backs” (51). This description could be read as likening the natives to animals such as tiger, lions or leopards, which can take a very high or long leap while bearing their prey on their mouth.

The possible likening of the natives to animals could have derived from the dichotomization between *Natur/Kultur*, *Menschen/Tiere*, *Naturvolk/Kulturvolk*, which dominated periphery literatures and discourses in the 18th and 19th century. Zimmerman writes,

For German historians, ‘culture’ involved the European self interpreting what was conceived as its own past, a practice that necessarily excluded all those perceived as ‘other,’ especially non-Europeans. Anthropologists proposed an inversion of this humanist historicism, arguing that to understand humanity scholars should look, not at European and classical ‘cultural people’ (*Kulturvölker*), but rather at non-Europeans who possessed neither culture nor history and who were therefore ‘natural peoples’ (*Naturvölker*).⁵⁵

Presenting the natives as *Naturvölker* legitimates European colonization of them. On the significance of Forster’s book to colonization, Michael Dettelbach notes, “Forster highlighted this chapter (the final chapter on maintaining a materially and morally happy ship’s company) in presenting copies of the book to the Swedish King, the president of the Swedish Medical College, and the secretary of the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, citing its importance for colonial enterprise.”⁵⁶ Alexander von Humboldt, who

⁵⁵ Zimmerman, p. 38.

⁵⁶ Michael Dettelbach, introduction, “A kind of Linnaean Being’: Forster and Eighteenth-Century Natural History,” *Observations*, p. lv.

was Reinhold Forster's student and a fellow explorer, comments, "Durch die Schilderungen von Otaheiti war besonders im nördlichen Europa für die Inseln des Stillen Meeres ein allgemeines Interesse erwacht"⁵⁷

Reinhold Forster, while criticizing travelogues for lacking in accuracy and veracity, argues that an in-depth study and presentation of the space, the people and their life will provide the knowledge needed to deal with the challenges of eventual colonization (144). He follows up the criticism with an authoritative statement of credibility and authenticity on his work,

As we met with many tribes in the course of our expedition, who had never seen any European or other polished nation, I thought it my duty to attend to this branch of the great study of nature, as much as my other occupations would permit. I collected facts, and now communicate them to the impartial and learned world, with a few inferences, as an imperfect essay. (144)

Reinhold Forster applied his expert knowledge to the study of the South Sea natives and their environment. Captain Cook's report, as could be gleaned from critiques such as Reusch, was a purely scientific presentation for the upper classes – academics, the educated bourgeoisie, and the colonist politicians. It was not meant for the middle class. On the other hand, Reinhold Forster's report, in-depth as it is, and delivered in simple, narrative language, demonstrates a deeper understanding of life and living, a closer connection with the subjects of his study, and a resonance with the educated middle class as his audience.⁵⁸

⁵⁷ Alexander von Humboldt, *Ansichten der Natur mit wissenschaftlichen Erläuterungen*, 2nd. ed. (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1860) 263. Print.

⁵⁸ Reusch, p. 109.

The implication of this was that, by connecting with and getting as close as he did to the middle class (a claim that the detailed description suggests), he was able to present the natives and their environment to his audience in such a way that a great curiosity was aroused in them. Reinhold Forster's probable aim was for his report to be accessible to as many Germans as could read, so as to spur them into undertaking periphery activities. Zantop recognizes this aim as common in Germans' periphery reports, "In short, there was a totalizing impulse to amass information, order it synchronically into geographies, diachronically into histories, and vertically into hierarchies of moral and cultural development, and make this structured information accessible to all strata and ages of the educated bourgeois public."⁵⁹

Reusch comments on the influence of Reinhold Forster's narratives, "These descriptions catapulted into the forefront of the mind of the emerging bourgeoisie a latent and often eroticized fascination with exotic natives, that reverberated in the increasingly revolutionary climate of the late eighteenth century and its preoccupation with liberty and egalitarianism."⁶⁰

One of the impressions of the Reinhold Forster report among Germans can be seen in Campe's *Robinson der Jüngere* (which shall be discussed in detail later). Thomas Schwarz discusses Campe in relation to the fantasy ignited in the hearts of Germans about the exotic,

Der Aufklärer Johann Heinrich Campe bediente sich dabei in seinem Fremdwörterbuch zur Abwehr der Hybridisierung des deutschen Wortschatzes einer Strategie der Pathologisierung:

⁵⁹ Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 35.

⁶⁰ Reusch, p. 93.

Scharf wandte er sich gegen die ‚Exoteronomie‘, gegen die ‚Vorliebe für Alles, was ausländisch ist,‘ eine Sucht, womit, wie man sagt, die Deutschen, und unter ihnen besonders unsere Sprachmenger, behaftet sind.⁶¹

It should be noted that one of the principal reasons presented for the colonial advocacy of Germans was finding a satellite home for German emigrants. Making knowledge about the exotics available to Germans was a way of directing attention towards the periphery regions presented in the writings.

From the foregoing, evidence emerges that German intellectualism gradually lost its orientation towards *Menschenliebe* without borders, and thereby, became an instrument for subjugation of the “other.” Linking intellectualism (anthropology) with imperialism, Zimmerman states, “Imperialism was the sine qua non of anthropology, for without imperialism anthropologists never would have had access to the ethnographic performers, artifacts, body parts, and – in the early twentieth century – field sites that provided the empirical data that they valued above all else.”⁶² Discussing the Enlightenment and colonialism, Knellwolf states, “Establishing a home for the imagination and preparing the ground for scientific analyses of these countries’ potential use for trade and/or new settlers, the exotic reflects the close relationship between two of the most important projects of the Enlightenment: scientific exploration and classification on the one hand, and colonization on the other.”⁶³ If Enlightenment is implicated in colonialism, then German intellectualism was not innocent as an instrument for

⁶¹ Schwarz, p. 85.

⁶² Zimmerman, p. 7.

⁶³ Knellwolf, p. 28.

subjugation. The reforms that elevated knowledge and intellectual exercise progressively provided the foundation for Germany's colonial projections and enterprise.

Section ii. Demonstrating “Humane/Model” Colonialism in Fiction (Joachim Heinrich Campe’s *Robinson*, 1779)

Campe’s *Robinson der Jüngere* is one of the better-known fictional writings within the discourse of German colonialism. It is foundational on the ground that the fantasies that dominate Germany’s colonial visions can be recognized in the text. Its appearance in 1779, just one year after Reinhold Forster published his *Observations* (1778), is significant. Reading both works, one can identify the influence of Reinhold Forster’s thoughts on Campe. It could be argued that Reinhold Forster developed the ideas of “humane/model” colonialism, and Campe downloaded and demonstrated their workability in abstractions, albeit on a fantasy colonial stage.

Another important issue on the relationship between Reinhold Forster and Campe is the emergence of Germans as the “ideal” colonizers. As I have pointed out earlier, although Reinhold Forster did not directly mention Germans as the “ideal” colonizers, the analysis of some of his arguments indicates his predilection for Germans as “better” colonizers. While Reinhold Forster was allusive in the idea of Germans as “better” colonizers, Campe was unequivocal about it. The first pointer to the choice of Germans as “better” colonizers in the text is the identity of his protagonist, a German not “polluted” by any form of Enlightenment ideas or by formal education, but rather still in the German *Urzustand* without any education or training.

By this choice Campe makes a further connection with Reinhold Forster’s vision of creating colonial enthusiasts out of Germans of all classes. That Reinhold Forster is

not restrictive in his advocacy for an across-the-board German involvement in colonialism suggests assumed inherency of humane tendencies in Germans. This is further reinforced by Campe's choice of a protagonist, who is described as a *tabula-rasa*. *Ein unbeschriebenes Blatt*.⁶⁴ Robinson's activities on the island resonate with the ideal of a "model" colonist, and thus fulfills the euphoria of the German as a "better" colonizer. Following the argument of Reinhold Forster trying to create a space for Germans to place themselves, Campe identified the space and placed Robinson in it.

Campe presents his goal in the foreword to the text, and in the fifth goal, he states how he intends to awaken the spirit of diligence that is slumbering in the heart of young Germans; to provide an antidote to the malaise of complacency, fear and lack of adventure among Germans; to provoke a stream of imagination about the unknown world that would spur young Germans into adventurous undertakings (vi-ix). In Campe's declarations, what I term "Campe's Manifesto," he details the intended impact of his text on Germans. The narrative is dominated by the notion of an "ideal" German colonizer. In the "manifesto," he criticizes the deviation from the state of nature and humanity's affinity with the natural. He advocates relocation to an environment that would give one the opportunity of experiencing nature for regenerative purposes. That environment is out there in the exotic periphery.

Robinson der Jüngere, an adaptation from Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (1719), is located within the German image of ingenuity. It demonstrates the German claim of diligence, humaneness, stoicism, creativity and more.⁶⁵ Defoe's *Robinson*

⁶⁴ Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 106.

⁶⁵ See Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 95.

Crusoe is also credited with the ability of the European (Englishman) to assert himself in his environment against all odds as does Campe's text. However, Campe projects the German's superiority by placing Robinson on the island with nothing but the clothing on his body and the shoes on his feet. By fashioning such a protagonist, Campe intends to present the German who is able to force his environment to meet his needs. In the *Vorbericht* he states,

Hierzu kommt in der Geschichte des alten Robinsons noch etwas, welches einen der größten Vortheile zernichtet, den diese Geschichte stiften könnte; ich meine den Umstand, das Robinson mit allen europäischen Werkzeugen versehen ist, deren er nöthig hatte, um sich viele von denjenigen Bequemlichkeiten zu verschaffen, welche das gesellschaftliche Leben gesitteter Menschen gewährt. Dadurch geht der große Vortheil verloren, dem jungen Leser die Bedürfnisse des einzelnen Menschen, der außer der Gesellschaft lebt, und das vielseitige Glück des gesellschaftlichen Lebens, recht anschaulich zu machen. Abermals ein nichtiger Grund, warum ich von der Geschichte dieses alten Robinsons abgehen zu müssen glaubte. (xv)

Campe tries to integrate the qualities associated with the "true" German – humaneness, industriousness, liberalism (tolerance/accommodation of alterity), ingenuity, perseverance, humility and more – into his Robinson.⁶⁶

The configuration of Robinson's circumstances responds to the controversy of "the self-made man" versus the "divinely charted destiny." With the emergence of the middle class, a testimony of upward societal adjustment out of personal efforts, the concept of the "self-made man" became dominant. Therefore, periphery enterprise, which to a large extent, was a middle class business initially, was perceived, as I have already argued, as the stage for self-making. The *Robinsonade* genre articulated this philosophy. *Robinson der Jüngere* emerges as the recipe for both self-making and "model/humane"

⁶⁶ Hertz, p. 30

colonialism as conceived by Germans. In the following analysis, we shall see how Campe works these tendencies into his protagonist and how these set him apart from other periphery agents he encounters.

Configuration of the German “Model/Humane” Colonist

The narrator starts his story by presenting a family of three boys who followed different paths in life. The first boy becomes a soldier and dies in a battle against the French, the second boy an academic, dies of *Schwindsucht* (consumption). The third boy, Krusoe, refuses to go to school, to become a soldier or to learn a trade. He becomes a *Nichtstuer*. In the fate of the three brothers, the author paints an ugly picture of the living situation of Germans in the 18th century – the lack of freedom and opportunity to determine and follow one’s predilections in life. Eda Sagara comments,

What was never in dispute is that Germans had far greater problems in gaining access to the political decision-making process, because their country lacked the kind of public sphere which the United States, France, or Britain could take for granted. This deficiency was part of the fragmented nature of Germany and the bureaucratic and paternalist traditions by which it was governed. It was by no means unknown for princes to employ middle-class advisers, but in general the gifted sons of officials, pastors, teachers, and master craftsmen found little outlet for their talents.⁶⁷

The two elder brothers, who chose careers in line with the norm, perished. As Zantop observes, the author registers his disapproval for the career paths that do not profit Germany in her present predicament vis-à-vis other European nations – the military and academics.⁶⁸ But Robinson finds no place in the German society, and looks beyond it

⁶⁷ Eda Sagarra, *Germany in the nineteenth Century: History and Literature* (New York: Peter Lang, 2001) 3. Print.

⁶⁸ Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 106.

for his future. His heart was full of dreams and fantasies of the wide world and he desired above all to sail away to experience the world. His yearning for the outside world could be understood as a yearning for freedom, for a breathing space and for the opportunity for self-determination. His parents, who would not let him sail, fearing for his safety, tried to persuade him to learn a trade. There is a clash of interests here which, viewed from the narrator's perspective, also reflects a generational clash.

Robinson's refusal to follow his parents' wish answers to the desire expressed by the author (see the manifesto) to shield the upcoming generation from the same "sickness" as the older generation. The author has to create a protagonist that would resist the order of the society to follow his drive. The insistence of his parents represents a familial version of the *fürstliche/königliche/kaiserliche* paternalistic dominance and subjugation of Germans over years. This has been identified as one of the reasons why Germany has lagged behind on every developmental front including periphery enterprise.⁶⁹ So, for Germans to have a breakthrough in periphery activities, a generation needed to arise that would break the incapacitating yoke of paternalism both at private and public levels. Hahn argues,

The concept of patriotic education . . . is a central part of Fichte's address: 'having been forsaken by its aristocracy and the upper middle classes, the country had to rely on the mass of its people, inspiring in them the awareness of patriotic citizenship. The new citizen would be the product of a state-controlled education which would foster the establishment of German character.'⁷⁰

The properties that constitute the German character have already been mentioned in this project. Robinson meets this challenge, the culmination of which was his leaving home.

⁶⁹ See Hahn, p. 56.

⁷⁰ Hahn, p. 68.

Once away from home, Robinson's education on how to be the "ideal" German colonist begins.

All this while, he has lived as a spoiled and protected child, „Nun war also nur noch der kleinste übrig, den man Krusoe nannte. . . . Auf den setzten nun der Herr Robinson und Frau Robinson ihre ganze Hofnung, weil er jetzt ihr Einziger war. Sie hatten ihn so lieb, als ihren Augapfel; aber sie liebten ihn mit Unverstand“ (5). So loved and protected, he lacks the toughness, independence the decision making ability that periphery environment is going to demand of him. His fantasies about the world and sea voyage did not recognize any hazards at all. So, as he launches out, his education starts. He is introduced right away to the hazards of sea voyage, as their ship is hit and destroyed by a serious storm. Although they survive the storm and make it to London safely on another ship, Robinson's chances of returning to Hamburg becomes minimal. He had sent a message to his parents informing them of his trip and that he would soon be back (7).

While Robinson revels in the bliss of London, an encounter with the German captain of the sunken German ship awakens familial sentiments. The Captain, definitely of the old school, orders him to return to his parents. This would have aborted the periphery project with Robinson as the pioneer. But the danger is averted through Robinson's encounter with the *Guineafahrer*, the captain of an English ship. The meeting becomes very significant in the development of the narrative. The author introduces a scenario of conflict of values and Robinson has to make a decision. One choice is to succumb to the pressure of familial sentiments and, in repentance and regret return to

Hamburg. Another option is to proceed with the voyage to Africa with the *Guineafahrer* and, thereby, work towards independence and self-actualization.

It should be noted here that Robinson's voyage from Hamburg was in response to his friend's invitation and assurance of support. There was no objective built into the trip other than the satisfaction of his curiosity. But as he meets with the *Guineafahrer*, there is a discussion, during which there emerges a goal, an objective on which a decision is to be made. For the first time the naïve Robinson has to reflect on issues, the prospect of sailing to Africa, and the justification and means for that (21-22). He decides to sail with the *Guineafahrer* to Africa instead of returning to scorn, shame and sanction in Hamburg (22). The prospect of sailing to Africa diminished the sentiments that were trying to force him back to Hamburg.

With this decision, Robinson seems to break free from the shackles of paternalism and is now positioned for the proper orientation that could reflect the philosophy of the "model/humane" German colonizer. The British ship also symbolizes the chance and opportunity to break free from the European system. While the ship from Hamburg is associated with an individual owner without any national reference, the ship in London and the ship in the Canary Islands are associated with nations – British and Portuguese.

As pointed out earlier, Robinson has now developed a sense of purpose from the discussion with the English Captain, and based on this purpose, he embarks on the voyage. At Canary Islands the ship anchors for a tune-up which is going to take a while. Robinson breaks away and joins another ship sailing for Brazil. Robinson's abandonment of the British ship is on two grounds, one, the boredom arising from the tarrying in

Canary Island (26). Second, an encounter with the Captain of a Portuguese ship opens up the opportunity of getting rich through gold. Robinson had heard of gold nuggets and believes this to be his chance to lay his hands on them, „Nach dem nämlichen – Robinson machte Bekannschaft mit dem Kapitain des Schiffs, und da er von den Goldkörnern und Edelsteinen gehört hatte: so wäre er um sein Leben gern mit nach Brasilien gefahren, um sich da die Taschen voll zu lesen“ (27).

Through Robinson's change of course, the author communicates further orientation for his periphery "ambassador." Considering the circumstances under which Robinson joined the English ship, it is obvious that the Captain must have been like a father figure to Robinson, exercising authority and providing guidance. This definitely would have translated into another form of the paternalistic relationship from which he had successfully broken free. Robinson has to cultivate self-dependence and the ability to do it on his own and in his own way. Any form of paternalism exercised over him would abort the concept of German "model/humane" colonialism. So he had to break away from this paternalism by joining the Portuguese ship.

Apart from the need for the "ideal" German colonizer to develop independence, the need to shield him from the corrupting influence of other Europeans factors into Robinson's abandonment of the British ship. The German opinion of other Europeans as corrupt and morally debased generates the need for separate spaces. So, while the author is configuring the "pioneer" of German periphery enterprise, it is unimaginable to have him under the mentorship of a corrupt and avaricious British seaman (Germany's opinion of them). Considering that German periphery thoughts condemn the gain-seeking of other Europeans, Robinson has to be shielded from the corruption of materialism.

Robinson, however, joins the Portuguese ship on-route to Brazil with the desire to enrich himself with gold and precious stones. Again, we see the corruption of materialism threatening. The author, in the business of creating the “German model colonial ambassador,” knows what he wants out of him and would not “suffer his holy one to see corruption.”⁷¹ The Portuguese ship is no different from the British ship since the two ships belong to nations, which, in the German view, were already corrupted by materialist greed. However, it represents the only means by which the “German colonial ambassador” could be taken to the designate land. He had to sail with them, but at the right time, he would be separated from them.

On-route to Brazil, a six-day storm comes upon them, which they survive. While celebrating the sighting of land, which brings the hope of survival to them, the ship hits a sandbank and is broken. The passengers and crew jump into a lifeboat and were paddling to the safety of land when a strong storm hits them, drowning everyone else but Robinson, who turns up unconscious by the seaside. The author finally locates his protagonist in the ideal circumstances and environment for a German colonist. Through the shipwreck, The author solves all the associational problems that would have threatened the periphery project. The corruption that would have occurred from intermingling with other Europeans was eliminated by not allowing any other survivor, and the corruption that would have come from materialist acquisitiveness was eliminated by making sure that nothing is salvaged from the ship.

⁷¹ This is an allusion to God’s effort to keep Jesus, His holy One, from succumbing to temptations while he was still on earth. See *King James Bible*, Acts. 2. 27. Print.

The author's continued elimination of material gains from Germany's periphery conception is given further expression through the environment where he places his protagonist, an environment where gold, precious stones and other material natural valuables are in abundance, but have no value. The material greed that has been identified as major cause of the failure of Europeans to manifest the Enlightenment principles of humanity would have had a negative effect on the German colonist also. So, the author eliminates the chances entirely. Robinson, who succumbed to the prospect of filling his pocket with gold nuggets, finds a huge lump of gold and dumps it because it holds no value for him. With all these distractive factors eliminated, the author's protagonist is provided with the perfect environment to launch a mission that would develop on the principles of humanity.

The author's aversion to material gains seems to be absolute. This is highlighted in the context of the marooned British ship, which Freitag⁷² and Robinson discovered. By this time, Robinson, already establishing himself as the owner of the island, would have seen reason to enrich himself and his kingdom materially. However, this was not the case. Although there were huge amounts of gold and other precious materials, they did not stir Robinson's appetite (359). Instead of those, Robinson and Freitag took guns and accessories, tools, clothing, food and other things that would enhance their effort to render the island a place for abiding human community. Having survived the worst days of his sojourn on the island, one would have expected a revival of his appetite for material things. By abandoning the precious items, the author seems to emphasize the

⁷² Freitag is an islander, who Robinson rescued from cannibals as they were getting ready to slaughter him.

non-materialism-orientedness of German periphery conception. This uncompromised *Haltung* towards materialism suggests a “humane” colonial enterprise immune to the corruption of greed.

It is not only on the island that the author devalues material gains, but also in the lives of prospective German periphery colonists. This he communicates through the final fate that befalls Robinson on-route to Hamburg after twelve years on the islands. As he was almost home, another shipwreck occurs in which he lost all the wealth that he had justly acquired (467). Through the loss of his material acquisitions the author emphasizes the place of material gains within the German projections of periphery enterprise,

Er ist nun gerade wieder so reich, als er damals war, da er von Hamburg abfuhr. Vielleicht, daß die Vorsehung ihn deswegen alles wieder verlieren ließ, weil der Anblick seines Reichthums einen oder den andern leichtsinnigen jungen Menschen vielleicht hatte bewegen können, seinem Beispiel zu folgen, und auch aufs Gerathewol in die weite Welt zu gehen, um, so wie er, mit gefundenen Schätzen zurück zu kehren. (468)

This argument explains partly why Robinson could not sail in the British ship to Africa to do business and get rich. It also explains why he was shipwrecked before he could get to Brazil to “fill his pocket with gold corns.” From the German perspective, these were wrong motives behind periphery enterprise, and were not to be encouraged.

In Robinson’s fate, the only thing that matters is he and the environment where he has been cast. Having prepared his protagonist by shielding him from unprofitable professions (military and academic); by pulling him away from crippling paternalism (familial and public); by plunging him into difficult experiences (shipwreck, hunger and uncertainties); by eliminating the chances of material corruption, and, finally, by casting

him into reclusive living circumstances, his survival would depend on how he connects with and exploits the nature that surrounds him.

Germans in Search of Virgin Territories

Periphery agitators envisioned two possibilities, first, the discovery and occupation of undiscovered and unclaimed territories. Zantop deciphers this in the colonial historiography of Germans over decades, “A history in which Germans could become agents again . . . presenting the history of a German family who builds a peaceful colony on a formerly uninhabited island, thus establishing their place in the New World.”⁷³ The second option is to inherit the territories that would be taken away from the Spanish and the Portuguese, who they consider unworthy colonizers. Zantop,

The European man who would best fulfill the fantasy of colonial cultivator is the peaceful, moral German. And the territory where he could best exercise his superior skills is the colonies that Spain, the brutal exploiter, will be forced to give up. It is a space which is already populated by his primitive ‘brothers’ whom he can domesticate and educate, and/or by effeminate others who, although of different ‘blood,’ will profit vastly from the presence of these tall, bearded – and industrious! – whites.⁷⁴

Out of these two options, we could see that the author favors the first. The possibility of sharing the territory with other Europeans does not come into question for the author. So, his “ambassador” would have to discover a territory, previously uninhabited, claim it, cultivate it and Germanize it.

“Previously uninhabited” does not mean that there are no people living there or using the land. Rather, the term connotes the absence of European impression. As a

⁷³ Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 37.

⁷⁴ Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 97.

characteristic of European colonial geography, it is only the areas that Europeans occupy that are considered possessed/inhabited. So, conscious of Germany's living space problem, Robinson's mission would be meaningful if tailored towards locating a space without people.

This is an additional factor why Robinson could not continue with the British or the Portuguese ship. Other Europeans may have established dominant presence in those areas. The implication of this is that the space is not uninhabited. Robinson's mission, though not known to him, is to find and claim uninhabited territory. The author skillfully steers him away from Africa towards the Americas. It is also important to note that, at this time Africa had not become a factor of consideration for periphery activities among Germans. Their whole concentration was in the Americas and in the South Sea.⁷⁵ While settlement areas in the New World had been founded by German emigrants, it was not until the unification that state sponsored colonial activities were initiated and directed towards Africa.⁷⁶ So, a British ship sailing to Africa holds no prospects for Germany's periphery designs. Robinson, therefore, has to be rerouted.

The same argument underscores the elimination of the rest of the voyagers by the author. As he found an uninhabited Island, it was time to separate Robinson from the rest. As I have argued earlier, allowing the voyagers to survive the wreck would have created room for crisis on the island, and this would have aborted the fantasy of "model/humane" colonialism which Robinson was supposed to initiate. The Portuguese would have definitely dominated and patterned the island according to their colonial system. So, the

⁷⁵ Reusch, p. 101-02.

⁷⁶ See Friedrichsmeyer et al., introduction, p. 9.

best thing the author could do was to annihilate all the voyagers by the storm leaving Robinson as the sole survivor. Robinson stands alone, unchallenged as the lord of the island. Everything within the island – known and unknown, human, animal, plant – is subjected to his will to survive, his authority, ingenuity and industriousness. Robinson was not just cast into a natural environment, but was also recast as a *Naturmensch* and he had to do everything in the *Naturmensch* fashion in order to survive,

Alles, was wir in Europa haben, fehlte ihm. Er hatte kein Brod, kein Fleisch, kein Gartengewächs, keine Milch; und wenn er auch etwas zu kochen oder zu braten gehabt hatte, so fehlte es ihm doch an Feuer, an einem Bratspieß und an Töpfen. Alle Bäume, die er bisher gesehen hätte, waren von der Art, die man Kampeschenbäume nennt, die keine Früchte, sondern nur Blätter tragen. (41)

Campe reenacts the Edenic scenario in the Bible, where, after God had created Adam and Eve and placed them in the Garden of Eden, he told them to “Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.”⁷⁷ The Edenic nature is actually the kind of environment that Germans were seeking, an environment that has not experienced European corruption upon which they could apply the stamp of “humane” colonialism. From the placing of Adam in the Garden of Eden, according to the Christian faith, a unique population of the world began and spread. Adam and Eve were able to dominate the earth and exploit it and by that, they were able to insure the continuity of the ecosystem. The same assignment is designed for Robinson in this Edenic environment, and, like Adam and Eve, Robinson has to create the culture he requires to be able to subdue the land before him and establish dominion

⁷⁷ *King James Bible*, Gen. 1.28. Print.

over everything on the land. If he could do this in a humane way, then he is on the path to founding the “model/humane” colony Germans are aspiring to in their colonial discourse.

I do not intend to go into the details of what Robinson did or did not do to insure his survival and the subjugation of the island. All I can say is that Robinson did not fail in this assignment. The encounter with the natives that led to the rescue of Freitag is significant. While, before the incident, he had initiated the cultivation of plants and animals, land demarcation for ownership, the cooking and preservation of food, it was the encounter with the natives, which gave him his first human companion, Freitag, that marked his first fight against inhuman native practice – cannibalism. In that context, the crusade of civilizing the “primitive” natives had its full expression – using force to stop an inhuman practice while at the same time pointing in a new direction. Although Robinson did not possess any European weapons at this time, the fatal use of the self-made weapon at the slightest prompting suggests that he would have used a gun if he had any in the same way. However, the effect of the weapon is the same.

Freitag is overwhelmed by the incident that debilitates his assailants and his reaction was one of unreserved submission to Robinson’s power,

Der arme Flüchtling stand zwischen Furcht und Hofnung noch auf derselben Stelle, auf der ihm Robinson zugerufen hatte, ungewiß, ob das, was voring, zu seiner Errettung geschähe, oder ob die Reihe jetzt an ihn kommen werde. Der Sieger rief ihm abermals zu, und winkte ihm, herbei zu kommen. Er gehorchte; stand aber halb wieder stille, trat abermals etwas näher, und stand von neuem stille, und zwar mit sichtbarer Angst und in der Stellung eines Betenden. Robinson gab ihm alle ersinnliche Zeichen von Freundschaftsbezeugung, und winkte ihm abermals herzutreten. Er thats; doch kniete er alle zehn oder zwölf Schritte mit den demüthigsten Geberden nieder, als wenn er ihm danken, und zugleich ihm huldigen wollte. (251)

It is not clear whether it was Robinson's ability to overcome his assailants, the suddenness and unusualness of the whole incident, or Robinson's apparitional appearance that elicited such a reaction from the *Flüchtling*. That Robinson was wearing a mask gave him an extra human appearance that could have been interpreted as an apparition, „Robinson nahm hierauf seine Maske ab, um ihm ein menschliches und freundliches Gesicht zu zeigen; worauf er ohne Bedenken näher trat, vor ihm niederkniete, den Boden küßte, sich platt niederlegte, und Robinsons Fuß auf seinen Nacken setzte, vermuthlich zur Versicherung, daß er sein Sklave seyn wollte“ (251).

Whatever be the case, when Robinson removed the mask, the *Flüchtling* submitted unreservedly to him. The unreserved submission could be in recognition of his superior power on the one hand, and on the other, in appreciation for saving his life. Reinhold Forster introduces the alliance of civilization and weapons as he reports on how the use of the European guns paved the way for them to enter the hinterland in spite of the resistance from the natives (Forster, p. 164). The author emphasizes this task of civilization stating, „ihre unmenschlichen Sitten, liebe Lotte, wollen wir verabscheuen, aber nicht die armen Leute selbst, die ja nichts davor können, daß man sie nicht unterrichtet und erzogen hat“ (234). So, the guns pave the way for the European civilization to be propagated among the “savage” population. A question to ponder at this stage is, if the gun has been used so far to secure the loyalty of the periphery natives, what did the concept of “humane/model” colonialism do with it?

Freitag provides answers to Robinson's craving for a human companion. He desired a human being notwithstanding the identities he may be carrying,

„Ach!“ seufzte Robinson mit freudigem, aber doch auch zugleich mit wehmüthigem Herzen – „ach! Wie glücklich wäre ich jetzt, wenn ich nur einen einzigen Freund, nur irgend einen Menschen, und wäre er auch der armseligste Bettler, zu meinem Gesellschafter hätte, dem ich sagen könnte, daß ich ihn lieb hätte, und der mir wiedersagte, daß er mich auch lieb hätte!“ (106)

With Freitag around, Robinson was now able to express himself as in a human community, at least to an extent. Owing to the language and cultural barriers, their interaction was limited, but nevertheless, a bidirectional enculturation was taking place between them. Although there was not much going on between them apart from instructions from Robinson and execution from Freitag, the significance of Freitag's presence cannot be overemphasized. Through this simple instruction and execution interaction, Freitag's reorientation away from his native ways began to take place. On the other hand, Robinson was learning survival strategies from Freitag. More to Robinson's advantage, Freitag's presence generates the environment for humane practices – love, kindness, humaneness, tolerance and more – which facilitate the accommodation of both personal and cultural alterity.

Freitag's presence also provides the platform to initiate the project that brought Robinson to the island – the founding of periphery territory for Germans. As I have argued earlier, it was the search for a virgin territory where the Germans would rule and reign unchallenged that conditioned the movement of Robinson and his final placement in the island. While he was taming the animals, cultivating the plants, building community with birds and spiders, he never had the opportunity to say “I am” and/or “you are.” The presence of Freitag avails him the opportunity and he does, „Er gab ihm also durch Zeichen und Geberden zu verstehn, daß er ihn zwar in seinen Schutz genommen habe, aber nur unter der Bedingung eines strengen Gehorsams: daß er sich

also müsse gefallen lassen, alles das zu thun oder zu lassen, was er, sein Herr und König, ihm zu befehlen oder zu verbieten für gut erachten würde“ (261).

Robinson presents himself to Freitag as his Master and King. By this, Robinson establishes absolute domination of Freitag, and instrumentalizes him for the subjugation and domination of the island and its people. Although the author continuously gives the impression of Robinson being on a humanitarian mission, the colonial undertone of the whole project becomes manifest as soon as Robinson encounters the “other.” By the very first interaction with Freitag, Robinson institutes absolute and irreversible subjugation. It is only by such an absolute subjugation that colonization could succeed.

Robinson did not understand himself as a “German colonial ambassador.” Overwhelmed by solitude, he tried unsuccessfully to escape the island and return to Europe. His failure could be due to the fact that his assignment was not yet accomplished. Even though he had established himself as the king and the sovereign ruler of the island, he had not secured it as a personal (national/individual) property. His abandoning the island would have occasioned its return to its former status of “uninhabited/unpossessed” and, as such, available for other Europeans to claim. So the author puts a spin in his scheme and Robinson ends up where he started after surviving a storm. His continued stay on the island leads to the rescue of more people, who eventually constitute the foundational population of King Robinson’s Kingdom (colony), and insured the continuity of the kingdom when he would be gone.

The only means by which Robinson hopes to take over the island is by creating and imposing “culture” upon “nature.” The little “culture” he had already instituted is

partly instrumental to Freitag's total submission to him. Knellwolf argues, "The justification of the monarch's absolutist rule over his subjects is superscribed on the eulogized superiority of culture over nature."⁷⁸ While Robinson represents "culture," Freitag represents "nature" and, from the Eurocentric visual prism, needs to be culturated. The narrator generates further justification for the self-enthronement of Robinson over Freitag by telling his audience how kingly rule began,

Geht, Kinder, auf diese oder auf eine ähnliche Weise sind die ersten Könige in der Welt entstanden. Es waren Männer, die an Weisheit, an Muth und Leibesstärke andern Menschen überlegen waren. Daher kamen diese zu ihnen, um sie zu bitten, sie gegen wilde Thiere, deren es anfangs mehr gab, als jetzt, und gegen solche Menschen zu beschützen, die ihnen Unrecht thun wollten. – Dafür versprachen sie dann, ihnen in allen Stücken gehorsam zu seyn, und ihnen von ihren Heerden und von ihren Früchten jährlich etwas abzugeben, damit sie selbst nicht nöthig hatten, sich ihren Unterhalt zu erwerben, sondern sich ganz allein mit der Sorge für ihre Unterthanen beschäftigen könnten. (263)

The above explanation does not feature merely as information on the origin of kingly rulership, but presents a stage in the advent of culture. Kingly rulership is "culture," and since the struggle between Europeans and non-Europeans is founded reasonably on a culture/nature dichotomy, Robinson's self enthronement is "legitimate" and fits into a program of culturating of the natural people. So, Freitag's unreserved submission to the *königliche* authority of Robinson seals the terms of king/subject relationship and marks the inception of a governmental order. The island is no more available waiting to be possessed, or nameless, but rather is now a kingdom that belongs to King Robinson with Freitag as his subject General.

⁷⁸ Knellwolf, p. 12.

The politics of kingdom ownership, power and domain jurisdiction vis-à-vis non-subjects is invoked in the context of the marooned British ship and the goods Robinson and Freitag salvage from it. By statutory provisions, as informed by the narrator, a percentage of the valuables salvaged from the ship belongs to the ruler of the domain where the incident happens,

Diesem zufolge hatte Robinson das Recht, von allen Sachen, die er aus dem gestrandeten Schiffe retten konnte, gleich zwei Drittel als sein rechtmäßiges Eigenthum zu gebrauchen, wozu sie gut waren.

Zwei Drittel?

Ja; eins für Mühe und Arbeit, das andere als einziger rechtmäßiger Herr der Insel, bei welcher der Schifbruch sich ereignet hatte.

Ja, wer hatte ihn denn aber zum Herrn der Insel gemacht?

Die gesunde Vernunft. Ein Stück Landes, das bisher noch gar keinen Herrn gehabt hat, gehört natürlicher Weise dem zu, der es zuerst in Besitz nimmt. Und das war hier der Fall. (354-55)

The availability of European items transformed Robinson's persona, and the way King and subject regarded each other henceforth. While in the eyes of Freitag King Robinson continues to metamorphose into a kind of a god as the European items begin to impact his life, Freitag conversely continues to diminish in status before his King.

Of all the items salvaged from the ship, the weapons were most effective in the challenges of Robinson's colonial mission. While "culture" continues to make impression on Freitag, it was the display of European military image that shattered his self-worth irreversibly. Robinson appears in full military regalia and Freitag fails to recognize him,

Das erste, was Robinson zur Befriedigung seiner Neugierde vornahm, war daß er hinter einen Busch trat, sich daselbst ein Hemde und ein ganzes Kleid, welches eine Offizieruniform war, nebst Schuh und Strümpfen, anzog; dann einen Degen an die Seite steckte, einen Treffenhut aufsetzte und so auf einmal, wie umgeschaffen, hervortrat, und sich vor Freitag's erstaunten Augen dahin pflanzte. Dieser wich voll Bestürzung einige Schritte zurück, weil er in dem ersten Augenblick

wirklich zweifelhaft war, ob er seinen Herrn, oder ein anderes, vielleicht übermenschliches Wesen sehe. (361)

As argued by Zantop, the author's representation of the careers of Robinson's two elder brothers was disapproving. The author would not allow his protagonist to become a soldier. Why then did he outfit him with military equipment on the island? By permitting Robinson to become a "soldier" in the island, the author recognizes the inherency of violence in colonization efforts. It could also be argued that he is advocating a redirection of the European guns at the periphery instead of inland, suggesting the non-existence of unoccupied land anymore in Europe to fight for. On the reverse side of this argument is the view expressed by the narrator that the natives of Robinson's island are not *Menschen*, but only *Menschenähnliche* (234). Therefore, using the guns on them would not be out of place as a necessary option.

Before the intimidation through military regalia, Robinson had put Freitag through the humiliation of trying to eat with a fork. While Robinson displayed the European dexterity of eating with cutlery, Freitag, who does not know more than using his bare hands to eat, puts the food in his ears. In this representation of Freitag, the author betrays the European regard of periphery natives as animals. Handed a fork, Freitag lost even the physiological naturalness of the use of his hands to put food in his mouth. Mere putting a fork in his hand disoriented him. However, the significance of this is to accentuate the "culture" and civilization gap between the enlightened European Robinson and his "barbarian" subject; a portrait that would legitimize the culturating mission aim of the Germans.

As I have argued earlier, where culture fails to elicit the needed submission from the natives, the guns would do the job. Although Freitag has not displayed any act of defiance towards his king, Robinson still needs to demonstrate the ultimate force that pushes European periphery enterprise, the guns. Without preparing Freitag for what is to come, he lets off a cannon shot. The narrator communicates the effect of this on Freitag,

Stellte euch des armen Freitags Erstaunen und Erschrecken vor! Er stürzte, als wär er selbst getroffen, zu Boden, weil ihm plötzlich sein alter Aberglaube an den Tupan oder Donnerer wieder einfiel, für den er in dem ersten Augenblicke des Schreckens seinen Herrn selbst hielt. Er fiel, wie gesagt, zu Boden; dann legt' er sich auf die Knie, und streckte seine zitternden Hände gegen Robinson aus, als wenn er ihn um Gnade bitten wollte. Reden konnte er nicht. (363)

The reinforcement of unlimited and multidimensional *Überlegenheit* continues. From the military portrait that transformed him into *etwas Übermenschliches* to cannon shots that eventually turned him into *Tupan* and *Donnerer* (the gods of the island), Robinson's status continues to soar higher and higher, while that of Freitag continues to sink lower and lower. This widening gap between Robinson's and Freitag's status has been recognized by Zantop and attributed to the resurfacing of Robinson's Europeanist consciousness, which both fears and coverts the alterity embodied in the non-European,

However, the rational project of uplifting the 'savage' to the level of friend and 'guest' . . . is undermined by Krusoe's fear of Freitag's otherness. Thus, despite egalitarian intentions, Krusoe feels compelled to play 'king' with Freitag, using the word *cacique*, 'which the savage Americans use to denominate their chiefs. . . .' Rather than integrating Freitag into the master-servant framework of his culture, Krusoe the anthropologist, deferring to native power relations, inscribes himself into the sociopolitical structures of the new world. By becoming Friday's *cacique*, he makes sure that Freitag understands the nature of the hierarchy, for the time being. Equality, the moral imperative by which Krusoe supposedly operates, cannot be realized in the interaction between the European and the Native American as long as the latter's subjection and assimilation are not complete. Krusoe, his professions to friendship notwithstanding, slips into the king or

master role whenever the situation warrants. It is a role governed by political expediency, Campe suggests.⁷⁹

With the help of the guns, King Robinson, together with his General, Freitag, can assert themselves on the island, generating the conditions for the admission or exclusion of people into or from the island. Robinson's battle to claim the territory as his is on two fronts. On the one front, he has to fight off any encroachment by Europeans or natives on the island. The island is his domain and anyone who would enter it would have to be subjected to the rules and regulations established by the King of the island. On the other front, he has to fight against any acts that conflict with his sense of humanity. This battle started with Freitag and constitutes more in the battles against other "savages" that have "encroached" on his island as well as the British pirates who hijacked the British ship. While his battle against the natives was directed at their "primitive" practices including cannibalism, his battle against the Europeans was directed against materialist wantonness, which accounts for their failure as worthy ambassadors of European civilization/culture.

The encounters that led to the rescue of Freitag and his father, and later the Spaniard (Chapter 36), and the encounter with the English ship all attest to Robinson's efforts against any threats to his kingdom. Because the island is the abode of *Tupan* and some other gods, the islanders resort to it for one ritual or the other. This indicates that the island is reserved for a (sacred) purpose, and as such, possessed by the natives who use it. However, from the European perspective, it is both un-occupied and un-possessed. This fits into Reinhold Forster's standards of valuation by which he declared territories

⁷⁹ Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 111.

unoccupied, but just resorted to, as un-possessioned.⁸⁰ It is only when the island is inhabited that it qualifies as possessioned. However, this does not inhibit European encroachment if there is no existing European presence. The narrator informs of how the right of ownership is established from the European perspective (355).

The more people Robinson has, the safer he feels and the more secure is his kingdom. This was because the increasing number of subjects provides not only the hands needed for the cultivation and the defense of the island against any incursions, but also broadens the spectrum for administrative activities that underscore the emerging portrait of the island as a colonial kingdom with Robinson as the sovereign King,

Und nun machten die beiden Wirthe Anstalt zu einer erquickenden Abendmahlzeit. Freitag wurde abgeschickt ein junges Lama zu holen, und Robinson besorgte das Übrige. Dieser konnte nicht umhin zu lächeln, da ihm der Gedanke einfiel, daß er einem ordentlichen Könige nun immer ähnlicher werde. Die ganze Insel war sein Eigenthum; seine Unterthanen, die ihm alle ihr Leben verdanken, hingen lediglich von seinem Willen ab, und waren verbunden, wenn es seyn mußte, Leib und Leben für ihn zu wagen. (413)

The above quote provides insight into the commonality that Robinson's subjects share. They all owe their lives to him because he rescued them from cannibalistic natives. This is significant in the political constitution of the kingdom.

The subjects did not come from somewhere requesting to be granted the privilege of residency in the island. If this were the case, they would have owed nothing more to Robinson's goodwill than their residency in the island, and their residency would have been out by their own choice. The circumstances that brought these individuals to the island ascribes a Messianic posture to Robinson, who delivered them all from an

⁸⁰ Forster, p. 26.

imminent death – Freitag and his father, Donnerstag (as he was renamed by Robinson), the Spaniard, the voyagers on the English ship – crew and pirates. On such a Messianic status, his position commands limitless loyalty from them all. This setup fits the German fantasy of unproblematic “model/humane” colonialism according to which the natives would be ever grateful to the Germans. Friedrichsmeyer et al. write,

Moreover, predating German colonialism by centuries, colonial fantasies generated a colonialist predisposition and the ‘colonial legend’ of the moral, hard-working German colonizer of superior strength and intelligence who—unlike other colonizers—was loved like a father by his ever-grateful native subjects. As stories of benign patriarchal relations, these colonial fantasies reflected the fantasy of the *Vater Staat* who—through the *Landesvater*—would take care of his obedient children.⁸¹

Robinson’s colony-founding mission experiences another dimension. As argued by Reinhold Forster, an increase in population creates the need for agricultural practices. The dependence on nature for subsistence ceases to be sufficient for the sustenance of the population.⁸² Robinson discusses the plan for expanded agricultural activities to cater for the increasing population of his kingdom, „Vorher aber mußte dafür gesorgt werden, daß ein, wenigstens zehnmahl größerer Acker umgearbeitet und bestellt würde; weil die Vergrößerung der Kolonie auch eine Vergrößerung des täglichen Aufwandes an Nahrungsmitteln zur Folge hatte“ (428). Converting “natural” lands into “cultured” lands is an aspect of the cultural colonialism that Germans envisioned.

With the anticipation of more subjects, as the Spaniard and Freitag’s father prepare to sail to the hinterland to bring over rescued Europeans, who were residing among the natives (427), Robinson takes a further step towards consolidating his colony

⁸¹ Friedrichsmeyer et al., introduction, p. 20.

⁸² Forster, p. 152.

in the pattern of European civilization by generating a code of conduct (a quasi-constitution) that would guide life and living on the island. This development also draws from Reinhold Forster's observations and recommendations as he discusses the organized format of European life vis-à-vis the primitive societies. Clearly spelled out laws, rules, codes of conduct and other regulatory measures are prominent features of European societies and civilization, which contrast with the periphery societies. It is possible for Robinson to control and regulate the life of subjects when they are just a few, but with the possibility of population increase, laid down guiding principles become mandatory.

The consideration of a formal regulatory system arises also from the fact that the expected new members are Europeans who are already used to systematized regulatory measures. The absence of a formal regulatory system would have been understood differently, and would have been exploited to perpetrate some "indiscipline" by the Europeans. So, Robinson introduces the code of conduct to eliminate the risk of chaos and rebellion, and to secure his position as the sovereign Lord of the island. The narrator informs, „Robinson freuete sich über die Treue seines neuen Unterthans, und that, was derselbe ihm gerathen hatte. Die Bedingungen die er aufsetzte, waren folgende: ‚Wer auf Robinson's Insel leben, und an den Bequemlichkeiten, die sie darbietet, Antheil nehmen will: der muß sich verpflichten: . . . “ (429-30). Robinson dictates a five point code of conduct. At the end of it he commands, „Jeder wird ermahnt, diese Punkte erst reiflich zu überlegen, und seinen Nahmen, statt einer eidlichen Versicherung, nur dann erst zu unterschreiben, wann er völlig entschlossen ist, ihnen in allen Stücken nachzuleben“ (430). Having put a set of rules in place, Robinson proceeds to institute a formal government with the Spaniard at the head thereof for the duration of his absence (461).

In Robinson's handover speech, he again reiterates his sole ownership of the island and refers to his abode as „*mein Burg*.“ By this, he emphasizes his status as the king of the island. Robinson does not use *übernehmen* as he hands the mantle over to the Spaniards. This would have meant an irreversible transfer of the colony to the Spaniard (Spanish), but instead, he uses *vertreten*, which inheres temporariness and suggests a future return, „Ich erkläre demnach, daß diese beiden Spanier künftig meine Stelle vertreten, und an meiner Statt die rechtmäßigen Herren der Insel seyn sollen“ (461). The author again invokes a biblical episode here, re-enacting the commissioning of the apostles by Jesus as representatives in his stead pending his return.⁸³ The future return may not necessarily bring Robinson back, but, as the underlying purpose of the project suggests, will be the actualization of the placement of Germans in the periphery space as “model/humane” colonists.

The complete silence on the approximate date or time of return of the King to the island could be interpreted in relation to the uncertain state of German nationalist politics. That the territory has been founded for the Germans is not to be contested, but when the Germans would be ready to take full possession and control is still uncertain. The ambassador has finished his work and must return to announce the terrain readied for full German possession. However, while the King leaves, the territory has to continue under an organized administrative system failing which it may fall back to barbaric and primitive ways. Installing the Spaniard, though not the best choice based on Germany's negative view of the Spanish, was the only option King Robinson has, under the circumstances, for inevitable regency arrangements. Of all the Europeans to be left

⁸³ *King James Bible*, Acts. 1. 8.

behind in the island, only the Spaniards had spent time with the natives, and probably attained the perfection that, according to Herder, the return to nature works in the human being. Their request to be left behind in the island could be a testimony to the regeneration they have experienced from their prolonged interaction with nature.

“Humane/Model” Colonialism in Practice

“Humane/model” considerations dominated Germany’s colonial discourse. Everything that is built into the fantasy – exploitation of the resources of the land (as a way of taking the people and land forward), the elevation of the local population through miscegenation, the culturization and civilization of the natives, and more, are considered within the context of “humane/model” colonialism. From the scientific discourse of Reinhold Forster to Campe’s literarized experiment, humane considerations take center stage. In the *Observations* (1778), Reinhold Forster subtly generates the image of “better” colonist for Germans by directly condemning the vices of other Europeans in the periphery on one hand, and making allusions to unidentified prospective colonists on the other.⁸⁴ In *Robinson der Jüngere*, Campe demonstrates the workability of “model/humane” colonialism.

While Reinhold Forster’s idea of “model/humane” colonialism is traceable to the colonist’s Enlightenment orientation, Campe’s derives from Christian orientation. Reinhold Forster, in his discussion of the religious practices of the islands, did not condemn them outright or try to blame their religion for their “barbaric” ways, neither did he trace the vices of colonizing nations to lack of religiosity. Rather, he finds the basis for

⁸⁴ See Reusch, p. 111.

every wrong practice on the possession or lack of Enlightenment *Fertigkeiten*. But for Campe, Enlightenment plays a muted role, while religiosity and godliness are on the forefront. Whether it is Enlightenment or religiosity, both of them express the primacy of “humane” considerations in periphery colonialism.

Robinson’s background does not indicate any religiosity. His indifference to the things of God is pointed out in the narrative, “Er tadelte sich nun selbst, daß er so wenig Vertrauen zu der göttlichen Vorsehung gehabt habe“ (42). His first conscious reference to God happens on the seaside, „Vor Freud’ und Schrecken zitternd warf er sich auf die Knie, hob seine Hände gen Himmel, und dankte mit lauter Stimme, und unter einem Strom von Thränen, dem Herrn des Himmels und der Erde, der ihn so wunderbar erretten, da er die andern Leute alle ertrinken ließ“ (32). From that point on, he never ceased to refer to God whether in protest, in petition or in gratitude.

That Robinson’s humane orientations came as a result of his religious orientation in the island cannot be denied. From the time he regains consciousness, everything that happens to him, contributing to his survival, more especially at the earlier stage, when he cannot do anything for himself, he recognizes as a miracle. Through these experiences he continues to develop a positive consciousness of and a dependence on God. Robinson, who never showed interest in anything as a loafer in Hamburg, begins to show interest in God and, with that, in every other thing around him. The mercy and kindness he is getting from God compels him to regard the humans around him with a measure of mercy and kindness too. We should also bear in mind that the Christian religion emerged in the European colonial discourse as an agent of cultururation and civilization. So, for Robinson

to qualify as a “German colonial ambassador,” he needed to develop the “Christinian”⁸⁵ European identity.

Even before Robinson encounters the first human being on the island, humane responsibilities were already generated for him, „Nein; die Länder, wo es jetzt noch einige von diesen armen Menschen giebt, sind so weit von hier, daß niemals welche zu uns kommen. Auch werden ihrer immer weniger, weil die andern gesitteten Menschen, die dahin kommen, sich Mühe geben, sie auch klug und artig zu machen“ (38). Robinson must be able to fulfill these expectations. Apart from forging a bond with God, the anti-materialism conditioning eliminated greed, which could breed inhumanity. His reaction to the gold he found confirms this,

Statt sich über den gefundenen Schatz zu freuen, stieß er ihn verächtlich mit dem Fuße fort und sprach: ‚da liege, du elender Klumpen, wornach die Menschen so begierig zu seyn pflegen! Was nüttest du mir! O hätte ich statt deiner ein gut Stück Eisen gefunden, woraus ich mir vielleicht eine Art oder ein Messer hätte schmieden können! Wie gern gäbe ich dich für eine Handvoll eiserner Nägel oder für irgend ein nützliches Werkzeug hin!‘ Und so ließ er den ganzen kostbaren Schatz mit Verachtung liegen, und würdigte ihn nachher kaum eines Blicks im Vorbeigehen. (108)

Subjecting him to a state of utter solitude also contributes to his development of humane tendencies. Suddenly removed from an environment of human sociability to one of isolation, Robinson begins to appreciate the value of community, hence his desperate wish for a friend, even if that is the most miserable beggar on earth (105). Thus desperate, he is conditioned to cherish any human being that would come his way whether civilized/cultured or primitive. The emergence of Freitag provides him with the stage to exercise the humane propensities he has developed. Nothing between the two –

⁸⁵ See Knellwolf, p. 24.

Freitag and Robinson – other than their humanity, strikes a note of compatibility. Religion, food, clothing, housing, language, values, and the list goes on, all represent contrasting variations and valuations. Looking at the description and classification that Reinhold Forster made of the natives in *Observations* (1778), one could see that, Robinson has come face-to-face with them in Freitag, and he has to generate credibility for Germans' claim of being "better" colonizers through the way he deals with the alterity which Freitag represents.

In his first encounter with natives, Robinson kills a man in the bid to rescue Freitag; he then instructs Freitag to kill another of his assailants, who had been wounded by Robinson (252). While the murder of the first man is to save Freitag, the second murder is to eliminate the danger of betraying a rival existence in the island to the natives. As the narrator reports, Robinson gave Freitag the responsibility of killing the second assailant because he did not want to shed more blood himself. The humane impression which Campe tries to communicate here is shaky. However, he succeeds in sustaining the humane project unhurt by locating the killing within the frame of self-preservation. Robinson has to kill in order to, first, save someone else, and, second, to conceal his existence on the island from the natives.

The message the author seems to communicate is, even within the frame of humane considerations, killing or hurting the other is justified if one is under the threat of being killed or hurt. While Robinson is still very vulnerable, eliminating any threats remains his best option and chance of surviving and possessing the island. This killing and the subsequent ones, when the Spaniard was rescued, do not violate the German

concept of “humane” colonialism. Instead, it is excusable on the grounds of self-preservation and ridding the space of inhuman “elements” and practices.

Chapter Four

Germany and Colonial Reality: Acquisition and Consolidation

After decades of fantasizing about colonialism, Germans eventually took steps to turn fantasy into reality. It is important to note that the initial moves were not made by Germany as a nation, but by individual Germans, who, by way of adventure or business ventures, found vantage positions to initiate colonial maneuvers. There were multiple significant political and socio-economic factors that contributed to Germany's drive for colonies, primarily the founding of the German Reich in 1871 and the overall shifting structure of the German society from agrarian to industrial. In addition, pressure from special interest groups at home, and trading companies in the periphery, who sought government presence for both protection and legitimizing of claims, as well as literary configurations, all played a vital role in bringing about Germany's expansionist program in the periphery. John Lowe describes these developments as follows,

Bismarck's colonial ventures began at a time when Germany's diplomatic situation was very strong. With the conclusion of the Triple Alliance in 1882 and the renewal of the *Dreikaiserbund* in 1884, during a period of calm in the Balkans, Bismarck was able to feel unusually relaxed about Germany's security. The economic situation, on the other hand, was much less favourable. Falling demand for manufactured goods fuelled fears that Germany was in the throes of a crisis of 'over-production', which led to pressure to find new markets, or to expand existing ones, for German exports. It was thought that such markets would be more secure if the state increased its political influence in the region, if necessary through annexation. Nor were Germans more immune than other Europeans to the pipe-dream of vast colonial riches to be won, as shown by their view of east Africa as 'second India'.

Trading companies in Hamburg and Bremen, which already had well-established links with West Africa and Zanzibar, were also seeking more active support from the German government to protect their interests against possible French or British discriminatory practices or tariffs.¹

¹ John Lowe, *The Great Powers, Imperialism and the German Problem, 1865-1925* (London:

In this chapter, using the literary and non-literary texts already presented in the previous chapters, I will delineate how Germany's colonial ambition evolved further from fantasy to reality. The chapter will be divided into two sections. Section one will focus on the domestic circumstances leading to the acquisition of the colonies, and the activities of Germany's pioneer colonist in East Africa, Carl Peters. Friedrich Fabri's *Bedarf Deutschland der Colonien? Eine politisch-ökonomische Betrachtung* (1879), and Balder Olden's *Ich bin Ich. Der Roman Carl Peters* (1927), will be the primary texts for section one.

Section two will focus on the efforts and activities of German colonial officers to consolidate the East African territories under German control. For this section, Frieda von Bülow's *Der Konsul. Ein vaterländischer Roman aus unseren Tagen* (1891), and *Im Lande der Verheißung* (1899) will be used as fictional examples that nevertheless convey aspects of reality.

Section i. Acquisition of Colonies. (Friedrich Fabri's *Bedarf Deutschland der Colonien?*, 1879. Balder Olden's *Ich bin Ich*, 1927)

Fabri's text is a colonial treatise by Friedrich Fabri, an evangelical theologian and pastor, who had much interest in Germany's colonial question. He was one of the most committed colonial agitators of his time, who believed strongly that Germany's survival and success as a nation lay in periphery colonialism. He builds his arguments for German colonial participation around five major developments in Germany in the 19th century – rapid industrialization, population explosion, the mass emigration of Germans, the question of the German Navy, and the leadership role of German scholars in

geographic and ethnographic research in the periphery. Fabri advocates three kinds of colonies for Germany – *Ackerbau-Colonien*, *Handels-Colonien*, and *Straf-Colonien*.

The *Ackerbau-Colonien* should become satellite German states to attract emigrating Germans. The purpose was to keep them from melting into and enriching other nations such as North America, which was dominated by British and French emigrants. At the time, these two nations were the greatest threats to Germany in Europe. Fabri maintains that, *Ackerbau-Colonien* will allow German emigrants to keep their *Deutschtum*, and a link with the fatherland, and the fruits of their exploits would always flow back to the fatherland.

Handels-Colonien, coming from a purely economic perspective, would offer Germany the badly needed market for her industrial products as well as sources of raw materials. Furthermore, *Handels-Colonien* legitimize the development of a strong German Navy. Fabri reasons that the great wealth of Holland and Great Britain resulted from their immense overseas trade, and Great Britain's naval dominance responds to the need to defend her numerous colonies.² For Fabri, building a great navy is contingent on establishing periphery colonies and maritime businesses across the globe.

Additionally, Fabri laments that, while German scholars have dominated geographic and ethnographic research in the periphery, other nations have benefitted from their research, „Aber sollen wir auch in diesen Gebieten nur die für alle Welt sammelnden und forschenden Theoretiker sein und bleiben? Sollen wir fortwährend von der Studirstube aus in allen Welttheilen wohl zu Hause sein, ohne irgendwo in

² See Fabri, pp. 39-40.

überseeischen Gebieten ein nationales Heim wiederzufinden?“ (11-12) His advocacy is that Germany should benefit from the labor of her citizens by founding colonies in the periphery as other nations do.

According to John A. Hobson, Fabri's *Bedarf Deutschland der Colonien?* (1879) is considered “the most vigorous and popular treatise” produced by the German colonial movement, and it has constantly been referred to as a key statement of German expansionist propaganda.³ The relevance of this text to my project lies in its classification as one of the prominent works in the agitation for Germany's periphery colonial expansion. This text outlines several core arguments that stirred up an intense quest for colonies, and conditioned Germany's initial approach to colony acquisition. I consider it the linking document between fantasy and reality by articulating existential circumstances in the agitation for colonialism, thereby making colony acquisition more urgent than ever.

Balder Olden's text is a biographical narrative on the life and activities of the father of Germany's East African colonial enterprise, Carl Peters (1856-1918). The significance of this text is self-evident. Peters' operations, approaches and writings were fundamental to Germany's colonial practices in Africa, and this text offers a good understanding of Peters as a person, and how he emerged as Germany's pioneer colonist in East Africa. The novel presents a high school boy endowed with virtue and vices, determination, obsessive ambitiousness, unparalleled leadership and organizational ability, with unreflective callousness and self-oriented glory-craving. Peters achieves a

³ John A. Hobson, *Imperialism: a Study* (New York: James Pott and Co., 1902) 19. Print.

sacred status for himself at school, even beyond the powers of the school administration. His ambition was to become a philosopher and a university professor.

An invitation from his uncle, Karl Engel, takes him to London with leanings towards making him his heir. An anticipated colonial position under the British crown in India is built into an envisaged marriage to an aristocratic lady. Peters declines this proposal, and focuses on winning a philosophy chair at the University of Leipzig. However, while in London, he rapes his uncle's young fiancée, Elizabeth, before he returns to Germany. A confessional letter to his uncle Karl, whether out of remorse or self-aggrandizement, gets to him on the eve of his wedding, and he dies supposedly of a heart attack. His death, being so sudden, he did not revise his will in which he had bequeathed his wealth on Carl Peters.

While in London, Peters is exposed to the English gentleman life style. An earlier meeting with an English noble lady, Maud Louistone generates an obsession, which later leads to a strong familial affinity with the lady's father, Mr. Georges Louistone. Through this connection, Peters is introduced to the business of colonialism in Africa. While vacationing with the Louistones in Africa, he cultivates the dream of founding colonies for Germany. He turns his back on the goodwill of Georges Louistone in order to pursue his dream.

Back in Berlin in 1884, he rallies some high school friends and shares his dreams and plans with them. It is necessary to note that it was during this brief stay in Berlin that he made contact with Frieda von Bülow, who, as we shall see later, would become an important figure in Peters' colonial endeavor, and in Germany's colonial discourse in

general. With the support of these friends, he leaves for Africa funded by private investors enthused by the African colonial scheme. However, they left without the support of the Berlin Government. After a few weeks, he was able to secure some territories by treaties with native rulers. As Berlin recognizes his enterprise, he gets radical, driven by his passionate hatred of the British. This leads to tension between London and Berlin, forcing Berlin to re-evaluate her East African colonial enterprise in relation to Germany's declared interest in East-European expansion. Peters falls out of favor with Berlin, and was recalled to Germany.

He was, however, sent back to Africa in 1891 as *Reichskommissar* and, while serving in this capacity, he spent his time writing about the natives, while committing all kinds of barbaric crimes against them. On account of his barbaric treatment of natives as a colonial agent, he was tried and banished from Germany's colonial territories. He defected to the British and continued to serve as a colonial officer under the British flag. Carl Peters' activities in East Africa will be discussed in detail later.

The historicity of this text is evident. Peters' outstanding intellectual ability at school, his stay in London with Karl Engel, Karl Engel's suicide, Peters' exposure to colonial politics through the British enterprise and more are historical realities from which Olden derived his narration.

Domestic Circumstances (Fabri's *Bedarf Deutschland der Colonien?*, 1879)

As I have discussed earlier, Germany's involvement in periphery colonialism was not an administratively determined venture. Although the colonial question saturated the socio-sphere, Bismarck's government did not give it any meaningful considerations,

favoring Eastern-European expansion in its stead. So, periphery colonialism emerged at first out of individual ventures. Juhani Koponen comments on the German government's politics towards colonialism,

I emphasize the element of haphazardness in the establishment of German rule in mainland Tanzania and its fragile and makeshift nature. German colonialism was not the result of a premeditated blueprint imposed by a superior vision and will. That the Germans came to colonize the area which we now know as mainland Tanzania was the result of a series of historical accidents. The Germans, and other colonial agents besides, arrived in Africa with very diffuse notions concerning their aims and the means available to them. They faced an environment which they did not know, over which they had no mastery.⁴

German colonialism was, as Juhani rightly observed, an outcome of various projected metamorphoses of the society, both real and unreal.

Fabri looks at the portrait of the domestic society from different aspects – political, economic, social, and military. He also considers it in relation to external factors – her status and prospects outside Europe relative to other European powers; the need for and the establishment of foreign trade, and the establishment of a world standard navy. Weaving the different aspects of Germany's existential circumstances together, he projects a gloomy future of national implosion if a solution is not found urgently. The solution, as he argues, lies in acquiring periphery colonies like other European nations. His work could be summarized as a clarion call for Germany to either pursue expansionism through periphery colonialism or implode.

I have already pointed out that Germany's achievement of super-power status through the quick victories in the three wars against Denmark, Austria, and France

⁴ Juhani Koponen, "Colonialism and Development: The Case of Mainland Tanzania During the German Period," *Proceedings of the Thirty-Seventh Annual Meeting of the African Studies Association*, November 3-6 (1994): 6. N.p. Print.

marked a new beginning, which was to be followed by other great deeds testimonial to a great nation. This meant, among other issues, the pursuit of naval primacy, the expansion of territorial space, the creation of international markets through enlarged mercantile operations and so much more. Although, these projects were more or less viewed as isolated, they were all linked together by one major factor – „*die Colonial-Frage*.“ So, Fabri makes the „*Colonial-Frage*“ the central beam onto which other components of his polemics are fastened.

In Chapter three of this project, I pointed out that the acquisition of colonies was seen by some Germans as a natural sequence to the founding of the German empire in 1871. With the victory over France, Germany established herself as a vital European power, opening up the desire for global power status as Matthew S. Seligmann and Roderick R. McLean acknowledge,

The creation of a unified Reich had transformed Prussia into a European power of the first rank. The next stage in the hierarchy of states was that of world power and Germany could only achieve such a position by acquiring a global importance of the kind possessed by the likes of Britain, France or Russia. To do that, Germany required colonies.⁵

This follows the trend of other powers' involvement in the periphery. Fabri references this thinking among Germans at the very beginning of his work, „Schon einmal, unter dem ersten Freudenrausch über das neu gebildete Deutsche Reich . . . durchflogen unsere Presse flüchtige Rufe nach Colonien, die in ein Paar Brochuren bestimmtere Gestalt anzunehmen versuchten“ (1).

⁵ Matthew S. Seligmann and Roderick R. McLean, *Germany from Reich to Republic 1871-1918* (New York: Saint Martin's Press, 2000) 46. Print.

The uncertain future of the Reich, as Fabri argues, arose from the drop in agricultural productivity, the rapid population increase, the stagnation of the national economy, and the rise in social disgruntlement among citizens. After outlining all these, he declares,

Darüber sind wohl Alle einig, daß nicht mehr viele Fehler gemacht werden dürfen. Aber es ist auch eine patriotische Pflicht, allen Möglichkeiten, die eine breitere und gesichertere Entwicklung unserer nationalen Arbeit und damit unseren nationalen Wohlstandes verheißen, aufmerksam nachzudenken. Und unter diesen Aufgaben weisen wir der Frage: „Bedarf das Deutsche Reich des Colonial-Besitzes?“ eine sehr hervorragende Bedeutung zu. (3)

The whole discussion in the book is a response to the above referenced question, and an effort to underscore Germany's need for colonies.

Fabri identifies the British mercantilist free-trade practice as the reason the German government does not take colonial questions seriously (6). In the politics of *Handels-Freiheit*, Fabri detects a calculated maneuver by the British to dissuade Germany from vying for colonies in the periphery. This conjecture is established on the basis of *Handels-Colonien*. With the guarantee of commercial freedom to German businesses by British administrations, German need to acquire colonies for business purposes is rendered dormant, while the British continued to hoist their flag whenever and wherever they found the opportunity to do so. Fabri tries to provoke a re-evaluation of the British free-trade principle in juxtaposition with Germany's colonial needs beyond Europe.

Fabri's discomfort is validated by the experiences of German merchants and farmers at the hands of other European colonists. The Fiji Islands episode is an example,

The English, however, speedily realized the worst fears of the settlers and consuls. In the first place, they enacted the *Statute of Limitations* which cancelled all debts contracted by the Fijian inhabitants before the year 1871, thereby dealing a severe blow to the German merchants, ‘who for many years had been creditors for considerable sums;’ and in the second place, they dispossessed the German settlers and evicted them from their lands and building without indemnity.⁶

Fabri also presents the argument of Germany’s naval aspirations. While he is not against the idea of a great navy to correspond with the greatness of the army, he ties that to the availability of colonial and maritime business that would need protection. He, therefore, makes the acquisition of colonies the bait for the pursuit of naval prominence (8). Speaking economically, he compares Germany’s naval aspirations with Britain’s naval prominence, justifying Britain’s naval prominence on the availability of tremendous overseas property and huge maritime business, which require protection, and which generates enough capital to sustain the navy. However, Germany’s miniature status in overseas property and maritime business makes a huge investment in a naval force unnecessary and unrealistic. So he declares, „Für England ist ein solches Vorgehen eine Notwendigkeit, für Deutschland im Blick auf seine wirklichen maritimen Interessen bis jetzt doch wohl ein Luxus“ (9).

Fabri does not just argue for making the naval venture productive, but goes ahead to discuss how that would happen – colony acquisition. He links economic buoyancy to colony acquisition and recognizes that, as in the case of Britain and France, it is the source from which the funding and sustenance of an expansive naval venture will come. In order to justify his argument for colony acquisition, he references the periphery activities of German scholars over time, from which other nations have been benefitting.

⁶ Townsend, p. 57. Print.

Using this perspective, Fabri presents a moral argument for Germany's involvement in periphery colonialism. Fabri is, however, under no illusions about Berlin's minimal interest in periphery colonialism. Aware that any colonial undertaking needs the governments support to be successful, he challenges the government to wake up to the demand of the time – periphery colonialism (12).

Fabri's reference to German intellectuals' contribution to periphery scholarship as a moral justification for Germany's involvement in periphery colonialism reinforces the argument of instrumentalized intellectualism discussed in chapter three. From the issues raised in that discussion, it was established that the elevation and pursuit of intellectualism among Germans, though not initially meant for colonial purposes, metamorphosed into a tool for *Ausgrenzung/Eingrenzung*. A demarcatory wall, a differentiating marker, emerges between the *Eingegrenzte* and the *Ausgegrenzte*, and this marker was continuously reinforced in order to 1) sustain and consolidate the attributes that define the groups, and 2) eliminate the chances of "contaminating" interaction between the groups. While discussing boundaries in the society, Bernhard Giesen states,

Within the real interaction processes and social relations, boundaries are what separate and divide. They mark the difference between inside and outside, strange and familiar, relatives and non-relatives, friends and enemies, culture and nature, enlightenment and barbarism. Precisely because these borders are contingent social constructions, because they could be drawn differently, they require social reinforcement and symbolic manifestations.⁷

Thus, it becomes clear that polarized relations is a natural component of bordered environments, and in polarized relations, disharmony and hostilities (sometimes) are

⁷ Bernhard Giesen, *Intellectuals and the Nation. Collective Identity in a German Axial Age*, trans. Nicholas Levis & Amos Weisz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998) 13. Print.

inherent. The instrumentalization of knowledge generated the boundaries that defined the German away from the “other.”

Seeing how their intellectual exercise was being instrumentalized by other nations for periphery colonialism, Germans began to reject the role of “servants” by agitating for active involvement in the periphery. Fabri, privileging the intellectual achievements of Germans in periphery research, which compares disharmoniously with Germany’s backwardness in colony possession, laments,

so wollen wir hier doch Das hervorheben, daß eine starke deutsche Einwanderung in die Vereinigten Staaten forthin Deutschland doppelt beschädigt. Nicht nur negativ, als ein für Deutschland unproduktiv werdender Abfluß von Menschen und Capital, sondern auch positiv, indem unsere Auswanderer nicht mehr, wie früher, im Wesentlichen nur Nahrungsmittel erzeugen, sondern auch der nordamerikanischen Industrie wohlfeile Arbeitskräfte in reichster Auswahl bieten und dieselbe damit um so mehr befähigen werden, der deutschen Industrie allüberall Concurrenz zu machen. So wird die unvermeidlich immer größer werdende deutsche Auswanderung, wenn nicht organisirt und in eigene Ackerbau-Colonien geleitet, an der wirtschaftlichen Verarmung Deutschlands forthin unmittelbar kräftig mitarbeiten. (25)

Reinhold Forster’s role in Captain Cook’s expedition is axiomatic of the servant role of German intellectuals to other nations. We should recall that it was Reinhold Forster’s text that discussed the socio-cultural and econo-political lifestyle of the natives of the South Seas. Such in-depth study of the natives probably furnished colonizing nations, such as Britain, with the knowledge they needed to develop a strategy of non-provocative rapprochement with the natives. It was this initial friendly approach, perfected by the missionary arm of the colonial agency, which paved the way for eventual colonization that became propelled and sustained with the force and violence that it inheres. As also discussed in the previous chapter, this in-depth ethnographic and

anthropological knowledge, made available more by German researchers than others, enhanced Germany's fantasy of a "model/humane" colonialism.⁸

Fabri discusses the problem of emigration of Germans as a drain on the nation's human resources. As he argues, there is no way a nation can sustain her economic-political position in the global society if she continues to lose her citizens in great numbers every year. While he recognizes this as a common European problem, he argues that Germany contributes the highest number of emigrants to the exodus. Reusch presents the immigration figures for Germans into the US between 1683 and 1800.⁹ Fabri laments that, while other nations, such as Britain, have managed to found territories (Australia, New Zealand) for their emigrants to settle in, Germans had nowhere they could call "home" outside Germany (15).

Fabri's worries over the loss of Germans to other nations stems also from the dilution of the "Germanness" of the emigrants who get swallowed up by the dominant population in the new environments. Being outnumbered and unable to retain or generate their own identity, the emigrants melt into the culture of the dominant group and lose their German identity. Wehler comments on the emigration epidemic and national feelings about it,

Ein Phänomen, das die Expansionspublizistik, aber gelegentlich auch allgemein die Öffentlichkeit und Regierung beschäftigt hat, ist die deutsche Auswanderung nach Übersee gewesen. Sie wurde häufig als schwerwiegender Verlust nationaler Kraft empfunden, als ein schlimmer Aderlaß, der das Reich wertvoller Substanz beraubt. Anstatt als ‚Völkerdünger‘ wirtschaftlichen Konkurrenten

⁸ Reusch, p. 111.

⁹ Reusch, p. 118.

wie vor allem den Vereinigten Staaten zugute zukommen, sollte die Auswanderung in deutschen Siedlungskolonien gleichsam wieder aufgefangen und nutzbar gemacht werden.¹⁰

In Fabri's view, the solution to this problem is *Ackerbau-Colonien*. The idea is to establish territories to which German emigrants could be channeled or attracted to, where they can build a German community, propagate German culture, and thereby correspondingly safeguard their *Deutschtum*. On the economic aspect, *Ackerbau-Colonien* will serve the added purpose of retaining the emigrants as diasporic human resources benefitting the fatherland in the long run through the bi-directional flow of goods, wealth, services, and more. Discussing Fabri's *Ackerbau-Colonien* as nationalistic colonialism, Juhani states,

The supporters of nationalistic, or emigrationist, colonialism saw the function of colonies more in nationalist and social-imperialist terms. They spoke of the economic profitability of colonialism at least as much as the others, but ultimately they regarded colonies less as immediate economic assets and more as overseas extension of German society and German influence. . . .

The ultimate aim of nationalistic colonialism was the propagation and planting of 'Germanness' abroad; this Germanness was represented by the local German colonists, and both the indigenous people and the colonial state were there to serve them.¹¹

Fabri's choice of colony acquisition as the only remedy to the problem of emigration suggests, among other things, a lack of hope in an improved form of governance in Germany. It is necessary to point out that there are two forms of emigration – willful emigration and forced emigration. Both involve people that are disenchanted with the system, and can no longer fit in the socio-political frame – the “castaways.” The willful emigrants leave the country out of their own volition. It is for this group that Fabri conceives the *Ackerbau-Colonien*.

¹⁰ Wehler, p. 155.

¹¹ Juhani, p. 8-9.

Forced emigration also arises from disenchantment with the system. However, instead of fleeing, the individuals remain in the society to continue to agitate for a change in the system. When the system can no longer bear with their presence and “trouble,” it forces them into exile. It is for such that Fabri’s *Verbrecher-Colonien* is proposed. Although the fundamental purposes for these two colonial concepts are different, the bottom line is that both would feature as German colonies, and will be administered from Berlin via proxy administrators for the Kaiser. In addition to the above concepts, *Handels-Colonien* are purely for exploitation.

From the foregoing, it stands out that the people destined to pioneer Germany’s periphery colonial enterprise were dissidents. Hannah Arendt comments on the people who pioneered periphery enterprises,

The superfluous men, 'the Bohemians of the four continents' who came rushing down to the Cape, still had much in common with the old adventurers. They too felt 'Ship me somewhere east of Suez where the best is like the worst,/Where there aren't no Ten Commandments, an' a man can raise a thirst.' The difference was not their morality or immorality, but rather that the decision to join this crowd 'of all nations and colors' was no longer up to them; that they had not stepped out of society but had been spat out by it; that they were not enterprising beyond the permitted limits of civilization but simply victims without use or function.¹²

Fabri’s discussion of the population forecasts a future of chaos and disorder if nothing is done to provide space for the restive citizenry. He attributes increase in socio-political problems such as moral decay, the breakdown of law and order, poverty, unemployment, increased crime rate, and more, to population explosion (20). He then poses a rhetorical question, „Ist es zu viel gesagt, wenn wir behaupten: hier liegt die

¹² Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (New York: Harcourt Brace & Jovanovich, 1973) 189. Print.

Grundwurzel unseres socialen Nothstandes, und alle Versuche zur sogenannten Lösung der socialen Frage, die nicht hier energisch einsetzen, müssen jeden genügenden Erfolges verfehlen?“ (20-21).

Fabri discredits measures that were being considered to stem the problem of overpopulation – increased agricultural production and increased industrial production. On increased agricultural production, he emphasizes the limitedness and fixedness of space in relation to an ever-increasing population.

Fabri also dismisses increased industrial production, arguing that population increase with low income and an attendant low purchasing power will lead to a glut of industrial goods and services. This will, in turn, lead to unemployment and widespread poverty. With these two options discredited, emigration emerges as the only effectual option, „So bedürfen wir nothwendig noch eines weiteren, dritten Weges: der Auswanderung. Ja wir müssen sagen: *die Organisation einer starken deutschen Auswanderung ist zu einer Lebensbedingung des Deutschen Reiches geworden*“ (24).

Fabri's advocacy for *Auswanderung* may appear like a flip-flop since in the earlier stage of his treatise, he criticized it as one of the major threats to the survival and success of the nation. But, in the contrary, his advocacy for *Auswanderung* provides a platform for his advocacy for colony acquisition. So, his concern is not stemming the emigration tide, but exploiting it to launch the nationalist periphery enterprise. His discussion of an organized *Auswanderung* suggests a solicitude for the government and organizations to get involved. He is against the get-up-and-go kind of emigration, which leads to Germany losing her national human resources to other nations. Fabri's organized

Auswanderung recommends a shepherding of Germans to designated places where they and their endeavor will not be lost to the fatherland (26-27). As Fabri believes, the nation cannot reverse the threat of overpopulation from within neither can it stem the tide of emigration. So, founding colonies becomes the option. Fabri's arguments reflect an uncompromising colonial attitude.

I have pointed out that Fabri does not see any solution to Germany's problems in the domestic setting, but rather in the periphery. So, he recommends *Ackerbau-Colonien* to take care of the overpopulation problem, „Angesichts derselben, im Blick auf unsere deutsche Auswanderung, im Blick auf unsere industrielle und wirtschaftliche Lage, könnte es uns, eigentlich wohl nur der Unwissende oder der durchaus Voreingenommene leugnen, daß Ackerbau-Colonien dem neuen Deutschen Reiche dringend noth seien“ (32).

For the economic problems arising from rapid industrialization and overpopulation, he recommends the *Handels-Colonien*. He did not mince words in his advocacy for *Handels-Colonien* as a colony for exploitation. The people and land are to be exploited for the economic benefit of Germany. As Taylor informs, Germans attribute the maritime, industrial, and economic greatness of England and Holland unequivocally to the possession and exploitation of rich colonial territories,

Many Germans demanded a colonial empire simply because other powers had colonial empires, and their demand was reinforced by the current belief that the possession of colonies was in itself a profitable thing . . . and they asserted the reverse, that the prosperity and wealth of Great Britain

were due to the existence of her empire. The German campaign for colonies rested on the simple dogma – give Germany colonies and the Germans will then be as prosperous as the English.¹³

The miserable state of Germany's economy and the living condition of the people, as Fabri sees it, arise from a mediocre internal economic system. Because the whole system and state lack the internal dynamics to turn the trend around – land for expansion, purchasing power to boost sales, ability to control population for balance of ratio between production and consumption, surplus capital but no corresponding investment opportunities, excess unexploited human resources, and more – the possibility of an upswing lies in the periphery. As Fabri argues, the excess human resources that are lying dormant at home could find avenues for economic self-application in the colonies. Since the *Handels-Colonien* were to be exploited, there would be a continuous flow of wealth back home from investments in the periphery. With finality, Fabri states,

Wir bedürfen daher nicht nur einer gesunden Steuer- und Zoll-Politik, wir bedürfen vor Allem der baldigen Wiedergewinnung reichlicher, lohnender und solider Arbeit; wir bedürfen neuer, fester Absatz-Märkte, mit einem Worte: einer richtig erwogenen und dann kräftig angegriffenen Handels- und Arbeits-Politik. Jeder weit und ansichtig aufgefaßte Versuch einer solchen wird aber auch mit Nothwendigkeit zu der Erkenntniß führen: Das Deutsche Reich bedarf unabweisbar colonialer Besitzungen! (44)

Fabri also discusses the third form of colony – *Verbrecher-Colonien*. Using Siberia (Russian) and Australia (British) as examples, he suggests that Germany establish a third form of colonies where the criminals, and other socio-political undesirables could be banished,

Es bliebe schlechterdings kein anderer Weg, als der, den Frankreich mit seinen Deportationen nach New-Caledonien eingeschlagen hat. Man könnte dann in wohlwollender Liberalität eine

¹³ Alan J. P. Taylor, *Germany's First Bid for Colonies* (Connecticut: Archon Books, 1967) 4. Print.

geeignete Insel – etwa Utopia genannt – den Communards zur Selbstverwaltung überlassen, um ihr Weltbeglückungs-Programm doch irgendwo einmal zu Experimente zu bringen, zur Probe zu nöthigen. Aber um solchen Weg beschreiten zu können, mußte eben Deutschland irgendwelche coloniale Besitzungen in geeigneter Lage bereits erworben haben. (50)

The *Verbrecher-Colonien* were, however, not conceived as a place for irreversible banishment. Instead, it was to be a place of rehabilitation. This standpoint corroborates Campe's view of the colony as a place of corrective punishment. It is on the basis of this that Robinson decided to leave the English pirates on his new colony.¹⁴ Considering the fact that the people are expected to thrive, it is envisaged that they would, in the course of time, become successful, and turn out valuable assets to the fatherland. Fabri recommends this as an alternative to imprisonment, which has failed to bring about the anticipated *Selbstverbesserung* (48).

Fabri also engages Germany's relationship with other European powers. In chapter two, I pointed out that low self-esteem and inferiority complex were underlying factors in Germany's characteristic aggressiveness. This is evident in their preference for the foreign style against the German version. Hahn comments, "Leading figures of the Enlightenment . . . rallied to the defense of German culture, often in direct contrast to their countries' princes living in imitation of Louis XIV, and the nobility and middle classes indulging themselves in a French *à la mode* life-style and all but abandoning their native language."¹⁵ Discussing Germans' self-identification with the concept of the "Noble Savage," Reusch highlights a general feeling of positional disadvantage, "Germans thus perceived themselves as a culturally, economically, and politically

¹⁴ See Campe, p. 459.

¹⁵ Hahn, p. 60.

enslaved people who saw their own struggle for self-liberation and self-determination as related to those of contemporary colonial subjects.”¹⁶ Hull puts the place of fear in Germany’s dealings succinctly, “Fear of weakness . . . was thus a powerful source of Germany’s obsession with the offensive.”¹⁷ Even the question of cultural and moral rebirth bears a sense of rivalry with the British as Hahn comments, “These so-called *Flottenprofessoren* preached the cultural and moral supremacy of the new Germany, directed in particular against imperialist British policies.”¹⁸

The low self-esteem spurred an aggressive campaign for the re-awakening of patriotism among Germans. Hahn presents an example from Christoph Martin Wieland, “Wieland advocated the cultivation of a national literature in order to kindle ‘the sacred flame of patriotism in every German heart’ and to inspire in the scattered population of ‘Germania’ that kind of community spirit which ‘a great, noble, brave and enlightened people are worthy of.’”¹⁹ The aggressive efforts to achieve greatness survive to metamorphose into aggressive efforts to prove and sustain the greatness. It continues as efforts against being considered inferior or cowardly.

Having discussed the reasons why colony acquisition is mandatory for the young German nation, Fabri turns to Germans and the government, whose attitude he considers contrary to the colonial question. He invokes the opinion of a national newspaper, which challenges the advocacy for colony acquisition in favor of a German expansion towards the East, „Ein verbreitetes und angesehenes Blatt hat jüngst ziemlich harmlos

¹⁶ Reusch, p. 116.

¹⁷ Isabel V. Hull (2005), p. 165.

¹⁸ Hahn, 124.

¹⁹ Hahn, 92.

ausgesprochen, Colonien brauchten wir nicht; man solle lieber unsere Haiden und Moore im Osten und Westen cultiviren, da fänden noch viele Menschen Platz“ (51). The idea of expansion towards the East was a prominent projection within the ranks of the German government at the time. This is a problem because, as long as the government and the people continued to consider the eastward expansion as a primary option, the prospect of a periphery colonial enterprise would never win any reasonable consideration. Agitators for a German Expansion to the East argue for the rerouting of the German emigration flow to territories already under German control.²⁰

Fabri suspects that German preference for eastern expansion against periphery expansion arises from the fear of provoking the hostility of other European nations, who have established dominance in the periphery. He tries to inspire confidence, courage, and boldness in Germans for the project, „Es liegt das eben in der Natur menschlicher Dinge, daß das Förderliche, Wahre und Gute nur im Kampf der Überzeugungen und Meinungen allmählig sich siegreich geltend zu machen vermag. . . . Je bedeutungsvoller wir die Colonial-Frage erachten, desto weniger erwarten wir einen raschen, sofortigen Erfolg“ (53-4).

Fabri, however, does not see colonial enthusiasm among the people eliciting a positive attitude from the government. But he is optimistic that as the people continue to gain awareness of colonial necessity and benefits, and continue to strive for it, the government will definitely oblige. In response to a publication on government's unyielding stance towards periphery colonial politics, Fabri challenges colonial

²⁰ Kopp, p. 19.

enthusiasts to draw inspiration from such and intensify their efforts to win the support of the citizenry for the periphery colonial project,

Aber ob dies auch eine entschloßene principielle Verneinung von Seite des Reichskanzlers selbst, nicht vielleicht nur ein: Noch nicht! – bedeutet, darüber ist bis heute wohl noch ein Zweifel berechtigt. Und wären denn Reichskanzler und ‚Reichs-Anzeiger‘ in dieser Frage wirklich identisch, so müßte dies Alle, die von dem Bedürfniß deutscher Colonien überzeugt sind, nur um so kräftiger antreiben, die weitesten Kreise für ihre Überzeugung zu gewinnen; sie würden dabei sich auch getröstet dürfen, daß ein wirklicher Erfolg in der öffentlichen Meinung auch zu einem Erfolg bei dem leitenden Staatsmann, bei der deutschen Reichs-Regierung führen wird. (55)

Furthering his argument on the position of other nations towards Germany's periphery ambition, Fabri criticizes Germany's apprehensiveness of other nations' attitude, highlighting the same negative attitude towards Germany's recent achievements, "Man sagt, die Gründung deutscher Colonien würde leicht *Mißstimmung im Auslande*, ja wohl auch Verwicklungen mit den Seemächten hervorrufen; und ferner: die Kosten seien zu bedeutend" (55). He, considering colonialism a humanitarian project (a position that may have derived from the rhetoric of some of the societies of the 17th century such as the "The Learned Society" founded by Leibniz²¹), sees it as a divinely ordained mission entrusted to the Germans. Therefore, it must be pursued irrespective of other nations' position, "Um so weniger kann aber ein Volk, dem von der göttlichen Vorsehung eine mächtige Weltstellung zugewiesen worden ist, die Erfüllung einer nationalen Aufgabe von dem Beifall oder dem Mißbehagen anderer Völker und Staaten abhängig machen" (56). The inherent argument in the invocation of those victories is that, if Germany did not consider the reactions of other nations to the wars or the development of the German *Kriegs-Marine*, then why should it be a factor in the colonial question.

²¹ See Dülmen, p. 25-31.

The notion of imperialism as a divine assignment to a particular people is not absent from Britain's imperial creed either.²² Thornton delineates the British understanding of her imperial mission in the sense of a providential ordination,

Imperialism is a policy forced upon a civilized nation by the very fact of its civilization. What had the doctrines *laissez-faire* led to in England itself but the breeding of domestic barbarism in factories and slums and sweat-shops? What did it lead to overseas but the exploitation by wiseacres of the ignorant? The horrors that resulted—in the Congo, at Putumayo, or in the New Hebrides—were not the results of any 'imperial policy.' Rather were they the consequences of its absence. These things were bound to spring from a lack of control, a lack of imperial governance. Where there was not such governance, civilised vice rather than virtue was the first lesson learned by native races. From this they must be protected. Such races were unable, not having the knowledge, to maintain a civilised rule themselves. Such a rule it was the duty of a civilized nation to provide, and therefore the government of dependencies was a necessity in the modern world.²³

Fabri's discussion reveals that Germany, which, though energized by war victories, the development of a naval force, rapid industrialization, and the founding of the Reich, is still in fear *vis-à-vis* other nations. He, however, recognizes the probability of conflicts in the periphery, but he develops and projects a moral argument onto the British to eliminate the fears, „Bei einer von solchen Gesichtspunkten geleiteten, einsichtigen Erwerbung und Gründung deutscher Colonien uns mit kriegerischer Verwicklung zu bedrohen, dürfte in der That ein haltloses Schreckbild sein“ (57). He further argues, „England, daß doch hier wesentlich allein in Betracht käme, hätte jedenfalls am wenigsten ein moralisches Recht, der Inangriffnahme einer deutschen Colonial-Politik sich entgegenzustellen; und es ist ja auch wirklich kein Gedanke daran, daß es versuchen würde, solches zu thun“ (57-8).

²² See Bass, p. 226.

²³ Thornton, p. 75-76.

It is necessary to hint that Germany's ultimate design was to emerge as Britain's equal or superior on world power ranking. By reason of this, Britain paradoxically remained both the incentive and the hurdle in Germany's dream of European and world significance.²⁴ Stig Förster, Wolfgang J. Mommsen, and Ronald Robinson report on the importance of Britain on the German agenda, "Behind it (the world power aspiration) stood the growing pressure from nationally minded people who regarded the foundation of the German Empire only as the first step in making Germany into a leading world power. Coupled with this aspiration was the desire to imitate and later overtake Britain."²⁵ So, it could be understood that a clandestine design to "neutralize" Britain was on the agenda of Germany's power program. Carl Peters sees Germany's chances of a "place in the sun" in stopping the British on their trail of what he calls the "Anglicization" of the world. Perras communicates on Peters,

With the victories of Königgrätz and Sedan, Germany had again joined the real struggle of peoples: The German movement to unify has, of natural necessity, to be followed by a struggle for a position of power overseas. Our European position as a great power has to be followed by a position as a world power. Peters justifies the German struggle for world power in terms of combating the ongoing 'Anglicization' of the world. Only through this policy would it be possible to guarantee that the Germans would not be completely overtaken by the Anglo-Saxons: 'Every year of hesitation in the assumption of such a task upsets the relationship between both races to our disadvantage.'²⁶

Fabri recognizes the superiority of British military capability over Germany, and thus, does not recommend a confrontational colonial politics. Rather, referencing the

²⁴ Eley and Retallack, p. 160.

²⁵ Stig Förster, Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Ronald Robinson, eds., *Bismarck, Europe, and Africa. The Berlin Africa Conference 1884 – 1885 and the Onset of Partition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988) 109. Print.

²⁶ Arne Perras, "Colonial Aggitation and the Bismarckian State. The Case of Carl Peters," *Wilhelminism and its Legacies. German Modernities, Imperialism and the Meaning of Reform, 1890-1930*, eds. Eley Geoff and James Retallack (New York: Berghahn Books, 2003)159. Print.

ingenuity of Germans, he is confident that there will not arise any occasion for war if the colonial politics is trusted into the hands of men with proven diplomatic credentials. Aside from questioning the morality of any British interference with Germany's colonial endeavors, Fabri questions Britain's ability to effectively and maximally exploit all the colonial regions she lays claim to. His doubt suggests that Britain's pretention over numerous periphery territories is just a strategy to deter other nations from claiming those regions (59). This was the case in the East African territory, where the British exercised authority through the Sultan, but without any official protectorate claims. Such an arrangement complicated the efforts of German colonial officers to stage official German claim over the territory.²⁷ Fabri's argument tends to suggest that England would not make so much noise, should Germany begin to press her right to the possession of periphery colonies.

Fabri dismantles every conceivable situation that accounts for Germany's reluctance to venture into periphery colonial politics. Convinced that he has done his part, he declares,

Wir glauben denn, den Beweis, daß die Organisation der deutschen Auswanderung und mit ihr der allmähliche Erwerb von Ackerbau-Colonien für Deutschland zu einer Lebens-Frage geworden ist, genügend erbracht zu haben. Wir wünschen, daß Deutschland dabei so rücksichtsvoll zu Werke gehe, wie es noch nie ein Staat, der auf colonialen Erwerb ausging, gethan hat. (85-6)

Fabri's arguments, along with other colonial propaganda at the time, definitely spurred some colonial enthusiasts into action in the periphery. A typical example was Carl Peters,

²⁷ See Frieda von Bülow, *Der Konsul. Vaterländischer Roman aus unseren Tagen*. Berlin: F. Fontane, 1891. Print.

whose involvement in Germany's colonial enterprise is considered foundational as we shall see in the next section.

Pioneering Activities in the East African Periphery (Balder Olden's *Ich bin Ich*, 1927).

Balder Olden was a German Jew, the son of Johann Oppenheim, a writer. While studying History, Literature and Philosophy at the University of Freiburg, he studied theater arts privately. Owing to a debilitating injury he sustained on his face in a duel in defense of his Jewish belief, the chance on the entertainment stage was lost to him for good. He picked up a journalistic career.

Olden worked with different newspaper establishments, and, while with the *Kölnische Zeitung*, he became a traveling reporter. As the First World War broke out, he elected to travel to German East Africa, where he enlisted with the German colonial army. Captured by the British, he spent the war period as a prisoner of war. Back in Germany after the war, he resumed his journalistic profession. It was during this period, while living in Berlin that he wrote the novel *Ich bin Ich. Der Roman Carl Peters* (1927).

It is reported that Olden died as a critic, and this can be seen in this novel. Although, he wrote this novel about 40 years after Peters' first colonial enterprise in East Africa, his journalistic background, his travel experience, and most especially, his participation in German East Africa during the First World War, must have exposed him to a wealth of information from which he developed his novel. His novel reads more like a negative critique than a praise of Germany's periphery colonial attitude in general, and of Peters' colonial mission in particular. It, among other things, delineates the

inconsistencies that characterized Germany's colonial enterprise at its founding stage. As a subtext, one can glean the projected doom of the enterprise even as it was taking shape.

In Fabri's polemics, the government's lack of interest and commitment was an on-going snag to the pursuit of periphery colonialism. While he recognizes the involvement of the government as the authenticating stamp to the colonial business, he does not expect the government to initiate the endeavor. Instead, he places the onus on private organizations to take the initiative, and thereafter, the Reich government would be under pressure to follow suit. Discussing the *Handels-Colonien*, he argues,

Wir sehen, die Frage nach deutschen Handels-Colonien ist in erster Linie ein Appell an unsere Hanse-, an unsere Seestädte, an unseren gesammten, als intelligent und thätig gewiß nicht mit Unrecht gerühmten Handelsstand. Geht dieser überlegt und energisch vor, dann wird, dann muß die deutsche Reichs-Regierung ihm nachfolgen und trotz aller Dementis im „Reichs-Anzeiger“ eine deutsche Colonial-Politik inauguriren. (156)

Since Fabri considers the colonial question a matter of survival for Germany, he recommends an aggressive approach in the hunt for colonies. Carl Peters emerged from the shadows of private intellectualism to respond to the call for periphery colonialism. From a historical axis, Zantop reaffirms this trend as the pattern that the German colonial endeavor would follow,

Private colonial societies such as the Westdeutscher Verein für Kolonisation und Export (1880), the Kolonialverein (1882), and the Gesellschaft für deutsche Kolonisation (1884) . . . therefore took on the task of spreading colonialist propaganda and forcing the government's hand by collecting capital, sending out emissaries, and purchasing territories, that is, by creating *faits accomplis*. The newly gained territories would then be put under imperial protection, to ward off competition from England.²⁸

²⁸ Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 193.

As I pointed out earlier in chapter three, at every stage of Germany's colonial discourse, Britain is directly or indirectly an ever-present factor. Britain was the context within which Reinhold Forster's voyage took place; the English *Robinson Crusoe* inspired Campe's *Robinson der Jüngere*. In Fabri's treatise, Britain features as a prominent reference point. In Olden's *Ich bin Ich* (1927), the British again are pivotal in the emergence of Carl Peters as a German colonist.

The Emergence of the Pioneer German Colonist

Carl Peters, as presented by Olden, epitomizes the dream figure of German colonialists in various dimensions. In every sense, he established himself above the status quo and pushed against bounds in becoming a figure of significance. The account of his life as a college student gives evidence of someone who would not be bound by restrictions; instead, he would, through his ingenuity, knock down barriers while in pursuit of his goals. The uninhibited spirit which Peters displayed in his early life resonates with the character of the "true" German, as defined by earlier German scholars and philosophers such as Arndt.²⁹ Peters achieved fame early in his life and was destined for a renowned academic career. Being intellectually gifted, he could fit in the crop of Germans described by Reinhold Forster, who are skilled and knowledgeable enough to understand periphery natives.³⁰

The author's characterization of Peters portrays arrogance, megalomania, authoritativeness, heartlessness, obsession with power, and little or no care about others.

²⁹ See Hertz, p. 30.

³⁰ See Forster, p. 376.

People mean little to him other than instruments in the pursuit of his goals. Fabri confirms this from a historical perspective,

All the lines of the movement always eventually came together in the person of the young Führer. Lucid and quick of perception, he was always determined and often dictatorial in his manner. Towards those who opposed his goals, he was sometimes self-consciously provocative and ruthless. He dominated his milieu, which was excited by the liveliest of stimuli.³¹

The author presents Peters' personality traits through his encounter with other people, both friends and foes. The narrator reports of him, „Aber Peters kannte keine Gnade“ (12). He is also described as „ein Unterwerfer“ (25). These are some of the ways the author characterizes Peters. From the fate of his girlfriend Amalia, who was apparently pushed to suicide by his mean treatment of her, it could be understood that Peters is ready to sacrifice humanity for glory. As the narration goes, Peters meeting and encounter with Maud Louistone, a British aristocratic girl, in Leipzig initiates a British dimension to his development into a colonist (32). The meeting with Maud ends in humiliation for Peters, and Peters swears to take revenge. By coincidence, he meets and develops a close relationship with Maud's father, Mr. Louistone, and through their interaction, he is exposed to periphery colonial politics for which he develops great interest.

Although Peters' career focus was academic, he manifested tremendous interest and ability in periphery scholarship (23-4). Being a multi-talented young man, he finds himself at a crossroads of multiple careers. It is necessary to note here that, following the domineering influence of the state over the life of individuals, career freedom and options

³¹ Friedrich Fabri, „Deutsch-Ostafrika 1,“ *Kölnische Zeitung*, 16 July 1886 (Bundesarchiv Berlin, Reichskolonialamt) 360, 6. Print.

were not always there.³² The state influence is identified by Fabri as one of the hindrances to Germany's desire for international significance (148). While Peters continued to build himself up for a possible academic career in Germany, an invitation from his uncle, Karl Engel, takes him to England.

The invitation to England marked a turning point in his life. It opened up the door for him to associate with the cream of English society. It was at this time that he met and struck a close friendship with Mr. Georges Louistone. Although the connection between the two in London ends in disaster, it was this association that prepares Peters for the imperialist career he later undertakes. Karl Engel does not make any secret of his imperialist intentions for Peters as he tries to persuade him into it, though for the British crown (38-9).

At this point, it is interesting to note how the path of a would-be German colonial pioneer has to be cut through a British influence. Mr. Georges Louistone loves and reveres Peters so much that he becomes an ever-present companion to him. As this relationship develops, however, Peters continues to target Maud, with whom he had a score to settle (124). He succeeds in his scheme to subsume her under his power by raping her (194). The final blow to Maud was to propose to marry her and then abandon her to pursue his colonial dreams in Africa. Maud finally falls into insignificance in Peters' scheme. Through the victims that litter Peters' trail one can see that he is, simply put, an egomaniacal villain. In presenting his personality, we can better estimate what to expect of him as a periphery colonist.

³² Tipton, p. 81.

Georges Louistone sees great potential in Peters regarding colonial enterprise (105), and lets him into his life and world. He makes him a partner in his imperialist endeavors for both self and country. Peters' impression on Mr. Louistone is described thus,

Denn auf Georges Louistone hatte Peters von ihrer ersten Begegnung an so gewirkt, wie auf seine Lehrer in Ilfeld, seine Kameraden, Kommilitonen, auf Fühlke, auf Karl Engel.

Mehr noch vielleicht auf Georges Louistone als auf alle andern, weil dieser jüngere Sohn eines Baronets und verwitwete Gatte einer Multimillionärin in absoluter Passivität zu fünfzig Jahren und grauem Haar gekommen.

Ein Menschentyp eigentlich war es, dem Georges in allen Völkern und Erbteilen nicht begegnet war, und dem die einzige Sehnsucht seines nicht mehr begierigen Herzens galt: der große Mann, der Schöpferische! (111)

Mr. Louistone says of Peters, „Der erste große Mann in meinem Leben . . . *Mein Bonaparte*“ (113). It is again necessary to remind us here that all the efforts to direct Peters' attention to imperialist enterprise are British oriented. Germany's colonial question does not come into the picture at this time.

It could also be argued that the author uses this scenario to depict Germany's colonial backwardness. This is most clearly referenced in the person of Karl Engel, a German, but who intends for Peters to become an imperialist functionary for the British crown. He is ready to will all his fortune over to him in the service of the British crown, but not the German nation, which neither recognizes his potentials nor knows how to exploit them. The British recognize these and are steering them towards their own benefits.

Uncle Karl ridicules German academia, „Aber du mußt den Dachstubenheroismus nicht beweisen. Die Hungerkur des deutschen Genies brauchst du nicht zu durchlaufen“

(38). This ridiculing reminds us of Campe's rejection of academic career through the accidental death of Robinson's elder brother, and by configuring his protagonist without any formal education or training.³³ The rejection of academic glorification is also reflected in Fabri's polemics as he criticizes the overemphasis on academic achievements for its own sake in the German society.³⁴ Although Peters knows and talks much about periphery enterprise, there is no motivation to get involved due to Germany's lack of decisive action. For Peters to have a chance of putting his skills and knowledge to use, an outside influence is needed. As the British had to be involved for Reinhold Forster to make the voyage, and, just as Robinson had to steal away from Hamburg to London to have a chance of seeing the world, Peters needs an English encounter to be liberated from the hindering clutches of *Dachstubeheroismus* to respond to a call to a periphery colonial career.

In a discussion with Mr. Louistone, Peters declares, „Glauben Sie, Mr. Louistone, da draußen liegt meine Zukunft“ (105). Georges and Peters enter a business pact to explore and exploit Africa south of the Zambezi. Their initial trip to Africa cut the path that leads Peters into Africa for the first time, and from there, his colonist interests receive the enlivening spark it needed. It is, however, a dual turning point. First, it awakens the desire to colonize, and, secondly, it awakens the desire to colonize for Germany and not for Britain. Peters declares, „Eine deutsche Kolonie wurde Maschonaland! Gerade weil er Deutscher war, einer aus dem zweitklassigen Volk, auf das die stolzen Vettern herabsahen, – gerade deshalb lag der Weg ja so leicht vor ihm!“

³³ See Campe, p. 5.

³⁴ See Fabri (1927), p. 25.

(127-8). From this point on, Peters becomes obsessed with the idea of German colonies in Africa, and he brings his aggressiveness into it. Peters reflects,

Deutsche Kolonie aber!

Vor zwanzig Jahren noch Wahnsinn, davon zu träumen, obwohl kleinere Mächte, Holland, Portugal, Spanien, Frankreich in ferne Weltteile ihre Fahnen gepflanzt hatten. Deutschland mit seinen Häfen zur Arktik hinaus, wäre nicht in den Sonnenländern geduldet worden. Aber jetzt nach den Bismarckschen Kriegen, dem ungeheuren Aufschwung von Königgrätz und Sedan? Deutschland war an der Reihe! Keine Macht, auch England nicht, würde ihm widersprechen, wenn es die Adlerklaue in afrikanischen Boden schlug. (128)

Characteristically, Peters was a man who did not consider any peaceful or friendly approach to Germany's colonial business. He recognizes and is incensed by Britain's dominance of the world. He reasons that nothing but an aggressive approach will communicate Germany's intentions to the rest of Europe, and compel them to concede to Germany her own "place in the sun." Arne Perras comments on Peters' philosophy of and commitment to an aggressive colonial campaign,

He refers to Goethe's works to show that the 'best spirits' have constructed 'something like an ideal *Weltbürgertum* instead of a universal empire. . . . In Peters's eyes, the implementation of the 'blood and iron' policy that had unified Germany was a decisive historical turning point. It led away from the theory of a nation of Dichter und Denker—a nation he dismissed as 'airy spheres of weak abstractions and obscure humanitarian sentimentalism.'³⁵

So, Peters apparently rejects and condemns the idea of *Weltbürgertum* and blames Germany's backwardness in empire-building on such philosophies. Perras quotes Peters, "it required deep humiliations and the greatest economic and political damage before our

³⁵ Perras, p. 159.

people woke up from such dangerous dreams.”³⁶ The author presents Peters as a kind of catalyst that Germany needed to wake up to the challenges of her colonial needs,

Jedes Land braucht seinen Erwecker!

Es war unausdenkbar und dennoch so wahr, daß die Erkenntnis sein Blut beizte, seinen Magen füllte, seine Kräfte vervielfachte, das Feuer in seinem Zentrum neu anblies: Deutschland braucht ihn, Peters, um der eigenen Kraft, der eigenen Notwendigkeiten bewußt zu werden! (129).

For Peters to respond to the patriotic fire that burns in him, he has to break free from the English patronage of Georges Louistone, return to being a German, and plot his way back to Africa as a German colonist.

Peters the Pioneer German colonist

It is one thing for an individual to exhibit patriotic enthusiasm, but it is another thing for the nation, towards which one is showing patriotism, to recognize, appreciate, and support the patriotism. Peters gives up his academic ambition for periphery colonial enterprise. However, Germany, still on the swing regarding periphery colonial space, was not yet ready for Peters’ colonial enthusiasm. The author depicts this problem, „Es macht einen geradezu kümmerlichen Eindruck, wenn man aus dem Kreis englischer Gentlemen heraus plötzlich unter die deutschen Herren geworfen wird“ (143). In England, everything he needed would have been provided, but now “*ein deutscher Herr*,” there are hurdles at every step as he seeks support for his project. Peters’ primary challenge as a German colonist is to convince Germans and the German government of the economic and political essence of his colonial project. The author communicates his plight with the government and people,

³⁶ Perras, p. 159.

Ganz gewiß, ein wirklicher Engländer, einer, dem das englische Selbstbewußtsein organisch war, hätte auch in jenem nach einwärts orientierten Deutschland, einer Weltmacht ohne Weltempfinden, leichtere Arbeit gehabt. Gerade von ihm, der in London vielleicht schon als echt wirkte, dem man aber an der Spree den Parvenue anroch, – gerade von ihm, wollte Berlin weder Belehrung noch Führung haben. (144)

In pursuit of his dreams, he decides to circumvent the authorities by founding a *Gesellschaft* of pro-colonists. Through this *Gesellschaft*, he is able to create a financial network that underwrites the cost of his project, at least for take-off. His clarion call is, „Jeder Deutsche, dem ein Herz für die Größe und die Ehre seiner Nation schlägt, ist aufgefordert, unserer Gesellschaft beizutreten. Es gilt, die Versäumnisse von Jahrhunderten gutzumachen“ (146). Whether as mockery or compliment, his activities were reported in one of the daily newspapers as, „Der erste Schritt in Deutschland zu einer wirklichen Kolonialpolitik“ (Olden, 148). His failure to secure government support prompts the team to leave Germany under cover for Africa. So, Peters’ actual colonial expedition in Africa was a private venture supported by private individuals and companies for economic purposes.

It becomes evident that the people who supported Peters’ project were not necessarily interested in Germany as a colonial power, but rather interested in the trumpeted economic benefits. In this scenario, a patriotic spirit, which fails to find patriotic resonance with the state, finds self-centered response from the people, who do not care much about the nationalist significance of periphery colonial space, or the “humane” considerations that have dominated German colonial fantasies for long.

Since the support for Peters project came from different quarters, a conflictual relation emerges between the executor and financiers on the one hand, and the German

government on the other. The executor (Peters) and his financiers are likely to favor the means and method dictated by capitalist greed, while Berlin, which still holds onto the ideal of universal humanity of the Enlightenment, would expect a “humane” approach that would foster friendship between colonizer and colonized. Peters is caught in the tug between two desires, and is destined to end up like the proverbial field where two elephants fight.

The author still evokes the virgin territory component of German colonial fantasy in Peters’ expedition. Notwithstanding his knowledge and experience with the periphery activities, he entertains the dream of finding virgin territories in East Africa. This indicates that he has both colonial systems recommended by Fabri in mind. Peters reflects,

Aus dem Lustschloß eines neuen Reiches wurde in einer einzigen Stunde der Plan einer
Landspekulation!

Billig ein paar tausend Hektar kaufen, zu denen noch keine Eisenbahn und kein Dampfschiff
führte! Auswanderer dort ansiedeln, die das Land rodeten, schlecht bezahlt wurden und mit ihrer
Lebenskraft den Wert des Hektars erhöhten! (152)

Upon his arrival in Africa with his trusted friend Fühlke, Peters is not under any illusions about the dominant presence of the English. Everywhere he looks, he is greeted by the Union Jack, „Wer je in den Osten gereist ist, durch den Suez-Kanal, das Rote Meer, erkennt bildhaft und schlagend, daß England die Wellen beherrscht. . . . Der Suez-Kanal schien einritisches Unternehmen; das Rote Meer eine englische See; dann ging es an Persien und Aden vorbei; überall der Union Jack und nichts als der Union Jack . . .“ (162). This is a suggestion that there is probably no virgin land anywhere to claim. Peters steadies himself for battle with the English if it would come to that,

Sie standen, zwei junge deutsche Zwischendecker, an der Reeling eines italienischen Tramp-Dampfers, genährt wie Kulis, gekleidet wie stellungslose Commis, und berieten: ‚Hier wird eine deutsche Marine-Station sein! Hier graben wir England sein geliebtes Wasser ab!‘ Denn das war Peters klar, und Fühlke würde nie bezweifeln, was Peters erkannt hatte: nun legten sie Hand auf ein Stück Afrika, übergaben es Deutschland, zwangen das Reich, dies großmütig dargebrachte Geschenk anzunehmen. Aus diesem Stück wurde eine Kolonie, aus der Kolonie ein Reich. (162)

It is noteworthy to point out that, through this resolve to challenge England on territories, Peters was set on a collision course with Berlin. As we shall see later, of all the things that Berlin may want to court from periphery colonialism, it wishes to avoid confrontation with England. However, so long as Germans aspire to a “place in the sun,” the existence of England is one reality that stands to challenge the fantasy of a smooth-sailing colonial enterprise. This collision immediately surfaces at the very primary stage.

Peters’ African expedition landed in Zanzibar. Somewhere before landing in Zanzibar, he acquires a servant, Hamisi, who also serves as his “horse.” The author describes the scene of his first landing,

‘Spring!’

Das Instrument aus Nilferdhaut pfeift drohend durch die Luft – Hamisi trägt nichts als den dünnen Kanzu.

‚Kali kabissa‘ denkt er, ‚besonders scharf ist mein neuer Herr!‘

Er gauzt auf, ehe die Peitsche ihn noch berührt hat, und schwingt sich über Bord. Gleich klebt Peters in seinem Nacken, der kleine, leichte Peters mit seinen eisernen Schenkeln. Jetzt findet Hamisi die Sache lustig. Er wird sogar ein bißchen stolz – Peters ist ‚bwana mkuba‘, der große Herr, bei dieser Reise. Es ist eine Ehre, ihm als Reitpferd zu dienen.

‚Heia, heia!‘ kräht Peters. Sein greller Ruf tanzt über die Fluten. Hamisi reicht das Wasser kaum bis zur Brust, er lacht, trabt los.

‚Heia, heia!‘

Es geht Peters nicht schnell genug. Plötzlich ist kein Hamisi mehr da, über seinem roten Fez schlagen die Hafenwasser zusammen. Peters Kiboko peitscht die Flut, daß sie schäumt. Er fuchtelte und brüllt. Aber seine Knie lassen den Hals des Negers nicht.

‚Herrgott, Peters!‘ schreit Fühlke entsetzt vom Schiff her. ‚Wahnsinn!‘

Aber Hamisi hat das Gleichgewicht nicht verloren. Unter seinen Füßen hebt sich der Boden wieder. Prustend, Salzwasser sprühend, glücklich setzt er die Wanderung fort. Da stehen Schwarze am Strand, sehen den kleinen brüllenden, gestikulierenden Bwana auf seinem zweibeinigen Reittier winken, lachen, kommen Hamisi entgegen, streckten ihm die Hände zu. Er will sie ergreifen. Aber der Boden wird plötzlich lehmig und glatt – Hamisi torkelt, fällt, und über seinen Kopf weg fliegt Peters auf afrikanisches Festland, liegt da wie eine Qualle, umklammert mit allen Vieren zugleich den wild ersehnten Boden.

„Hier bin ich, hier bleib ich!“ schmettert er zu Dan hinüber und denkt an Wilhelm den Eroberer, der ebenso den Boden Englands betreten. Jetzt wirklich, durchnäßt und unter einem Katarakt schallenden Lachens, beginnt seine Eroberung. (167-8)

This scene is symbolic, critical, and almost satirical. The riding on the *zweibeinige Reittier*, the choking knee-hold on Hamisi's neck, the wielding of the *Peitsche* to elicit prompt reflex response, the stumbling and the crashing onto the ground, onto African soil, constitute a significant adumbration of how Peters will go about his territory acquisition. It is also necessary to begin to direct our attention to the disharmony that is already beginning to emerge between the fantasy of “model/humane” colonialism and the reality of colonization sustained by capitalist ambition.

The intimidation, the violence, and the dehumanization of the natives, which is displayed at the very first point of colonial association between natives and Germans in Olden's text, have no place on the shelf of “humane” colonialism that seemed to have dominated German colonial thinking for more than a century. This development is not surprising, however. After all, Fabri makes no pretense in his polemics of the kind of colonial administration Germans were to put in place, „Da das Schwergewicht dieser subtropischen Colonien ganz auf der weißen Einwanderung ruht, so findet durch diese eine Zurückdrängung der meist spärlichen Reste farbiger Eingeborenen nothwendig statt“ (31).

According to the author, Peters' expedition into the hinterland of Zanzibar faithfully follows the picture painted of his landing contact with the natives. As he constitutes his expeditionary team, he institutes an absolute dictatorial system that makes him the sole ruler. Only in his absence or incapacitation would Fühlke, his trusted friend, takeover the right of decision-making (173). *Absoluter Gehorsam* is the word. He warns the team members, especially the Blacks, „Wer Dienst verweigert, bekommt fünfundzwanzig mit diesem Kiboko. Ich kann Euch versichern, daß ich sauber ziehe. Wer zu desertieren versucht, wird erschossen!“ (174). It stands out that there is no dialogue or negotiation. By this, every member of his team becomes a mere tool for his use. The implication of this standard for the target communities is that they would have to either oblige him or face his wrath. Even though he would present himself appealingly, he leaves the audience no option of choice between consent and refusal. From the tone and nature of Peters' expedition, one does not expect any diplomatic expediency, but the use of hoodwinking, coercion, and/or absolute, flagrant force.

Peters' team sets off on their mission of invasion. Peters uses all kinds of manipulation to rob community leaders of their powers and influence. His first strategy is to present the white man as the ultimate protector against other neighboring communities, and in some cases, the English man. An instance is his encounter with the Sultan of Usagara. Peters' interpreter responds to the Sultan's question, „Was wollte der weiße Mann?“,

Er brachte nur Schutz gegen Nachbargewalt, versprach, weise Männer ins Sultanat zu senden, die hier wehren, lehren würden aus dem Schatz der Uleia=Weisheit. Er versprach Reichtum und Aufschwung. Die Sorgen der Regierung wollte er auf sich nehmen. Aus dem Boden Gold und

Eisen zaubern, Recht sprechen, nicht mehr zulassen, daß Sklavenräuber das Volk des Sultans verringerten.

Sein Beistand würde Segen des Himmels sein, wenn wirklich Massai, die furchtbaren, aus der Seringeti hervorbrachen, Land zu überfluten, Herden wegzuschleppen, Dörfer in Asche zu legen.

Der Sultan verlor nicht. Er gewann, wenn er solch eines Herrn Untertan wurde! Titel und Würde blieb ihm, blieb seinen Damen, ewiglich! (179-80)

With such a strategy of deception, Peters was able to wrest the authority and influence of the community leaders out of their hands.

Judging from the way he directly addresses specific things that trouble these communities, one could understand that he had done some research on the communities and was acquainted with some of the problems they were facing. He is able to focus on that aspect of their life that would make them vulnerable to his intrigue. So, it seems reasonable for them to trust him and grant him his requests. The outcome of the encounter with the Sultan of Usagara is communicated by Alistair Boddy-Evans, “One typical agreement, the ‘Treaty of Eternal Friendship,’ had Sultan Mangungu of Msovero, Usagara, offering his ‘*territory with all its civil and public privileges*’ to Dr Karl Peters as the representative of the Society for German Colonisation for ‘*the exclusive and universal utilization of German colonization.*’”³⁷

In circumstances where the community is not ready to oblige, Peters resorts to intimidating and coercive options in order to have his way. It stands out clearly that Peters is ready for anything, be it peace, crisis, or even war, with the natives. The only

³⁷ Alistair Boddy-Evans, “Biography: Carl Peters,” N.p. Web. Dec. 26th, 2011.
http://africanhistory.about.com/cs/biography/p/bio_peters.htm.

thing he is not ready for is retreat at any point. As Wildenthal puts it, “They used bribery, deception, and terror to conclude so-called treaties with local village leaders.”³⁸

Peters elects to march into the hinterland, where he hoped to find virgin territories, and at the same time, not to encounter other European powers. Jan-Georg Deutsch informs that the German government warned him to stay away from the coastal area of Zanzibar.³⁹ This is probably because of the dominant presence of the British and the desire for a friendly relationship with Sultan Bargasch. The search for virgin lands could also be interpreted in association with Germany’s view of other Europeans’ negative reputation in the periphery. He probably hopes to exploit the non-experience of the natives with the white man’s colonial system to assert himself over them. So, he projects the image of the “ideal” German colonizer, who is different from all other white men in the area. With lack of colonial experience of the inland natives, his claim to being a different white man is more easily believable than among those, who are already sensitized to the disenfranchisement of the colonial system. This experience, articulated in Reinhold Forster’s *Observations* (1778) and Campe’s *Robinson der Jüngere* (1779), is a humane and peaceful approach, which would be met with a willing concession from the natives. In such a setup, conflict is not envisaged. Peters hopes to overwhelm them with the façade of the friendly German for their willing endorsement of him as their colonial overlord,

Etwas wie großes Mythos umgab sie in diesen Binnenländern Afrikas, in denen man viel von ‚Uleia‘ gehört, aber noch kaum einen Europäer gesehen hatte.

³⁸ Wildenthal, (2001) p. 15.

³⁹ Jan-Georg Deutsch, „Inventing an East African Empire: The Zanzibar Delimitation Commission of 1885/1886,” *Studien zur Geschichte des deutschen Kolonialismus in Afrika*, eds. Peter Heine & Ulrich van der Heyden (Pfaffenweiler: Centaurus-Verlagsgesellschaft, 1995) 212. Print.

Man wußte nur: das sind die Übermenschlichen, die den ‚Akili Uleia‘ besitzen, den europäischen Geist, der da Schiffe baut, Feuerwaffen erfindet, dem Wellen und Blitz gehorchen. Gegen den es Widerstand nicht Gibt. (181)

Once, in negotiation with the Sultan of Wapokomo, the interpreter, addressing the Sultan, who is not willing to oblige Peters, tells him, „Du kannst nichts gegen ihn tun, Sultan. . . . Er kommt von Gott“ (265).

Peters also perceives himself as a messianic figure among the natives. This is highlighted in a discussion about the Wadsakka, „Die Wadsakka sind kultivierte Leute, die in schönen Hütten wohnen, von Dorn-Kraalen umgeben, Ackerbau treiben und reich an Vieh sind. Sie haben nie einen Weißen, nie einen Araber gesehn und haben keinen Respekt vor den Sendlingen Gottes“ (270). It is also reported that, „Seine Leute folgen ihm wie Hypnotisierte. Für sie gibt es nichts mehr als Rupanda Scharo, der den Willen Gottes verkörpert“ (274). Fabri, as quoted by Perras, recognizes the messianic figure that Peters cuts among his followers and attributes his megalomaniacal tendencies to that, “On the contrary, he later saw in him ‘a degree of conceit which comes close to megalomania.’ In his eyes, this was rooted in ‘the devotion of the crowd,’ that followed Peters in those years.”⁴⁰

The notion of being God-sent echoes at various levels of Germany’s colonial discourse. While it is not clearly stated in Reinhold Forster’s *Observations* (1778) Campe and Fabri identify periphery colonial enterprise (camouflaged in the cultururation and Christianization nomenclature) as a mission to which God has called the Germans. Hammerstein recognizes this in her discussion of Bülow’s “Eroberungsfahrt,” „Der

⁴⁰ Perras, p. 158.

göttlich entsandte Herr, welchen Bülow für die Erweckung Ostafrikas aus dem zugeschriebenen Dornröschenschlaf ausersehen hat, ist unschwer in den deutschen Kolonialisten zu erkennen.⁴¹ With the status of God's representative, even among his followers, some of which are Germans, Peters expects that his position on any issues should not be questioned. This kind of *Haltung* partly explains why the German response to native resistance is very brutal and decisive. With the mentality of being God's agents, any opposition from the natives is interpreted as opposition to God's will.

But for how long does Peters' façade of friendliness and the myth of the god-like white man deceive or intimidate the natives in the face of the disenfranchisement they are experiencing? It does not take long before the natives realize what is happening, and they begin to sensitize one another to the reality of colonial disinheritance,

Andere wühlten ihre Finger in die Falken des Gewandes, warfen irre, wirre Blicke um sich und wußten mit Entsetzen, daß jene neue Zeit hereinbrach, von der sie aus Nord und Süd mit Schauer gehört hatten. Zeit der Weißen! Die den Schwarzen zwang, in seinem eigensten Heimatland, unter der Glut der bisher nur ihm erträglichen Sonne, im Gestrüpp des bisher nur ihm zugänglichen Busches zu dienen, für den Fremden zu arbeiten, ihm zu steuern, schlug seine Brust, weil gerade er es war, unter dessen Regierung dieser weiße Lindwurm sein Reich bekroch. (182)

From the above entry, it could be seen that Peters' hope of a peaceful invasion of the hinterland is not going to last. The natives are not always going to welcome Peters and hand him their sovereignty as happened in Usagara (183). The inland natives, realizing that they have been duped, begin to spread the news about him further, and that spurs some resistance against him.

⁴¹ Hammerstein, p. 155.

Peters constitutes a team for a special expedition, *Die Emin Pascha Expedition Peters* (E.P.E.P.) into a southern Sudanese region to rescue a German Doctor – Emin Pascha. Boddy-Evans communicates from a historical perspective,

In 1889 Carl Peters returned to Germany from East Africa, giving up his position as chairman. In response to Henry Stanley's expedition to 'rescue' Emin Pascha, a German explorer and governor of Egyptian Equatorial Sudan who was reputed to be trapped in his province by Mahdist enemies, Peters announced his intention to beat Stanley to the prize. Having raised 225,000 marks, Peters and his party departed from Berlin in February."⁴²

Perras reports, "He (Peters) embarked on an expedition to rescue Emin Pascha in the African interior and hoped to use the opportunity to grab even more colonial territories."⁴³ This expedition was launched on July 3rd 1889. According to Olden's text, it is during this expedition that Peters encounters the stiffest resistance from the Africans, and he also meets it with extreme brutality.

Through Peters' coercive approach, he earns himself the name "Rupanda Scharo," (*Städtebezwinger*) among the natives. This becomes the warning and battle cry of Africans wherever he turns his expeditionary march. Peters continues his Emin Pascha expedition killing, looting, and abducting women. On February 13th 1890, he was handed a letter from Sir Stanley informing him that Emin Pascha had been rescued.

Although Olden's narrative ends Peters expedition at the failed E.P.E.P., historical accounts record that Peters carried on with his plan northwards to Uganda. There he signed a treaty with the King of Buganda Kingdom in Uganda, Kabaka Mwanga

⁴² Boddy-Evans, "Biography: Carl Peters."

⁴³ Perras, p. 165.

II of Buganda.⁴⁴ However, owing to the Helgoland-Zanzibar Treaty between Britain and Germany, the Baganda treaty was annulled because the region had been left in the British sphere of interest in exchange.

Berlin and Peters' Pioneer Endeavors

As Peters continued his colonial drive, how did Berlin get involved? I have already pointed out that Peters and his team left Germany secretly because of the unfavorable governmental disposition towards their project.⁴⁵ Meanwhile, in a speech to his team, he communicates the conviction that, with meaningful success in Africa, Berlin would adjust her position (170-71). As contained in Olden's text, after a few acquisitions, he makes a solemn appeal to Berlin to accept the territory as a gift,

Jetzt konnte Peters als gleichberechtigter Kontrahent vor die Regierung Deutschlands treten: ‚ich bin in meiner Person – denn nach den Statuten der Gesellschaft für deutsche Kolonisation bin ich ihr unabsetzbarer Vertreter – Herr über ein afrikanisches Reich. Nehmt es aus meiner Hand als eine Gabe, die euch in wenig Wochen kein Herr und keine Flotte mehr erobert! Ich fordere nur Dank.

Oder weist sie zurück. Dann werde ich diesen, meinen Besitz, unter den Schutz einer anderen Macht stellen. Belgien oder England – wie ich's für gut befinde.

Dies ist Quittung eines Patrioten für den Fußtritt, mit dem du, Deutschland, dein Bismarck, dein Auswärtiges Amt mich an der Schwelle meiner Bahn begrüßten!‘ (184-5)

Wehler presents this communication from the historical perspective, „. . . doch triumphierend telegraphierte er seinen Erfolg nach Berlin, wo die GfDK (Gesellschaft für

⁴⁴ Boddy-Evans, “Biography: Carl Peters.”

⁴⁵ Arthur J. Knoll & Hermann J. Hiery, eds., *The German Colonial Experience* (Lanham: University Press of America, Inc., 2010) 66. Print.

Deutsche Kolonisation) am 23. Dezember die Nachricht erhielt und an das Auswärtige Amt weitergab.⁴⁶

This appeal does not change Berlin's position. However, Peters neither gives up his drive, nor hands over his acquisitions to other European powers as he threatened in the novel. He continues to bank on time for Berlin to change her stand and grant him the imperial recognition that will make the acquisitions German colonial territories. He also recognizes the limitedness of his financial resources if he has to depend only on the *Gesellschaft* for the furtherance of his project. With more acquisitions, Peters travels to Berlin to appeal directly to Bismarck. Olden comments,

Ja oder Nein, Fürst Bismarck? Reichsschutz für die Erwerbungen meiner Gesellschaft, Usagara, Uguru, Ufeguba, Ukami? Reichsschutz für neue Erwerbungen, zu denen von mir trainierte, von mir erwählte, schnelle Adjutanten entsendet werden? . . .

Ich werde mir erlauben, zwischen den Breiten von Sambesi und Kap Guardasui diesen hellen, lustigen, dunklen Erdteil zu besetzen.

Werden Euer Deutschland, dessen Befehl die Ermordung Ihres bescheidenen Dieners so quasi angeordnet hat, heute den nie erbetenen, aber ohne Bitte einst abgelehnten Reichsschutz gewähren? Für einen Besitz, um den selbst England uns beneiden wird? (189)

Peters' persistence and hope are rewarded as Berlin decides to get involved in the colonial project. As the author informs, this follows a one-on-one meeting with Bismarck and with the Kaiser in Berlin. He secures, not only the recognition for his project, but also the financial support he needed (198). Jan-Georg Deutsch presents the historical perspective to this encounter, "After spending merely four weeks in the interior, Peters returned to Berlin and obtained the famous 'Schutzbrief' . . . from the German Emperor in

⁴⁶ Wehler, p. 341.

February 1885. The territorial ‘acquisitions’ of the Company thereafter enjoyed Kaiser Wilhelm’s personal protection.’⁴⁷

It remains a subject of speculation what had prompted the sudden reversal in Bismarck’s stance. Various arguments have been advanced ranging from genuine interest in periphery colonial politics to the instrumentalization of it for domestic political purposes. Wolfgang Mommsen argues,

In short, his imperialism was dictated by domestic politics: the policy of colonial acquisitions was in the last resort a form of ‘manipulated social imperialism’ with the object of defending the conservative social structure and, not least his own ‘Bonapartist dictatorship’ against the rising tide of modernization, while suppressing or thwarting all political movements that in any way opposed his purpose.⁴⁸

Andreas Hillgruber identifies, among other things (predatory treatment of Germans by other colonial powers;⁴⁹ restive domestic situation due to economic hardship; *überschäumendes Kraftgefühl und Vitalismus*; European politics), German local politics as one of the main reasons, „Mit dem Übergang zu einer aktiven Kolonialpolitik wollte er ,den Deutschen ein neues Ziel setzen, für das sie sich begeistern könnten, nachdem . . . die Popularität der Regierung zu verblassen angefangen hatte.’ Über den ‚Kolonialrausch‘ sollten die folgenden Wahlen von 1884 wieder eine gouvernementale Mehrheit herbeiführen.“⁵⁰ Whatever the reason, Bismarck’s support for the course was without pretense. He accompanied it with the same aggressiveness with

⁴⁷ Deutsch, p. 212.

⁴⁸ Wolfgang J. Mommsen, *Theories of Imperialism* (New York: Random House Inc., 1980) 98. Print.

⁴⁹ Breuning and Chamberlain, p. 14.

⁵⁰ Andreas Hillgruber, *Bismarcks Außenpolitik* (Freiburg: Verlag Rombach, 1972) 168-70. Print.

which he had pursued his European politics.⁵¹ With limitless power granted Peters by Berlin, he returns to Africa and launches the Emin Pascha Expedition Peters (E.P.E.P.). The bequeathing of government endorsement on Peters' activities marks a turning point in the whole project. It gives us the opportunity to understand how Berlin regards British interests in periphery colonialism. It also opens the window to better understand Germany's general attitude towards periphery colonialism.

I have already highlighted Peters' hatred of Britain. While he operated without Berlin's support, he was cautionary, but with Berlin's support, he threw caution to the winds. The author notes, „Monat um Monat geht es so fort: neue Expeditionen mit neuen Zielen! Entflammte Männer, die nur er geprüft, ernannt hat, durch Handschlag in Dienst genommen, ziehen ihrem Schicksal entgegen, das er bestimmt hat“ (199). The aggressive drive by Peters and his lieutenants provokes British apprehension, a development the author argues, Peters consciously stirred up, „Es ist ein weltpolitischer Moment, von Peters lang erwartet, fast erzwungen! Zum ersten Mal stoßen England und Deutschland als Weltmächte gegeneinander. In dieser Stunde braucht ihn Bismarck, seine Kenntnisse, seinen Rat“ (200).

Perras comments on the development of tension following Peters' aggressive drive for territories,

However obscure the eventual size of the German territory may still have been, the basic goal of the charter of protection was obvious: it had sanctioned Peters's colonial acquisitions and given the go-ahead for the company to establish control over the mainland. Since the territorial claim of the DOAG (Deutsch-Ost-Afrika Gesellschaft) cut right across the major caravan routes to the

⁵¹ Lowe, p. 93.

interior, the sultan's protests were not surprising. He realized that the German protectorate threatened the fragile political and commercial balance in the region.⁵²

Sultan Said Bargasch, whose sovereignty is recognized and protected by the British, sends troops to a region of his territory, which incidentally falls under German protectorate. A tense situation develops. According to the text, Bismarck summons Peters to a dialogue on the issue. After consultations with Peters, Bismarck sends the following message to London, „Deutschland sei gezwungen, dem Sultan mit Gewalt zu begegnen, wenn er seine Truppen nicht aus dem deutschen Gebiet zurückzieht“ (201). Britain advises the Sultan to recognize the German claim and withdraw his troops. This episode is understood by Germans as a huge victory against their most dreaded enemy – Britain – and was going to be instrumentalized as an impetus by the colonists.

However, it is necessary to note that at the time the Sultan Bargasch problem arose, Britain was involved in a colonial crisis with Russia over Afghanistan and does not want to have another crisis. This reason is confirmed by Hillgruber, who highlights the unfriendliness that had developed between Britain and Russia on one side and Britain and France on the other, and that Bismarck exploited this atmosphere to full German advantage in East-Africa.⁵³

This victory would become a referent for Peters and German colonial enthusiasts in further colonial issues involving Britain. It is a demonstration of a wholehearted commitment to the course, which colonial enthusiasts have been waiting for. It is also interpreted in Peters' camp as a sign of unconditional support in case of any further

⁵² Perras, p. 162.

⁵³ Hillgruber, p. 173.

challenges from the British. The author writes, „Peters, das Herz voll Wut gegen England, rief gerade zu dieser Flotte auf. Sein Program war das ja: Deutschlands kleinen Finger, von dem er auf der Fahrt nach Bombay geträumt, hielt er in der Hand, seit der Schutzbrief ausgestellt und bekräftigt war! Nun ging's um die Hand“ (205). The ways in which the colonial politics will be played out with Britain is influenced by Peters' views. He is credited with knowing much about the British way of doing things, and as such, would know how to handle them (203).

It is necessary to point out, however, that Peters' hatred of England is a national trend both at the popular and government levels. Seligmann and McLean comment,

In Colonies, therefore, Bismarck had a ready-made mechanism for generating Anglo-German diplomatic incidents at any time he wished. Given that such incidents would undoubtedly create an anti-British mood in Germany, colonialism was an ideal way of making the position of a British-born empress extremely difficult. In the climate of public hostility to all things British that Bismarck could always engineer, it would be simple for Bismarck to discredit foreign ideas of government and to make it patriotic to oppose them.⁵⁴

Hillgruber mentions how Bismarck's politics is secretly oriented towards a rapprochement with Russia against England.⁵⁵ In recognizing the negative public sentiment towards Britain, Peters' views of Germany's periphery involvement constitutes in the show of power in general, and in the provocation of Britain in particular. He envisages a Germany that is invincible and will plunge into the periphery enterprise with might and power, bulldozing her way through Africa, crushing every resistance, especially from England. So, he launches his campaign without any restraint. However,

⁵⁴ Seligmann and McLean, p. 49.

⁵⁵ Hillgruber, p. 170-71.

his two-fronted passion – founding colonies for Germany on the one hand, and cutting in on Britain on the other – eventually generates the circumstances for his downfall.

His obsession with dealing with England provokes concern back home and, as Olden communicates, popular opinion begins to turn against him as his activities were perceived as threatening the security of the young Reich. Describing him as „unreifer Stürmer . . . grauer Theoretiker,“ they complain, „Kolonien bedingen eine Kriegsflotte. Das wissen wir seit der Demonstration vor Sansibar. Eine Flotte kostet Geld, das uns nicht zur Verfügung steht, wenn wir Europas stärkste Landmacht bleiben. Der Versuch schon, sie zu bauen, macht uns England zum Feind. Dieser Bursche (Peters) verwickelt uns in Krieg und Katastrophe“ (205).

Germans, who have been enthused with Peters' rapid achievements in East Africa, now begin to recognize the dangers arising from the whole enterprise. Germany is now caught between the options of either continuing with the colonial drive at the risk of a major conflict with England, or giving up the periphery colonial quest in order to preserve the Reich.

As pointed out earlier, with Berlin's support, Peter's operations become more radical, employing the language of force and violence more blatantly than before. The presence and interests of European nations were becoming more and more insignificant to him. His team under Fühlke and Weiß took the Kilimandscharogebiet in spite of stern English opposition. The same team launched an attack on Somali regions, where Italians had established presence and claim, and also took it in disregard of Italian opposition.

Under the prevalent circumstances of possible conflict with England, Bismarck's support for Peters' East African project began to wane. Seligmann and McLean inform,

All the evidence suggests that he possessed some ulterior motive for his change of heart (to support the project). Bismarck's behavior after 1885 provides further evidence for this conclusion. To begin with, in the remaining five years of his chancellorship, Bismarck added no new colonies to the German collection. Such opportunities as existed, he ignored.⁵⁶

It remains an issue of speculation among scholars, why Bismarck suddenly turned away from the colonial project. The argument of the capital intensiveness of the project does not support the action, since, as the author notes, a supportive word from Bismarck would have opened floods of financial support (214). Some scholars, such as Seligmann and McLean, argue that Bismarck never had any real interest in periphery colonial politics, but was just using it for internal political maneuvers.⁵⁷ Olden, however, poses a rhetorical question that suggests reasons involving national security and stability, as well as fear of conflict with Britain, „Sah er in Peters eine große Gefahr für sein Werk: Deutsches Reich? Eine neue Epoche mit neuen Problemen, für die er zu alt war?“ (216). That this turnaround is more on security grounds than other reasons is further reinforced by the author as he discusses a meeting between Bismarck and Peters,

Die Zeit verrauschte, brachte keine Antwort.
Zwei Menschen hatten aneinander vorbeigelebt.
Viel später einmal zeigte Bismarck ein gnädiges Lächeln. Empfahl dem Kaiser, einen Beitrag von fünfhunderttausend Mark zu leisten.
Im Augenblick standen die großen Bankherren bereit.
Aber da waren Peters die Zügel schon halb entwunden, rechts und links Kompromisse geschlossen, die seinen Genius bändigten. (216)

⁵⁶ Seligmann and McLean, p. 50.

⁵⁷ Seligmann and McLean, p. 48.

Bismarck is reported to have unequivocally expressed preference for British goodwill to colonies in East Africa. Lowe writes, “Bismarck was reported to have emphasized in December 1888 that ‘a good understanding with England means much more to him than the whole of East Africa.’”⁵⁸ The pursuit of goodwill with England did not necessarily mean goodwill towards Britain. Rather, it is a conciliatory position, which Berlin adopts in recognition of her obvious disadvantage vis-à-vis Britain, and any alliance she may form, in the case of a conflict. Knoll and Hiery comment on the mindset of Berlin regarding the crisis with Britain, “The enmity of France was one thing. To risk the opposition of Great Britain would have been tantamount to risking Germany becoming a still-born child.”⁵⁹ Hillgruber recognizes this reasoning also,

Die gefährdete Situation des Reiches auf dem Kontinent, die in der großen Krise 1885-1887 wieder deutlich zutage trat, verbot jede weitere Spannung mit England. . . . Jetzt erschien ihm der in der ruhigen Phase der europäischen Politik vor 1885 unternommene Vorstoß in die überseeischen Weiten fast wie ein Abenteuer, der Besitz deutscher Kolonien keinen Konflikt mit England mehr wert. Von den Kolonialenthusiasten . . . trennten Bismarck Welten.⁶⁰

Bismarck’s new stand of seeking rapprochement with England manifests in the first negotiation that takes place over East Africa. According to Olden’s narrative, Peters attended the conference in Scotland as a professional attaché to German diplomats, and representative of DOAG, but not as a representative of the government. „Peters mit eigenem Stab, war den deutschen Diplomaten als Sachverständiger und Vertreter seiner Gesellschaft zugeteilt“ (232). By his status at the conference, Berlin may have sent a message of self-distancing from his recent colonial activities in East Africa. Whether this

⁵⁸ Lowe, p. 100.

⁵⁹ Knoll, p. 1.

⁶⁰ Hillgruber, p. 174.

was a diplomatic maneuver or a genuine representation of Berlin's stand, it indicates that the carpet had been pulled from under Peters' feet.

However, Peters is not deterred by this development or by the outcome of the conference. Instead, he views Britain's need for negotiation with Germany as an evidence of Germany's steady growth in world politics. In Oldens text, Peters sends a message to Germans in the Diaspora celebrating Germany's growth in international politics, „Das deutsche Reich, mehr und mehr erstarkend aus Jahrhunderte langer Ohnmacht, beginnt mit Nachdruck, hinüberzugreifen über die Weltmeere“ (232).

Peters continues his drive for territories in East Africa until a widespread revolt breaks out against him and his team over their “criminal” colonial operations. The revolt generates an occasion for Berlin to once more demonstrate her inconsistency towards Peters' enterprise. In spite of having withdrawn support from Peters' project, Berlin still sends troops to the region to protect and preserve German interest in the area (254). Although Bismarck expresses dissatisfaction towards this act, he neither reverses the action, nor makes any effort to restrict or streamline the operations of the colonists and the soldiers placed at their disposal. They are sent there to just bring back order to the region. The method and approach to accomplishing this task is left to the troops. The militarization of Germany's colonial enterprise in Africa began with this deployment of troops to East Africa.

Although the military was sent to support Peters and his Gesellschaft, their involvement enhanced the eventual fall of Peters as the flag bearer of Germany's colonial enterprise in East Africa. Peters' last effort was the Emin Pascha expedition, which was a

failure because it brought no benefits to Peters or Germany. Historically, by the time Peters expedition reached the region, Sir Stanley had rescued and taken Emin Pascha with him. However, the author fictionally stages a meeting between Peters and Emin Pascha and communicates Pascha's response to Peters' aborted intentions, „Alles stimmte, Emin Pascha bestätigte alles. Zusammen wären sie auf dem Aequator unbesiegbar gewesen“ (281). The Emin Pascha failure marked the end of Peters' colonial enterprise in East Africa for Germany. Wehler comments, „Als im Oktober die Erfolgsmeldung Stanleys in Europa eintraf, mußte das Komitee (Emin-Pascha Komitee) sein Unternehmen endlich abblasen. Der letzte deutsche Expansionsversuch in Ostafrika war gescheitert.“⁶¹

Peters' East African colonial project was a relative failure on many fronts – financially, territorially, politically, and even in regards to patriotic dividends. Compared to the multi-dimensional investment that was made in the project, the territorial possession left to show for it is mockery. As for Peters, who used economic gains to market his colonial enterprise, there is absolutely nothing for him in the territories, „Kein Stein darin war Peters Eigentum. Dafür hatte er Maud und seine Jugend gegeben!“ (282). On his return to Germany, Peters is, however, rewarded for his colonial endeavor with a new appointment as *Reichskommissar* to Deutsch Ost-Afrika. The author describes the new office,

Als Souverän hatte er heimkehren wollen!

Dieser Peters, dem endlich ein Posten im Kolonialdienst gewährt wurde, irgend eine unklar definierte Stellung zweiten Ranges, ein freundlich klingender Titel dazu und die ersten

⁶¹ Wehler, p. 366.

bescheidenen Ehrenzeichen – und der all das annahm, diesen Hungerlohn annahm! – war nicht mehr Rupanda Scharo. (282)

Peters interprets this appointment as banishment from Germany to keep him from developing another fantabulous colonial dream (284).

Peters returns to Africa as *Reichskommissar*. His influence, however, does not dissipate in the new political arrangement. He still has a reasonable number of native servants and concubines against whom he takes out his frustration and anger, „Vor einem Jahr war er, Rupanda Scharo, in Bagamoyo eingezogen. Mit sechsunddreißig Schwarzen, die ihm jeder einzeln ans Herz gewachsen. Jetzt haßt er alle schwarze Haut, seine Askari, seine Boys, die jungen Weiber, die ihm der Sultan von Moschi als Morgengabe gesandt“ (283).

Peters expressed his hatred of Blacks through various cruel acts against his servants and concubines. The author informs of how Peters tortured his male servants in an attempt to find out who broke into his “*Magazin*” where his concubines are quartered. Mabruk was eventually made the scapegoat for the act and was hanged (286-87). He also hanged one of his concubines, Jagodja, for attempting to run away a second time (288). As a furtherance of his hatred of the natives, Peters dedicates his time to writing about Africans and living among Africans, „Peters schrieb. . . . Er befaßte sich mit Negerpsychologie, um seinen Haß aufs Papier zu leiten“ (285). It is self-evident that, with so much hatred, he must have written terrible things about Blacks.

Considering the fact that Peters had made a name as a budding philosopher of renown before he decided to veer into periphery colonialism, and, against the background of his being the pioneer colonist for the new German nation, his writings about the black

race were considered informed documents, and provided insight into the evaluation, relation with, and treatment of Blacks. Dominik J. Schaller confirms this, “The popular writings of Carl Peters, the conqueror of GEA (German East-Africa) . . . had a huge impact on the corresponding colonial discourses and policy making.”⁶² It could be argued that Peters’ periphery project – the operations and writings – did not only pave the way for Germany’s colonial enterprise, but also contributed to the formula for it. The inhuman treatment of blacks – canning, raping, hanging, extortion, shooting, looting, and the likes – which, according to studies, characterized Germany’s colonial legacy in Africa, are all practices used by Peters.

Olden presents Peters’ views on how to treat the natives for effective colonial subjugating,

Man kann nicht über Hunderttausende herrschen, ein Gewehr über Hunderttausende von Speeren, wenn man nicht furchtbar ist. Herrscht man, dann darf man nie Schwäche zeigen, nie Mitleid, nie Angst. Es kommt keineswegs auf Menschenleben an, wenn man Völker unterwirft. Nur auf Mythos, in den man sich hüllt, Furcht, die man anstrahlt, Furchtbarkeit, die man genießt wie Götter den Opferrauch.

Nur so, nur so läßt sich eine Welt unterjochter Feinde beherrschen. (288-289)

It is interesting to note that Peters’ views here communicate the same stance as the views expressed in 1773 by Edmund Burke in the British House of Commons in his defense of the East Indian Company on allegations of violence against the colonial subjects,

In order to preserve some kind of subordination [they were] forced occasionally to act the despot, and to terrify the refractory by the arm of power or violence. This, Sir, I believe, you will find to be the genuine source of that arbitrary conduct charged upon the late governors in Bengal. Where

⁶² Dominik J. Schaller, “From Conquest to Genocide. Colonial Rule in German Southwest Africa and German East Africa,” *Empire, Colony Genocide. Conquest, Occupation, and Subaltern Resistance in World History*, ed. Dirk A. Moses (New York: Berghahn Books) 313. Print.

no laws exist, men must be arbitrary; and very necessary acts of government will often be, in such cases, represented by the interested and malevolent as instances of wanton oppression. Suppose some examples of real tyranny to have occurred, does it thence follow, that the governors were culpable? Is it not possible, that they were misinformed? In such a multiplicity of affairs, and in a government without laws, some enormities must have been committed.⁶³

The similarity of these two positioning, in spite of the orchestrated humanitarian trope, exposes the inherency of violence in any effort to subjugate a people. This is because they target population is never willing to hand over their sovereignty to the invading power without a fight. As the resistance registers, the invading force resorts to force and violence to impose its will. At that point, all humanitarian considerations, though unrealistic from the onset, are jettisoned.

Olden presents what, on the surface, could be summarized as a simple report on Carl Peters' colonial undertakings for Germany. But an important subtext is a summary of the constellation of Germany's colonial enterprise. The portrayal of conflict between a patriotic, glory-hunting, and fast-moving individual, who is obsessed with acquiring colonies for Germany, and the reluctant, undecided and slow-moving nation he is fighting for, is a literarized expression of Germany's colonial portrait in Africa in its early stages. As we shall see in the next chapter, where I shall discuss the concept of dilemma in Germany's colonial enterprise, the author also portrays Germany's multi-dimensional malaise in periphery colonialism. One is left to wonder if Germany was clear on what it wanted from periphery colonialism, if she was prepared for it, if she knew what it required, and what it all was really about. Perras comments on the state of the German government in relation to colonial possessions at the time of Peters' colonial expeditions,

⁶³ See William Cobbett, *The Parliamentary history of England from the earliest period to the year 1803* (London: T.C Hansard, 1806-1820): vol. 17, col. 463. Print.

The Reich was totally unprepared when it acquired its overseas possessions: it had no trained personnel to handle colonial affairs, and there were no legal provisions that could be applied to the new territories. The Germans, one could say, became a colonial power overnight. Their case thus contrasted sharply with that of Britain or France, who looked back over a long period of imperial activity overseas.⁶⁴

Germany's aggressiveness brought them considerable territorial gains, but she was soon to realize that acquisition is just the beginning of colonization. The main challenge of the enterprise is stabilization and the implementation of an administration. In the next section, we shall see a literary representation of Germany's attempt at colonial administration.

Section ii. Consolidating the Colonies. (Frieda von Bülow's *Der Konsul*, 1891; *Verheißung*, 1899)

In this section, we shall discuss how Germany's initial effort at consolidating their hold on the East African colony is represented in two of Bülow's novels – *Der Konsul. Vaterländischer Roman aus unseren Tagen* (1891), and *Im Lande der Verheißung* (1899).

Frieda von Bülow. *Der Konsul. Vaterländischer Roman aus unseren Tagen* (1891)

The significance of this text for this project derives from the fact that it addresses the fundamental problem of Germans' disunity abroad, which is probably due to the *Zersplitterung* at home. Addressing the metamorphosis of Germany from colonial outsider to colonial significance would require a close look at the foundational efforts towards building a united German front for the goal of founding Germany's "place in the sun." Bülow's *Der Konsul* (1891), though a fictional text, is a good option in this sense. It also introduces Berlin's handling of her periphery colonial officers, thereby offering us

⁶⁴ Perras, p. 154.

insight into part of the reasons for the topsy-turvy portrait of Germany's East African colonial enterprise.

Der Konsul (1891) is about a German noble man, Max von Sylffa, sent on a foreign mission to Germany's colonial territory in East-Africa. Von Sylffa arrives in the town of U. (most likely Ungudja) to find a handful of Germans living in a disorganized state, without any consciousness of "Germanness." Worse still, the well-to-do Germans in the town have developed a preference for the English way of life, while the rest of the Germans languish under the intimidating dominance of the English, who are more organized, and enjoy the full support of their home government. Everyone regards the Konsul with contempt and expects him to fail like his predecessor, Fürstendank.

Von Sylffa, the Konsul, sees his first assignment as bringing the Germans together under one common identity and to awaken a sense of "Germanness" among them. He pursues this primary goal by various means including founding a German church, where the people gather every Sunday to worship as Germans. Gradually, the Germans begin to come together and act as one people. This development, however, provokes concern among the British, who feel threatened by the politics and popularity of the Konsul. A British conspiracy leads to his being charged with overstepping his official limits by Berlin. He is subsequently recalled to Germany.

An appendage to the story is the love relationship that develops between the Konsul and Nelly. This turns out to be a factor in the British-German relations. Initially, Nelly was close to being betrothed to St. Clair, a British colonist, but instead, she falls in love with von Sylffa and develops a fervent German patriotism that alienates St. Clair

and the British from her and her brother. Towards the end of the narrative, von Sylffa, feeling betrayed by Berlin, contemplates suicide, but Nelly's visit at the decisive moment averts the tragedy.

Bülow's second novel to be discussed here, *Im Lande der Verheißung* (1899), provides insight into the gender conflict in Germany's colonial discourse. The text, having a female protagonist, generates the scenario for us to understand the plight of German women within Germany's periphery colonial discourse. Their determination to be functionally involved, as Maleen's role in the narrative suggests, generates a gender dilemma, which will be discussed in the latter part of this project. To understand how German colonialism offered German women the opportunity to achieve agency, Bülow's text is most insightful for this project.

Im Lande der Verheißung (1899) demonstrates the bid for a functional space in periphery colonialism by German women. The protagonist, Maleen, the wife of a German colonist and plantation owner, joins her husband in Ungudja. While in Africa, she gets into an illicit relationship with the colonial officer, Dr. Ralf Krome. She is also very close to her brother, Rainer von Waltron, who is a member of the *Schutztruppe*. She gets to meet Maria, a mulatto daughter of a German missionary, Dr. Beta, and an Egyptian woman. An attempt to develop a mother-daughter relationship with Maria, fails owing to Maria's deep distrust for white women.

Maleen's relationship with Dr. Krome provokes contempt among Europeans, and as a result, she is not allowed to take in Maria, whose father is killed during an uprising. When Maleen's husband dies of a severe fever, she receives no sympathy from the

European community, and has no other choice than to return to Germany. In Germany, her grandmother, with whom she is living, dies, leaving her with no relations. Urged by her brother, she returns to Africa to support him in running a farm. This plan suffers a setback, following the death of her brother. Determined to stay in Africa, she takes over her brother's farm in Nova and launches a farming project. As a farmer, she achieves success, rebuilds her reputation, and earns herself a re-integration into the European society. Meanwhile, Maria has married the Italian, Delpini, and is now a successful woman herself. The name of Maria invokes a mutual rivalry, where the colonized African orphaned girl has taken the glorified position of the humiliated female German colonizer and is now celebrated in society like Maleen once was.

According to biographical accounts, Frieda von Bülow was born into an aristocratic family. She spent the first years of her life in Smyrna, Turkey, where her father was a diplomat. After his death, the family settled in Thüringen. Bülow developed an interest for periphery colonialism, and when he moved to Berlin in 1884, she founded the *Frauenverein für Krankenpflege in den Kolonien*. There in Berlin, she met Carl Peters, who was also preparing for a colonial expedition in East Africa. In pursuit of her interest in periphery colonialism, she travelled to East Africa to found nursing stations from 1885-1889. There, she fell in love with Peters, who was heading Germany's colonial enterprise in the region. She attracted negative publicity through her activities, which led to her removal as the head of the women's colonial organizations in East Africa.⁶⁵

⁶⁵ **Frauen.** Biographieforschung. <http://www.fembio.org/biographie.php/frau/biographie/frieda-von-buelow/>

She returned to Freiburg in 1888 to both recover from severe malaria and to seek reconciliation with the women organizations. While in Germany, she launched her writing career with many novels and short stories. In June 1893, she returned to Africa as a single woman to run her brother Albrecht's farm. Again, the second attempt at colonial involvement failed. In 1894, she was forced to hand over her brother's plantation to a German company and to return to Germany where she lived and died of cancer in 1909.⁶⁶

Her works include, *Deutsch-Ostafrikanische Novellen* (1892); *Ludwig von Rosen. Eine Erzählung aus zwei Welten* (1892); *Margarethe und Ludwig* (1892); *Tropenkoller. Episode aus dem deutschen Kolonialleben* (1896); *Im Lande der Verheißung* (1899); *Die Schwestern. Geschichte einer Mädchenjugend* (1909), and *Frauentreue* (1910). Many of these works, as the titles suggest, thematize Germany and colonialism.

The primary documents of reference are the two texts identified above. Inasmuch as the texts are fictional representations, their historicity is undeniable. Wildenthal attests to this, "While the meanings of a fictional text cannot be completely delimited, however, the historical and political context of her (Bülow's) writing should be kept in mind."⁶⁷ Reading from a New Historicist perspective, relevant historical information will be integrated into the discussion. Through the integration of various discourses (historical, literary and others), the literary representations will not pass as mere fiction, but will rather find connection to the colonial realities of that time.

⁶⁶ Katharina von Hammerstein, „Reiseberichte von Frieda Freiin von Bülow. Einführung,“ *Kolonialer Alltag in Deutsch-Ostafrika in Dokumenten*, ed. Ulrich van der Heyden (Berlin: Verlagsgruppe Dr. Wolfgang Weist, 2009) 153. Print.

⁶⁷ Wildenthal (2001), p. 55.

Awakening “Germanness”

As I have pointed out in the preceding discussions, Germans were already scattered in numbers all over the world before Germany’s colonial enterprise began. Fabri’s work reveals that the exodus of Germans features prominently in the arguments that advocate for periphery colonies. However, just like the *Zersplitterung* among Germans at home, Germans in the Diaspora lived more or less in disconnectedness with one another. There was no consciousness of “Germanness” or the desire for it among them. As in U. (probably Ugundja), the setting of the text, instead of making efforts towards collectiveness, Germans were individually seeking affinity with other European nationals.

While Berlin delayed on the question of periphery colonialism, Diaspora Germans did not have any platform for any collective initiative. Although there had been German Konsuls in U. such as Fürstendank, the probable absence of colonial ventures in their mandate did not reverse this malaise. But with a twist of fate, a Konsul with a colonial ambition arrives, and recognizes the primacy of reversing the problem of isolationism, disconnectedness and indifference of the German Diaspora to *Deutschtum*. In *Der Konsul* (1891), Frieda von Bülow deals with the problem of dispersal, the challenges of generating the consciousness of “Germanness,” and igniting the spirit of collectiveness among the German Diaspora in U.

Max von Sylffa, a German of noble status, was appointed Konsul to U., a town of mixed nationals – Natives, Germans, British, French, and probably more. From this narrative, it is clear that the English had established some socio-cultural and econo-

political predominance in the territory via the native administration, and thus, generated both individual and collective identity. The French also demonstrate collectiveness. However, the reverse is the case with Germans. Harry Donglar, a Hamburg native and one of the most successful Europeans in U., is presented as an avid admirer and imitator of the English,

Harry mischte gerne englische Worte und Wendungen in seine Rede. Er trug auch Haar, Backenbärtchen und Anzug wie ein Engländer. Man hätte ihn ganz und gar für einen solchen halten können, wenn nicht Bewegungen und Mienenspiel bei ihm zu lebhaft gewesen wären. Bei all seiner Bewunderung für englisches Wesen war es dem Hamburger nicht gelungen, den stumpfsinnigen und stieren Ausdruck sich anzueignen, der britische Gentlemen von Distinktion kennzeichnet. (11)

The gravitation of Germans towards the English is further evidenced in the discussion with Schrotmüller, who has been attending an English church since his arrival in U. (50). Even as the Baron arrives, the Chesters, the English consular in U., make an effort to recruit him into the cast of German imitators of the English. Judging from the prevalent situation, Mrs. Chester sees no option for the Baron other than joining the blossoming English community. In her opinion, „Seinen Verkehr werde er überhaupt unter den Engländern suchen müssen, da seine wenigen Landsleute einer inferioren Gesellschaftsklasse angehörten, – mit Ausnahme von Donglars natürlich, welche reizende Leute seien“ (56). So, Germans in U. appear to other Europeans as inferior, and they carry themselves in such a manner as to justify this classification. Mr. Donglar responds to the Baron’s question about the Germans in U.,

„Du lieber Himmel!“ sagte er. „Sie haben die Bande ja selbst gesehen. Das ist ein ganz trauriges Gesindel. Lauter Plebejer! Wer’s vorher noch nicht war, verbauert hier rettungslos. Man schämt sich beinah, ihnen irgendwo zu begegnen. Da ist doch auch nicht Einer darunter, der die Bezeichnung ‚Gentleman‘ verdiente, müssen Sie das nicht zugeben, Herr Baron?“ (27).

Mr. Donglar highlights the moral decadence of the German population in U. This manner of living is in contrast to the German self-image of superior moral consciousness vis-à-vis other Europeans. Christa Knellwolf analyzes the problem of moral decadence among Europeans in the periphery and traces the root to the feeling of freedom from the caging culture of Europe, which according to her, had alienated human beings from nature and the exhibition of natural tendencies.⁶⁸

Thomas Schwarz, arguing that the exotic periphery constitutes an irresistible but fatal attraction for the European, aligns the Germans with this malaise,

Durch die Expansion jenseits des Meeres lebten nun viele Deutsche ‚nicht in den Schranken‘ der ‚hohen Kultur der Heimat‘, sondern mußten, ‚in ursprünglichere Verhältnisse gestellt‘ eine Neubildung des ‚Charakters‘ erleiden. Man wisse, ‚wie diese Freiheit des Auslandes für gar manchen Deutschen die berausende Wirkung des Willkürlebens gehabt‘ habe, der ‚Tropenkoller‘ werde ‚immer als eine der merkwürdigsten Kinderkrankheiten der deutschen Expansion betrachtet werden.‘⁶⁹

With the absence of state interest and influence among the German Diaspora, it was as if everyone chose and followed one’s own path. As I have pointed out earlier in this chapter, the majority of German migrants left as exiles, both willful and forced. It could be argued that there was no reason for them to allow the “culture/moral burdens” of the fatherland to plague them. In these circumstances, it would take someone who would represent state interest while responding to their needs to change the trend. Baron von Sylffa emerges in this position. While acknowledging the degenerate state of the German Diaspora, he still expresses optimism that, with the right approach and treatment, a reversal is possible,

⁶⁸ Knellwolf, p. 21.

⁶⁹ Schwarz, p. 87.

„Es ist doch nicht wahrscheinlich . . . daß sich gerade eine auserlesene Schaar von niederträchtigen Hallunken hierher verirrt haben sollte, sozusagen der Auswurf unserer Nation. Das glauben Sie selbst nicht. Die Leute kommen auf Albernheiten, weil sie hier ganz ohne geistige und moralische Stütze sind. Ganz und gar sich selbst überlassen, sind sie natürlich der Gefahr ausgesetzt, moralisch zu verkommen. Wenn aber die Liebe zum Vaterland mehr ist, als ein leerer Wortschall, sollte sie sich mit derartigen Zuständen nicht als mit einer Thatsache abfinden.“ (70)

The unification of the German states into one German nation in 1871 did not automatically translate into the unification of Germans under a single geo-political entity, neither did it trigger a gravitation to the center among them. So, as Eley (1986) observes, the task of uniting Germans under the newly geo-political national umbrella of citizenry remained the immediate and pressing challenge for the politicians.⁷⁰ The unhealthy relationship among Germans in East Africa is further reinforced in the text by Nelly's reaction as Mr. Donglar alerts her to the arrival of the Konsul,

„Meinetwegen mag er Baron, Graf oder Fürst sein, wie es ihm beliebt.“ . . . Ein Hungerleider ist er doch, sonst bliebe er hübsch zu Hause und lebte „standesgemäß“ von seinen Renten. Ein Titel ist eine ganz hübsche Zugabe, wenn das nöthige Kleingeld vorhanden ist, sonst . . . nun, wie gesagt, mir ist's gleich. Wenn er ein Pedant ist, wie der ehrenwerthe Fürstendank, so werde ich mir ein besonderes Vergnügen daraus machen, ihn zu hänseln.“ (14)

Reflecting on what his sister said about the Konsul, Mr. Donglar murmurs, „Ein preußischer Beamter . . . bleibt immer ein Automat, ein Sklave seiner Behörde, der bei jedem freieren Schritt die Kette an den Fußgelenken fühlt. Daneben ist er meist ein Herr Habenicht“ (15). Against such a background, der Konsul has his work cut out for him.

The Baron arrives in an atmosphere of anxiety and apprehension on every side. The Germans await him with nonchalance, believing he would be no different from his predecessor, Fürstendank, who was satisfied with reveling in high society paraphernalia

⁷⁰ Eley (1986), p. 61.

among the English. The English await the new Konsul with apprehension, hoping he will not be nationalistic enough to attempt a German reawakening in U. (17). The French also wait with anxiety, hoping the Baron does not launch a mandate that would alter the status quo of English dominance, French significance, and German inconsequence. Although he is received with some friendliness in different quarters, the air is saturated with apprehension, waiting for his agenda.

As unorganized as the Germans may have been, all they needed for a turnaround was a leader who would be bold enough to stand his grounds against the enemy – the British. Such a person becomes a rallying point, and they follow his leading enthusiastically. It does not take the Baron much time to demonstrate this ability, and he has the whole German Diaspora behind him. He launches his mission with an address, challenging them to turn around and gravitate towards collectiveness,

„Meine Herren! . . . lassen Sie uns fest zusammenstehen! Man redet uns nach, wo es drei Deutsche gäbe, da gäbe es auch drei Parteien. Ich selbst schätze den stark entwickelten Individualismus, der diesem Worte zu Grunde legt, sehr wohl, nur darf er nicht das Gefühl der Zusammengehörigkeit untergraben, nicht wahr. . . .

„Also unter uns möge Jeder wagen, ganz er selbst zu sein, . . . dem Ausland gegenüber aber in erster Linie ein Deutscher. In dieser Geschlossenheit allein sehe ich ein Wachsen und Aufblühen des Deutschthums hier, wie ich es mit Ihnen, meine Herren, wünsche und erstrebe.“ (22-23)

With this speech, the Baron is able to stir up something that has been lying dormant in the hearts of Germans. The enthusiastic response to his ideas evidences the desire to achieve a sense of “Germanness” in U. through collectiveness. Without further delay, Germans begin to conglomerate, and out of the informal gatherings emerge regular weekly social gatherings and a weekly church service. Bülow writes about the church service and its effect on the German Diaspora,

Plötzlich schnellte Sylffa in die Höhe. ‚Genug!‘ rief er. ‚Jetzt wollen wir’s des Redens und mißtönigen Lärmens genug sein lassen! Ich schlage vor, eins zu singen.‘

Und ohne etwaige Meinungsäußerungen abzuwarten, stimmte er an: ‚Ich habe mich ergeben.‘

Schon bei der zweiten Zeile summten die Anderen die Melodie, bei der zweiten Strophe sangen Alle mit, auch die Schweizer. Die herrliche, sieghaft klingende deutsche Weise tönte mächtig und voll weit hinaus auf die Gassen von U. Wie Erzgeschmetter dröhnte Brüllow’s Baß, während der musikalische Fürstendank, dessen Stimme sogar beim Sprechen melodisch klang, mit viel Gefühl die Unterstimme hielt.

Als das Lied verklungen, herrschte andachtsvolle Stille. Nur Fürstendank bedient sich mit Getöse seines Schnupfstuchs. Ohne besondere Aufforderung folgte nun ein vaterländisches Lied dem anderen: ‚Ich hatt‘ einen Kameraden‘, ‚Wenn einst ein Geist herniederstiege‘, ‚Die Wacht am Rhein‘ u.s.w. Erst um Mitternacht trennte man sich und ging in gehobener Stimmung auseinander.

(83)

This gathering is very significant in the life of the German Diaspora. Apart from serving as a platform for conglomeration, it generates the opportunity for them to re-awaken nationalist sentiments that inspire collectiveness all over again.

Social stratification has been identified as one of the problems which plagued the unification process, as well as reforms. The walls which separate the classes are so iron cast that there is hardly any crossing from one to another. The only meeting platform is that of master/servant and nothing else. The German Diaspora carried this tendency with them as epitomized by Mr. Donglar and his sister Nelly. They would not tolerate any mixing with other Germans whom they consider inferior. This class-orientedness is also reinforced by the British consular’s wife, who, being aristocratic, sees to it that every high society German that comes into U. is absorbed into the British gentlemen cult. With this strategy these Germans would be alienated from the German Diaspora and rendered functionally insignificant to their needs. It is in the elimination of class consciousness that von Sylffa’s greatest initial achievement is registered.

He is able to resist the allures of the English gentlemen's cult so he can focus on the needs of the German Diaspora. He is able to break down the limitations of class and regional consciousness, and has the set goal of forging an all-integrative German community. He becomes a messianic figure among them, and they are ready to follow his leading unwaveringly (116). With skill, charisma, and decorum, he is able to convert the doubters and the pessimists among the German Diaspora into enthusiastic crusaders of „*Deutschtum*.“ The conversion of the Donglars from pro-English aristocratic isolationism to pro-German populist “associationism” is quite impressive and worth highlighting. In Harry Donglar's opinion, von Sylffa is just „ein Phantast und unpraktischer Trumer“ (31). According to the Jew, Lindenlaub, „Er is  guter Mann, der neue Konsul, . . .  guter Mann und  feiner Mann un  Phantast. An den werd' ich knnen machen  Geschft“ (42). The German Diaspora's initial general opinion of him is that of a dreamer, investing efforts and resources in impossibilities. But it does not take long for the whole opinion to change as von Sylffa begins to turn their minds around.

Although the Baron had already made a commendable impression on Harry Donglar, it was the English recognition and praise of the Baron that struck the chord of patriotic “renaissance” in him,

Mit Erstaunen nahm Harry Donglar wahr, da seine englischen Freunde, die ihm in gesellschaftlichen Fragen Autoritt waren, eine hohe Meinung von Baron Sylffa zu haben schienen, und besonders dem ausgesprochenen Patriotismus des Konsuls Beifall zollten. Mrs. Chester, die in U. zum Mindesten den gesellschaftlichen Rang einer ersten Botschafterin einnahm, schien an diesem kleinen preuischen Beamten . . . frmlich einen Affen gefressen zu haben. Sie fhrte ihn bestndig im Munde. (84)

It does not take long for the first German *Versammlung* to take place, and, against all expectations, almost all the German-speaking residents of U. are present. That marks

the beginning of patriotic renaissance in U. At the first *Gottesdienst*, the Donglars, who have always distanced themselves from other Germans, were also in attendance. While Mr. Donglar becomes a regular companion of the Baron, Nelly begins to get active with issues and matters regarding women. Her involvement with Mrs. Gabelsberger during her sickness, her adoption of Mrs. Gabelsberger's son, and the financial and direct support she contributed, all attest to Konsul von Sylffa's success in transforming the German Diaspora in U. Lora Wildenthal recognizes this success,

The novel, *The Consul*, for example, shows how a racially superior German man, Max von Sylffa, forges a harmonious and patriotic community out of contentious German settlers in East Africa. At the margins of that community but still participating in key events are Josefa, a dissolute Czech Catholic, and Lindenlaub, a money-lending Jewish tavern owner who keeps Josefa as his mistress.⁷¹

The most outstanding evidence of von Sylffa's success is the women's role during Mrs. Gabelsberger's illness. In the first place, Mrs. Gabelsberger is hosted and nursed by Josefa in Lindenlaub's home, which doubles as a public entertainment spot. It is a dreaded place for people with moral and social sensitivity. However, the woman's illness causes the German ladies – the missionary's wife, Josefa, and, above all, Nelly Donglar – to overlook the threat of the Lindenlaub compound to render service to a fellow German woman. Josefa, being a service woman, occupies the lowest position in the social and moral strata in U. She and Mr. Lindenlaub make no secret of her business among the European Diaspora. On a certain occasion, she even tried to seduce the Konsul at their home in the absence of Mr. Lindenlaub. However, in spite of all these, the women still have the sense of duty to converge in her house to nurse a sick "sister."

⁷¹ Lora Wildenthal, "'When Men Are Weak': The Imperial Feminism of Frieda von Bülow," *Gender and History*, 10.1 (1998): 64. Print.

The act of the women is a further stamp on the Konsul's success. Through the meeting at Lindenlaub, Nelly establishes a cordial relationship with Josefa and that generates the opportunity to discuss Josefa's moral and social issues with her. Their interaction reflects an endorsement of von Sylffa's philosophy of tolerance and accommodation of other persons and views, „Anstatt sich einander mitzuteilen und dadurch zu bereichern, zieht sich Jeder vorsichtig in das Schneckenhäus der Konvenienz zurück, um sich nur ja nichts zu vergeben. Schwäche und Mißtrauen gegen sich selbst liegt dieser Verbarrikadierung zu Grunde!“ (88-9). The fact that Nelly, the highest socially and economically placed of the German women in U., could come low enough to interact with Josefa, is an uncontestable evidence of the emerging *Einigung* of the German Diaspora.

There is irrefutable evidence that Konsul von Sylffa has overcome the primary “organic” problem that the German colonial enterprise has to face. The Germans now act like one body, meeting for social and religious purposes, working with the Konsul as he directs. The missionaries, who have been operating along denominational lines in different directions, have been united, and their responsibility of softening the natives for German colonization clearly defined. With a united front, the Germans are confident that they can achieve much in U. if Berlin is ready to grant them full support. Flabs, one of the German Diaspora in U., articulates their mood at a gathering,

„Aber die Hauptsache ist und bleibt, daß er ein Patriot ist! . . . Denn ich frage Euch: was bedeutet der Einzelne an sich? Eine Nummer stellt er dar im Staatsganzen und weiter nichts! Aber wenn die Nation, wenn das Volk, wenn das Vaterland hinter ihm steht . . . dann, meine Herren, dann ist er eine Macht! – ‚schließ an ein Ganzes Dich an!‘ ruft der Dichter. Ja, ich wage es zu behaupten, eine solche Macht kann jeder Einzelne unter uns werden, wenn er sich emporschwingt über die Erbärmlichkeit seines Ichs und zum Träger einer großen Idee wird. Denn die Idee, meine Herren,

die Idee ist es, die den Erdball beherrscht, nicht wie die halbverthierte Gewinnsucht meint, brutale Thatsachen. Denn die Idee schafft die Thatsachen, nicht umgekehrt. In diesem Fall aber heißt die uns beherrschende und tragende Idee: Vaterland! Darum fordere ich Sie auf, meine Herren, die Gläser zu füllen und sie hochzuheben und sie bis auf die Nagelprobe zu leeren mit einem dreimaligen begeisterten Hoch auf das Vaterland!‘ (176)

„Bravo Konsul von Sylffa,” could be the chant among the German Diaspora. It is necessary at this point to investigate the reaction of other Europeans to Konsul von Sylffa’s operations.

With the Konsul’s effort at unifying the German Diaspora restoring self-worth among them, one would expect some disquiet among the British, who hoped that the new Konsul would follow in the steps of Mr. Fürstendank. The British did not hesitate to strike. The first British concern is communicated by St. Clair, who warns his English colleagues of the danger of allowing Konsul von Sylffa to continue the way he is going,

Lassen wir ihn weiter arbeiten, wie er es jetzt thut, so wird unsere Stellung hier eine sehr klägliche. Wir thun dann in der That besser, unsere Koffer zu packen. Sollen wir etwa mit langem Gesicht zusehen, wie dieser Deutsche uns Schritt für Schritt aus unseren alten Positionen hinausdrängt? Ich für meine Person verzichte darauf. (111)

St. Clair’s statement above indicates that the British had not established any official protectorate status over the territory, but have unofficially made their presence to count in the affairs of the town. So, having arrogated the right of ownership to themselves, the activities of the Konsul, which could lead to the Germans staging a claim for the territory, is considered a severe threat.

The first manifestation of the Konsul’s Germano-centric maneuvers vis-à-vis other European colonists registers in his objection to the sign on Lindenlaub’s business house. Reminding Lindenlaub that, „Wir leben doch nicht unter Franzosen,“ he orders

him to change the designation of his tavern as “Restaurant” to *Gasthaus*, *Wirtschaft* or *Schenke* (41). Although this action seems to be a politics of language, its implications go beyond that. It is one of the Konsul’s strategy to announce the revival of the German spirit among the Diaspora. By such a simple measure, which is followed later by German social and spiritual gatherings, other German impressions begin to appear in the city, and sooner or later, the reality of German presence will cease to be a matter of “once upon a time.” As people begin to read and hear German on the streets, the psychology and consciousness of their existence will no more be in the background. So, this measure is for the attention of all the Europeans in U., including the British.

Although there is no such clear attack on British interests in the narrative, it is apparent that von Sylffa’s activities have registered some delimiting effects on the British influence in the territory. This situation is expressed by Josefa in a conversation with Mr. de Sufa, „Beim Herrn hat Euer Konsul jetzt allein das Wort. Der Engländer ist abgesetzt“ (157). The seriousness of the situation could be gleaned from the fact that, even Josefa, the Bohemian “social outcast,” could notice the power shift in U. in the favor of the Germans. Gumprecht celebrates this new turn of events,

„Es ist Thatsache . . . die Landesregierung arbeitet uns jetzt geradezu in die Hände; der englische Einfluß sinkt rapide. Wenn ich diesen Umschlag nicht erlebt hätte, würde ich ihn kaum für möglich halten. Das haben wir aber ganz allein dem Genie unseres verehrten Konsuls zu danken. Ich fordere Sie auf, meine Herren, unsere Gläser in Anerkennung der Verdienste dieses ungewöhnlichen Mannes zu leeren!“ (148)

In chapter two, I pointed out that other colonial powers in Africa viewed Germany as an intruder. St. Clair echoes this view unequivocally, „Unsere Losung heißt: Afrika englisch von Kap zum Nil! Es ist längst unser moralisches Eigenthum und wartet nur der

Gelegenheit, dies auch praktisch zu werden. Ich frage: was hat Deutschland hier zu suchen? Sie sollen zu Hause bleiben, die Deutschen, bei ihrem Soldatenspiel! Hier überm Ozean sind wir die Herren und wollen es bleiben“ (112). So long as the German Diaspora lived and carried out their individual businesses dependent on English goodwill, the British had nothing to worry about.

The German Diaspora is quite aware of this, but cannot change the status quo. Gumprecht laments the situation (103). It is only when the German Diaspora begins to organize itself as a unit under the Konsul that the British feel threatened. As St. Clair declared, the British would not sit and watch as the Germans pull the carpet from under their feet. A conspiracy is hatched against the Konsul in order to get him out of U. as soon as possible and re-install Fürstendank in his stead. „Sylffa muß fort. Man soll Fürstendank an seine Stelle setzen. Das ist der Mann, den wir gebrauchen können. . . . Gewiß, Sylffa muß fort, und je eher desto besser. Er ist hier ganz unerlaubt populär; hat das ganze Gesindel in der Tasche“ (113).

It is interesting to note the certainty with which the British assert that von Sylffa must go. One begins to wonder what gives them the confidence to dictate which of the German representatives stays, and which must leave. The secret to their confidence in this matter is betrayed in a statement by St. Clair, „Ihr großer Bismarck ist zum Glück kein Kolonial-Politiker. . .“ (113). This statement demonstrates how well the British understand Berlin's lukewarm attitude towards periphery colonialism, and how a little spin would turn things to their favor from Berlin. To enforce their design to remove the Konsul, the British write a letter to Berlin that accuses him of actions capable of upsetting

the relationship between the two nations. This marks the turning point in von Sylffa's career as colonial diplomat in Africa.

Berlin and Konsul von Sylffa's program

Berlin's indifference towards Germany's periphery colonialism in its early stages has been highlighted in relation to Carl Peters' colonial program. Be it as it may, it could be argued that Berlin's attitude towards Carl Peters was one of apprehension, since his program marked the initial venturing of Germany into Africa as a nation. Recalling the circumstances that led to Peters' fall – operations that precipitated an unfriendly atmosphere with Britain – there should be no surprises that the Konsuls that have been sent to U. did not display any patriotic colonial enthusiasm. Gumprecht's complaint indicates that blaming the German Diaspora each time there is a complaint by the English has been the usual practice with Berlin, „Haben wir denn nicht Vertrauen! . . . Geglaubt und vertraut und gehofft haben wir, bis wir darüber zu Narren geworden sind. Ja zu Narren! Denn während wir hier unsere Kräfte für eine nationale Sache einsetzen, wird daheim in einem einzelnen Streitfall gegen uns entschieden“ (104). With Konsul von Sylffa out to change the status quo, one would not be surprised if he suffers the same fate if the English would complain.

Flab, a member of the German Diaspora in the text, complains that, until the home government gets involved and supports the Konsul's efforts, his achievements will amount to nothing (176). Flab's statement becomes oracular as, shortly after, the Konsul receives a reprimand from Berlin. As he continues his cultural rebirth program among the German Diaspora, Berlin never intervenes or demonstrates any appreciation for the

project. Berlin's attention is registered as soon as the British express some disquiet over von Sylffa's activities, and the response is flatly against the Konsul. Von Sylffa receives an official letter from Berlin, which references the British letter of protest. Without mincing words, he is warned to desist from any actions that could precipitate further discomfort for England (195).

Considering the situation, von Sylffa's only option against provoking English discomfort is to reverse the course of German significance in U, and to refrain from displaying any colonial interests. Earlier in the narrative, an English mocked the German Diaspora as unfit to establish colonial administration, „Jedenfalls werden sie nie und nimmer eigne Kolonien verwalten können,' . . . die Deutschen sind unstreitig die besten Kolonisatoren, die es gibt, aber nur unter anderer Verwaltung“ (8).

This scenario as presented in the text, suggests that, the British always regarded the Germans as mere jokers, and would always apply the strategy of giving Berlin a serious frown to occasion a change of course from Berlin. The humiliation of the German Diaspora in the present setup is encapsulated in the cynicism of the English consular, Chester. His response to von Sylffa's worries about the “wing-clipping” letter from Berlin is very epitomic, „Chester konnte, als er den Baron bis an die Gartenpforte geleitete, es nicht unterlassen, ihm auf die Schulter zu klopfen und mit einem vertraulichen Augenzwinkern die Bemerkung zu machen: ‘Man muß niemals *plus royaliste que le roi* sein wollen! Es kommt nichts dabei heraus“ (200).

The solidarity of the German Diaspora and their confidence and support for the Konsul is further demonstrated by the initiative to write a collective protest letter to

Berlin. This measure fails to strike any chord of positivity with Berlin. The ultimatum from Berlin demoralizes the German Diaspora and threatens the patriotic spirit, which von Sylffa has worked so hard to kindle among them. Von Sylffa complains,

England runzelte einmal wieder die breite Stirn und drohte mit dem Finger, weil es mit einer durch die Gewohnheit entstandenen Sicherheit auf deutsche Nachgiebigkeit rechnete. Nur einmal mußte man sich ungerührt zeigen, und es würde sofort andere Saiten aufziehen! Oder war Deutschland in der That so ohnmächtig, daß es sich dem ‚ich bin groß und du bist klein‘, welches den englischen Ansprüchen gewöhnlich zu Grunde lag, beugen mußte. (196)

Harry Donglar, formerly a diehard admirer of the British lifestyle, who converted back to the „*Deutschtum*,“ laments Berlin’s attitude (217).

Bülow uses the British problem as an avenue to communicate an aspect of Germany’s attitudinal problems in periphery colonialism. As Donglar articulates in the text, although Germany prides herself in multi-faceted greatness, she still fails to take strategic and significant decisions whenever Britain is involved. In spite of Germany’s war victories, the industrial upswing, the comparative numerical population superiority, and the overall intellectual prowess of the Germans, Britain continues to be an ever-present intimidation.

Another dimension to the British problem in U. is the emergence of discord between the Germans and the local administration. When the Konsul launched his subtle colonial program, the local authorities under Ibrahim bin Nasr cooperated with him. Before this time, Germans in U. would need the goodwill of the British to do business in the town and with the *Statthalter*. The evidence to this situation is drawn from the complaint in the official letter from Berlin about Gumprecht and his business (194-195). But through the Konsul’s ingenuity, Germans began to enjoy direct access and dealings

with the local authorities. In fact, the *Konsul* enters a trade agreement with the local administration in his capacity as the representative of the German government. While waiting for the ratification of the agreement from Berlin, business transactions begin to take place. Following the British-instigated withdrawal of confidence by Berlin, the ratification documents fail to come and the *Statthalter*, spurred by the British, capitalizes on this, and impounds Gumprecht's goods.

This measure by the *Statthalter* reveals how deep and far-reaching the Berlin ultimatum is, and the extent to which the British intrigue could go. The author writes, „Indessen machten sich die Wirkungen der aus Berlin ertheilten Direktive bemerkbar. Der arabische Statthalter sah sich von dem Konsul von Sylffa hintergangen und diesen von seiner Regierung in deren Auftrag zu handeln er vorgegeben, desavouirt. Natürlich unterließ es Chester nicht, ihn in dieser Auffassung zu bestärken“ (221). The English hand in the stand-off between the *Konsul* and the *Statthalter* becomes evident as the *Statthalter*, apprehensive of the *Konsul*'s threats of violence, consults Consular Chester, who advises him to hold his ground against the *Konsul* (223).

This scenario presents a picture of the tri-postalty of the crisis German colonists faced in U. On one position is the rebellion from the natives, who have woken up to the reality of colonialism, and are fighting against it. This is evident in Carl Peters' experience during the Emin Pascha expedition. On another position is the threatening presence of other European powers, who are not very willing to yield space to Germany. On the final position is the Berlin government, which continues to be indecisive on how to prosecute Germany's colonial designs due to the concern about British response. As I

have said earlier, Britain always remains the nemesis of Germany at every level of the periphery colonial enterprise.

Bülow's narrative, though fictional, draws richly from the historical record of Germany's colonial experience. Using her protagonist, Konsul Max von Sylffa, she portrays the desire and enthusiasm with which German colonists embraced the responsibility of furthering Germany's colonial ambition. While the Konsul and his predecessor Fürstendank may differ in how they related to the expectations of the German Diaspora and Berlin, it is noteworthy that both are literarily configured for specific purposes in Germany's periphery colonial enterprise.

Fürstendank is used in the narrative to highlight the lip-service that Berlin was paying to periphery colonialism at the time. He is projected as the pacifying act from Berlin to mitigate the pressure from the colonial enthusiasts back home. History suggests that Bismarck's apparent interest in periphery colonialism was prompted by political circumstances back home in Germany and in Europe. Seligmann and McLean argue, "Firstly, there are those interpretations that stress the pre-eminent role of diplomacy and emphasize that, for Bismarck, colonial policy was grounded firmly in European considerations. According to this argument, Bismarck's entry into the colonial arena was intended as a means of enhancing Germany's diplomatic position in Europe."⁷² The fact that the driving force behind Bismarck's colonial interests are founded in Europe, could mean that no real expectations or returns were attached to the periphery colonial enterprise, or to the position of the Konsul. So, understanding quite well that his position

⁷² Seligmann and McLean, p. 47.

is more or less ceremonial, Fürstendank is content to flow with the wind of the status quo – the British dominance.

The smooth-sailing atmosphere that characterizes Fürstendank's consular regime suits Bismarck's desired domestic political atmosphere, whereby he does not have to grapple with issues arising from the colony. A summary of this stance of "just follow the wind" is communicated via the official letter written to von Sylffa. It turns the representative into a dead fish that flows with the current.

The German Diaspora, another significant component of the constellation of Germany's colonial landscape, is also instrumentalized in the narrative. In Fabri's discussion of *Handels-Colonien*, he clearly states that the onus is on Germans of the maritime states and cities to take the initiative and the government will follow (Fabri, 156). It could be argued that the German Diaspora in U. fits in the Fabri formula. Other Germans mentioned in the narrative are all running flourishing enterprises as private individuals, but depending on the goodwill of the British and the local administration. They have always waited for the involvement of Berlin to provide the protection and support they needed.⁷³ Unfortunately, Berlin treats Germany's colonial question with dissimulation by stripping the government representatives of the necessary political tools they need to function effectively.

From the text, it could be argued that the German Diaspora is more or less a castaway to the home government. They live in the periphery on their own account; they live according to the rule of whichever European or local authorities that have dominion

⁷³ Lowe, p. 95.

over the territory; their businesses do not count on any support or protection from Berlin; any issues arising from their dealings do not attract any serious government attention; any representative of Berlin is not necessarily for them, and should not be brought into whatever they are doing. In essence, the so-called *Handels-Colonien* degenerates into the status of *Straf-Colonien*, which, according to Fabri's formulae, would start off as a banishment territory.

The *Konsul* is objectified to reflect the dilemma of German patriots who want to propagate the greatness of Germany away from the redundancy of *Dachstuben-heroismus* (Olden, 38) and *Soldatenspiel* (Bülow, 112) onto the outside world. His fervent enthusiasm, when contrasted with Berlin's non-commitment, underscores the claim of instrumentalization of periphery colonial politics for gains in domestic politics. Bülow paints a picture of a colonial enterprise that seemed doomed to failure, due to the inconsistencies within the citadel of German politics.

Women and German Colonialism (Frieda von Bülow's *Verheißung*, 1899)

Frieda von Bülow's novel, *Im Lande der Verheißung* (1899), has a unique dimension to it. Not only is it among Germany's first colonial novels, it is also one of the few colonial novels that has a female protagonist. Although there are female characters that introduce a new dimension to Germany's colonial discourse in *Der Konsul* (1891), the protagonist in *Im Lande der Verheißung* (1899) plays a significant role that cannot be ignored in Germany's colonial discourse.

The discussion of Germany's colonial fantasies, expounded by Zantop, reveals a necessity for women's participation. If we analyze the "familial" structure built into the

colonial fantasy, by which the natives were supposed to be integrated for the purposes of racio-cultural elevation, one could see that there is necessarily a position for women in the setting. However, in the planning, designing, and execution of the colonial project, German women were not given any considerations at the early stage. Wildenthal comments on the place of German women in relation to colonization,

Formal overseas empire was important to German women, but German women were not initially important to the men who dominated that empire. Women's legal inequality meant that they could not participate in politics as men did; apart from some local elections, they could not vote until 1918. Their enforced lack of academic credentials . . . prevented them from participating in academic 'colonial sciences' such as geography and linguistics.⁷⁴

Colonial enterprise became a stage for the furtherance of the European male's masculinity, and at the same time, an extension of the disrespect for women in Germany, based on which they were excluded from any public/governmental affairs, domestic or foreign. Frank B. Tipton writes,

Male commentators across the political spectrum insisted that women's role was to serve as a submissive wife and nurturing mother in a private sphere cut off from public life. Moral, philosophical, and historical arguments had been elaborated and repeated to support this view. Now the authority of the new national state could be invoked as well. . . . Bismarck himself was deeply concerned about the potentially disruptive role of women in public life, as seen in his objections to the idea of portraying Germany as a female Germania, and in his insistence that no female person should even consider bearing arms.⁷⁵

So it could be seen that German women lacked agency to the barest minimum. However, with the advent of periphery colonialism, German women saw the possibility of carving out an angle of agency for themselves. *Im Lande der Verheißung* (1899) tells of the experiment and experience of a German woman on the stage of periphery colonialism.

⁷⁴ Wildenthal, (2001), p. 2.

⁷⁵ Tipton, p. 152.

Given that the concept of agency is prominent in this section of this project, it is necessary to discuss the concept in two different spheres of its use. The first I term the feminist understanding of the concept, and the second, the Marxist understanding thereof. In Terry Eagleton's discussion of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (ca. 1601-1603), he searches for the place of agency in the performances of the actors in the play.⁷⁶ This raises the question of being an object or a subject of an interaction or a setting. As Eagleton puts it, "in this condition, a man can either consent to finding his real self only in the margin of society, in non-official activities and relationships; he can sell himself over, alternatively, to the public definition, become as he is valued; or he can continue to assert his authentic life and risk destruction."⁷⁷

Agency in this sense is an encapsulating term for the binds between "act/source," "action/agent," and "actee/effect." In this bind, agency becomes the source, the subject of the setup, while action is carried by the agent, the object of the setup. Be it as it may, the agent/object may decide to limit his/her agent/object status by infusing some autonomy into the process of discharging the action. The agent achieves a measure of independence if s/he is able to do this.

The understanding of agency in this context does not necessarily differ from the feminist understanding of it. What German women strove for through their involvement in Germany's colonial enterprise was the platform to be able to infuse their autonomy in the colonial setup. The Berlin government, the German society, and the colonial office

⁷⁶ See Terry Eagleton, *Shakespeare and Society. Critical Studies in Shakespearean Drama* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1967) 39-65. Print.

⁷⁷ Eagleton (1967), p. 52.

designed the sphere of operation for women in the colony, a sphere which would limit them to the status of absolute agents/objects. Friederike Eigler argues,

Within these constructions of Germanness, women characters assume a special role, a role that lends itself to a discussion of the racial and sexual politics that underwrote the colonial conquest. Like more established colonial empires, Germany increasingly promoted the 'import' of German women to its colonies in an effort to assure the racial 'purity' of its colonial ruling class.⁷⁸

However, as typified by the actions of Nelly Donglar and Maleen Dietlas, women pursued a broader scope of functionality. By achieving agency, women could become a source from which an act could be initiated. This we shall see via the actions of Maleen, the protagonist in the discussion of Bülow's *Verheißung* (1899). Agency in both senses means being an active component of the setup instead of an absolute passive component. This is Bülow's perception of agency.⁷⁹

As I have already pointed out, the plan and the design for the colonies had no place initially for women. Therefore, any woman in the colony is riding on the back of her husband: functioning as a healthcare administrator (still on the anchor of her husband), or operating as a rebel, breaking the bounds of domesticity and femininity if she gets involved in colonial issues proper. Wildenthal comments on the chances of the European female colonist,

Colonialist women faced a particular predicament as they tried to act on behalf of their race and nation: they had constantly to justify their importance to the imperial enterprise, even to convinced colonialists. A German or other European man's right to be in the colonies was self-evident to

⁷⁸ Friederike Eigler, "Engendering German Nationalism: Gender and Race in Frieda von Bülow's Colonial Writings," *The Imperialist Imagination: German Colonialism and its Legacy*, eds. Sara Friedrichsmeyer, Sara Lennox, and Susanne Zantop (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press; 1998) 74. Print.

⁷⁹ See Frieda von Bülow, „Das Weib in seiner Geschlechtsindividualität,“ *Die Zukunft*, 1897: 601. The Sophia Project 21 July 2011 < <http://sophie.byu.edu/?q=print/node/3708>>.

Europeans across the political spectrum, even as debate rages over methods of colonization and incidents of brutality. German and other European women had to give reasons for their presence in the colonies, and indeed in the colonial movement.⁸⁰

In Bülow's novel, a moment of concern grips the European community in Ungudja as Georg Dietlas, a tobacco farmer, expects his wife from Germany. This is because the state of the colony regarding ownership and stability is still questionable. Despini, the Italian, expresses his concern,

‘Ihre Kolonie ist vorläufig erst ein Experiment, und zwar ein kolossal unsicheres. Ich glaube, Sie haben nötig, mit aller Vorsicht einen Fuß vor den anderen zu setzen, wenn Sie nicht zu Schaden kommen wollen. Was sind Sie denn heute an dieser wilden Küste? Eine Handvoll wagehalsiger Einzelner, ohne Truppen, ohne große Geldmittel, ohne jede persönliche oder finanzielle Sicherheit. Wenn sich jetzt schon eine Ihrer großen Damen hier niederläßt, so wird das in Ihrem Vaterland die Meinung erwecken, daß Sie hier bereits viel fester im Sattel sitzen, als es in der Tat der Fall ist.’ (3)

Despini's remark indicates the shaky nature of the German colonial hold on Ungudja. It also highlights Germany's attitude of not reckoning with reality, but rather giving impressions about the state of things in the colony. The Frenchman adds a cynical dimension to the whole scenario of a German woman in Ungudja, “Nun, nun . . . mit allzuviel Vorsicht und Vorbedacht läßt sich die Welt nicht erobern, mit schönen Frauen dagegen wohl. Also: Vivent les Dames!” (4). To the Europeans in Ungudja, the involvement of women in the field, which is not yet secure in German hands to accommodate their femininity, is just another bold act by Germans. The conceptual “fragility” of the woman is essentialized within the colonial milieu as an authenticating factor. If the German woman is able to survive in the colony, it then means that the colony is more secure and safer.

⁸⁰ Wildenthal (1998), p. 54.

Maleen Dietlas arrives in the city as the only German woman in the budding colony. Although she is expected to function within domicile domesticity, she displays her interest and desire to also function on the public stage. Friederike Eigler recognizes this, “Maleen’s decision to marry Dietlas, for instance, was motivated by her wish to join him in German East Africa, a place onto which she had projected her desire for meaningful life and work.”⁸¹ In the very first conversation with her husband, she asks questions about the colony, and talks about reforms that would transform the colony from *Schlaraffenland* into a modern society (19). In the course of their discussion, Maleen makes a remark that highlights the primacy of Germany’s colonial fate on her agenda, „Dir ist es im Grunde ganz egal, glaub’ ich, ob Deutschland eine Kolonialmacht wird oder nicht, wenn du nur deinen Tabak gut verkäufst. Ihr seid eben alle Materialisten, ihr langweiligen Männer – alle!“ (20). Maleen’s reference to men as boring materialists tends to place women on a higher pedestal on colonial patriotism.

It is necessary to note here that, as soon as Maleen arrives, her brother, Rainer Waltron, associates her with the caring service sphere, which has been recognized as the woman’s sphere, „Weil . . . mit Männern, siehst du, das ist wieder so was anders. Jeder kümmert sich doch hauptsächlich um sich selbst und denkt an sich. Aber ihr Frauen denkt auch an uns. Ihr könnt euch viel leichter in andere hineinverstehen. Männer kommen auch nicht ganz über eine gewisse Rivalität fort“ (11). So it is taken for granted that Maleen would simply take her place among the other European women in Ungudja in the care-giving service. However, this is not the kind of emancipation drive the author projects for her protagonist.

⁸¹ Eigler, p. 78.

As we shall see later in the text, the author tries to portray and advocate for an on-the-stage involvement of women in the colonial enterprise. She, however, recognizes the need for liberation from the prevalent patriarchal dominance for this to happen. She hints at this liberation in Maleen's soliloquy while observing her husband,

„Sie war seine zweite Frau. Die erste, ein liebreizendes Geschöpf, den Bildern nach, war trotz seiner aufopfernden Pflege an der Schwindsucht gestorben. Er hat sie sehr geliebt . . . aber jetzt liebt er mich ebensowohl, und wenn ich bald stürbe, würde er eine dritte nehmen und die auch wieder vergöttern. Ja, das würde er. Die Liebe bleibt die gleiche, aber der Gegenstand kann ruhig wechseln. Ob alle Männer so sind?“ (22)

Maleen's evaluative rumination on the circumstances of the relationship leads her to understand the ephemeral nature of love. Although this line of thought could be read as instrumentalization based on what would later happen between Maleen and Krome, it still indicates a liberating reflection that would free her from the status of “mein Kind,” Georg's favorite way of addressing her. In the same thought process, she recognizes herself as a slave of love (23).

The tension between Maleen's reform ideas and her husband's views of her as a typical housewife continues to increase. Georg's concentration on how to spoil his “Kind” with new clothing and some goodtime in the city reveals either a lack of understanding of his wife's personality and agency craving, or pretence not to know. His proposal to take her to town for shopping creates the opportunity for Maleen to communicate her ambition to him (27). Maleen's declaration indicates a rejection of domicile domesticity as her sphere of functionality. Her obsession with Germany's colonial question generates fertile circumstances for an alliance with whosoever shares

the same passion. Again, we see the woman, the “unwanted,” challenging the men, the “privileged,” to rise up to the challenges of Germany’s colonial future.

The author, in order to create the protagonist that would fulfill her design, has to first of all toughen her. The toughening does not come from any direct negative experience from patriarchal dominance, but rather from a cognitive exercise that complicates the status quo of patriarchal superiority, which derives from a projected inferiority of women. Maleen is able to arrive at certain decisions using the power of reason rather than sentiment and emotions. She will be able to stay on course in spite of the resistance and discouragements she will encounter. Reason helps her to maintain a balance between her duties as a wife and her colonial zeal for the fatherland.

At the head of Germany’s colonial drive in East Africa is Dr. Ralf Krome. Although Fürstendank is the Konsul, Krome embodies Germany’s colonial future in East Africa. He is first mentioned in the text by Georg Dietlas as “Deuwel”, which could have meant “Teufel” (19). When Dr. Krome appears on the scene, Georg introduces him thus, „Dies war Doktor Ralf Krome, der vor wenigen Jahren den Anfang einer deutschen Kolonie geschaffen hatte und seitdem mit eiserner Energie einer Welt von Gegnerschaft und einer Welt von Gleichgültigkeit zum Trotz daran arbeitete, seine Schöpfung sicher über das allzu gefährdete Babystadium hinüberzubringen“ (31). Georg has more to say about Dr. Krome,

„Ralf Krome war nicht allein Willensmensch, sondern besaß auch eine starke, schweifende Phantasie. Das mit dem Gedanken Erfaßte stellte sich ihm allsogleich mit greifbarer Deutlichkeit als Wirklichkeit vor Augen und veranlaßte ihn, keck und sicher an die Verwirklichung seiner Phantasie zu gehen. So geschah manches, was große Bewunderung erregte und Folgen nach sich zog, von denen sich keiner hatte träumen lassen.“ (31)

The picture Georg paints of Dr. Krome makes him the ideal person within Maleen's colonial projections. In that same setting, Krome spots Maleen's colonial enthusiasm, and is ready to reinforce and exploit that. He even confesses to her that her involvement would be more effective than that of many men (33). While ignoring Maleen's protest that her primary responsibility is to fulfill her husband's desires, Krome introduces the British problem and the need to neutralize British influence and establish German rule in Ungudja (34).

From the discussion between Maleen and Krome, one can see a partnership developing; a partnership oriented towards the colonial future of the fatherland. The author makes her advocacy for women clear at this early stage of the text. While the conjugal/familial bond between Maleen and her husband begins to crack by reason of conflicting attitudes towards colonial matters, a utilitarian, colonialism-oriented bond is developing between Maleen and Krome. This new relationship dimension is encouraged throughout the novel. It is through such a relationship that the woman has a chance of achieving agency.

We have seen that, in Georg's perception, Maleen will just be a loved and pampered housewife. His terms of addressing Maleen, such as „Mein Kind“ (28), „meine liebe Maus“ (51), „Frauchen“ (52), „kleine Frau“ (86), „herzlose kleine Person“ (96), „süßes, kleines Frauchen“ (156), „mein süßes Herzenskind“ (157), „mein Engel“ (156) and many more, are condescending terms that not only portray Georg's perception of her as dormant, but also his effort to infantilize her perpetually. At one instance, he even directly tells her, „Du weißt doch wohl, mein Engel, daß Du mir gehörst?“ (156). All through the novel, each time Maleen raises any issue of importance with her husband, he

treats it with levity. He resorts to infantilizing references by which he usually reminds her that it is not her place to discuss or even consider such matters. This weakens and forces her to capitulate before his incapacitating patriarchal prowess.

The text attacks this status of incapacity vehemently. The author configures her protagonist to grow into a “stubborn,” independent figure, who would not reckon with societal views in her striving for what she considers a right. She recognizes the will to overlook public opinion as one of the fundamental keys to the achievement of agency. After all, it is on the public stage that the backward location of German women is legislated.⁸² Therefore, she equips her female protagonist with the strength of mind to rise above societal regard in the pursuit of agency.

Krome recognizes Maleen not merely as Georg’s wife, but also as an agent for Germany’s colonial future. He, therefore, involves her in ways that would facilitate her functioning outside the confines of the home,

Hier in Ungudja . . . sind wir vorläufig noch alle Vertreter und Repräsentanten irgendeiner Größe, die hinter uns steht. Das darf man nicht aus den Augen lassen. Sie zum Beispiel sind die deutsche Dame, Dietlas der deutsche Plantagenbesitzer, Ihr Bruder der ritterliche Kriegsmann, ich der Vertreter der Kolonie. Wir müssen uns also ebensogut als offizielle Persönlichkeiten fühlen und danach benehmen, wie regierende Fürsten. (35-6)

With the idea that Maleen represent the women, the author does not simply mean her physical presence in the colony to deliver the feminine colonial services (care-giving). She configures her to represent the emancipation needs of German women. The implication is that she is an exponent of German women’s striving for agency through

⁸² Ann Allen Taylor, *Feminism and Motherhood in Germany, 1800-1914* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1991) 26. Print.

involvement in periphery colonialism. Daniel Schneider comments, „Für Frieda von Bülow sei die Kolonie der Ort, welcher den Wunsch nach klaren Wertigkeiten erfüllen könne, in ‚Im Lande der Verheißung‘ spreche sie ihre Sehnsucht ‚nach einem nationalen Heldentum aus, das in einer reformierten, ständischen Gesellschaft nach vorindustriellem Muster Anerkennung fände.“⁸³ The way Maleen handles herself translates into hope for freedom or otherwise for the group she is representing. That Maleen’s presence in the East African colony is experimental is already highlighted by Despini, the Italian, though from a different perspective (3).

In Maleen’s agency-seeking mission, the emergence and role of Krome becomes “apostlary.” Although Maleen already possesses the fervor for colonial engagement, it is the encounter with Krome that provides the involvement outlet for her enthusiasm. Each time the two meet, even in the presence of Georg, colonial issues constitute the subject of discussion, and Maleen always listens with hypnotic interest. A situation eventually develops, whereby Georg, oriented to conjugal and familial dominance, continues to lose prominence, while Krome, the partner in colonial vision, increases in significance and worth. At a dinner scene, Georg exclaims, „Lieber Krome. . . . Sie reden meine Frau so in Fanatismus, daß sie Essen und Trinken vergißt“ (58). Yes, the woman, who should be satisfied with being loved and pampered by her husband, now seeks and derives satisfaction from a project that is the exclusive preserve of men. The man, Georg, who has no enthusiasm for the project, now sits and looks on in confusion as the colonial apostle, Krome, spares no chances to make a fervent colonist convert of Maleen.

⁸³ Daniel Schneider, *Identität und Ordnung. Entwürfe des >>Eigenen<< und >>Fremde<< in deutschen Kolonial- und Afrikaromanen von 1889 bis 1952*. Bielefeld: Aisthesis Verlag, 2011) 87. Print.

Krome's first practical involvement of Maleen is a request to edit an official letter to Berlin (64). Through this involvement, Maleen begins to feel stronger and more capable contrary to being weak and needing protection. While Georg continues to see her as weak and in need of protection, Krome sees her as strong and able to contribute meaningfully to the colonial course. Upon seeing Georg from a distance, she evaluates him and his *Haltung* towards her, „Der Gute! Der Brave! . . . Er muß schützen und sorgen können, um zu lieben, und die er liebhat, mag er nur als schwach und schutzbedürftig empfinden“ (66-7). Maleen's remark indicates a distance from her husband prompted by contempt. The contempt does not mean the lack of love, but rather, that her desire for agency, which finds no anchor in her husband, overwhelms her love for him, in favor of Ralf Krome. What makes Georg contemptible to Maleen makes Krome admirable on the flip side.

Maleen's preference for colonial activity over conjugal passivity is further highlighted through her regard for the military arm of the colonial enterprise (80). The gist of this is that her total life is being increasingly consumed by fantasies of German colonial glory, and the more she conjures these images of „König Artus, Achill und Ajax, Ulisses usw“ (80) in her head, the more she is obsessed with the desire to be an active part of it. At a point Georg expresses jealousy upon hearing his wife confess her love for the troop, „So? Mir wär' es aufrichtig gesprochen lieber, du liebtest mich allein, mein Engel“ (82). Maleen responds, „Kampfgenossen und Weggefährten seid ihr mir! Muß man solche nicht lieben? Einer in allen und alle in einem. So soll es sein. Der ist mir der Höchste, der unsere Sache am kräftigsten fördert“ (82).

Maleen is now infected with the fever of *vaterländischem Fanatismus*, which elevates German colonial future above every other thing, personal or collective. Although the author permits her protagonist to develop this fanaticism, she is careful enough to retain her within the bounds of conjugality. By expressions like „Ich habe mich ja natürlich in erster Linie nach den Wünschen meines Mannes zu richten“ (33), „Ich habe den geheiratet, der mich haben wollte, und das warst du“ (83), Maleen is made to reiterate her commitment to her marriage and her husband. The author is, therefore, not advocating the abnegation of marriage, but instead, she is soliciting for a marital union that is symbiotically enhancing. This is where Georg fails as a husband and Krome excels as a friend. The desire to hinder and subjugate (Georg) conflicts with the ability and desire to enhance and support (Krome), and in an ambitious personality like Maleen, the latter wins.

Maleen's realist and enlightened view of life continues to manifest and expose Georg as locked down by tradition and archaism. In a discussion about Madam Eltville, who gave up aristocratic privileges in Europe to join her lover in colonial service, Maleen refuses to endorse the popular negative opinion of her. Instead, she argues that her actions are more deserving of noble attributes than if she had stayed in Europe to marry someone she does not love and live her life in total insignificance (88). Even though Maleen would not settle for that, she still considers it a noble undertaking to attend to the needs of sick people here in Africa. Georg is disappointed that his wife has a different opinion.

Georg's marital conservatism is further highlighted in a discussion with Rainer on how a wife should be treated. Rainer opines, „Wenn ich heirate, soll meine Frau mein

guter Kamarad sein und auch die Gefahren mit mir teilen. Zuckerpuppen mag ich nicht“
(78). Georg responds,

,Ganz schön, lieber Rainer. Du bist ein Fatalist. Ich für mein Teil werde die Rücksicht auf die Gesundheit meiner Frau jeder anderen vorgehen lassen. Frauen sind einmal zart und können nicht mit dem gleichen Maße gemessen werden, wie wir. Du als junger unverheirateter Mann weißt das eben nicht. Aber ich kann davon reden, denn ich habe schon eine verloren.‘ (78)

So, to Georg, the woman is a fragile “thing” that must be protected even against her own will. That also translates into perpetual subjugation, and no chances of agency. In this scenario, the text once again pushes the question of women’s agency to the forefront. The social status of the woman in the European setting, notwithstanding whether she is aristocratic or common, denies her agency. Tipton references Hersch and Gruber’s *General Encyclopedia of the Sciences and Arts* (1856), which contains a categorical statement on the social location of German women,

. . . the original, true character of woman could only appear over time, and woman’s ‘moral history’ demonstrated that her true destiny could only be realized when the family had correctly been recognized as a ‘worthy’ and ‘high’ institution. This they said had only been achieved in Germany at the end of the eighteenth century. Woman was now defined by the family, and the family in turn was defined by woman’s role. It was therefore the laws of nature, morality, and history together which established the boundaries of the female role. Now, to step outside those boundaries would be ‘going against nature; and against the whole flow of human history.’⁸⁴

Statutorily then, the woman is stripped of any chances of agency in the public space. It, therefore, does not matter much whether or not a woman is in the periphery, so long as she remains within the confines of domicile domesticity. The author’s project is to set the woman against this social barricade until it crumbles.

⁸⁴ Tipton, p. 106.

The campaign to free the woman from the crippling socio-political restrictions has been going on since the early 19th century. Tipton presents Louise Otto-Peters, the founder of the *Allgemeiner Deutscher Frauenverein*, as an example, “In her writings before and during the 1848 revolutions, Otto-Peters had called for equal treatment of boys and girls in education, but she also insisted that their education should be nationalistic in orientation. The fundamental purpose of education, she said, was to instill a sense of Germanness into all pupils, both boys and girls.”⁸⁵

Although agitations had been going on for a long time, the plight of German women remained pitiable into the later part of the 19th century. So, just as periphery adventure provided a liberating alternative for frustrated European males, it also provided a new avenue for the women to explore in their search for agency. The experiential commonality of being oppressed in Europe destined both the male of the lower social rung and the European female together in the same ship of exile. However, the men seized the rudder of the ship and steered it away from the women. The European male holds on firmly to the tradition of patriarchal dominance, and is unwilling to concede any space to the woman. Wildenthal identifies this tradition and men’s inflexibility as the main obstacle to women’s progress, “In Bülow’s non-fiction, the obstacles to women’s progress were tradition and male inflexibility.”⁸⁶ The fact that Maleen is seeking an active role in colonial affairs amounts to “going against nature; and against the whole flow of human history,” as asserted by Ersch and Gruber (see above). Being quite aware

⁸⁵ Tipton, p. 106.

⁸⁶ Wildenthal (1998), p. 63.

of this, the author configures her protagonist in such a way that she is tough enough to assert herself on the stage reasonably and responsibly.

Georg's failure to recognize Maleen's mental maturity, and to reconcile himself to her desire for involvement in colonial activities continues. Georg plans to travel inland and Maleen requests that he take her along. Georg finds this unimaginable considering the hazards involved and Maleen's "fragility" as a woman. To him, going inland is a man's business. While Maleen sees reason in Georg's argument and agrees to stay home, Georg gives her a bill of conduct to guide her while he is away. From the way Georg dishes out the instructions, one can easily see the condescending attitude with which he treats Maleen. He specifically defines the limits of her movements in time and space and elicits promises from her as one would from a child (100).

Maleen's impact on colonial affairs in Ungudja registers through her influence on Krome. Apart from functioning as Krome's unofficial secretary, Maleen provides her opinions in colonial matters. She has become someone he listens to and regards highly. Dissatisfied with being left out of the expeditionary team into the hinterland, Rainer asks her to persuade Krome to include him in the next team. He is convinced that a word from her to Krome would do it for him, „Wenn du mit ihm darüber redest, das ist viel besser. Alle sagen, daß er auf dich hört. . . . Und weißt du, sicher bist du ja hier in Ungudja mit Krome als deinem Freund und all den Konsuln um dich herum wie in Abrahams Schoß – auch ohne mich und ohne Georg“ (115-6). While Rainer tries to emphasize that she is safe in the Consulate, even in his and Georg's absence, Maleen insists she is able to handle eventualities on her own, and does not understand why she should be wrapped up in cotton (116). This figurative expression indicates her understanding and interpretation

of how she is viewed and treated by the people around her – a fragile, highly vulnerable person that must be protected. If she endorses this perception of her, there is no way she would achieve agency in Ungudja, and she would be disappointing the group she is representing in the German society.

Georg's absence avails Maleen the opportunity to express some agency. The Dietlas' house becomes a rallying place for the German Diaspora in Ungudja, „Auch jetzt, in des Hausherrn Abwesenheit, war ihre Halle der Sammelpunkt der ‘Gesellschaft. Hier wurde die öffentliche Meinung gemacht. Das war, was sie wollte und was Krome wollte“ (131). She also begins to meet regularly with Krome in the house, even late into the night. Without expressly insinuating anything illicit about this relationship and rendezvous, an erotic component is very apparent (131).

Maleen's struggle with her affection for Krome is a demonstration of the discipline and piety she possesses. She is not like Josefa Lindenlaub of *Der Konsul* (1891), or a woman of loose morals. Rather, she finds herself under circumstances where her conjugal desires to become a functional wife with agency on the one hand, and to become an active woman colonist in Ungudja on the other, are not only in conflict with each other, but bind her to two different men for realization. Her dilemma is that these two aspirations are threatening to merge into one, realizable in one man, Krome.

The author uses this development to communicate two major issues in the question of agency for women. First, it features as a component of the achievement of agency and liberation from the clutches of socio-political subalternation of the woman. This “fatal attraction” between Krome and Maleen does not result from mere

“animalistic” desire, which mostly drives the copulation of male colonists with native women, rather, it is the natural consequence of a multi-layered harmony that exists between the two. First is the continued coming together to discuss colonial issues, and the persistent physical or participatory absence of Georg. Furthermore, the woman’s agency also lies in the enablement the colony could offer. She can respond to the stimulus of agency without so much of the constraints, which would have emerged if she were living in Germany.

Secondly, the “humanity” of the two persons involved contributes to agency for the woman. It would have been scandalous, given the high position that Krome occupies and Maleen’s aristocratic background, for them to be involved in a frivolous extra-marital affair. However, just as it happened in *Der Konsul* (1891), between von Sylffa and Nelly, the humanity of both is granted expression under fated circumstances. The mutual compatibility between the two, which has made them allies in the service of the fatherland, has also generated emotional responsiveness as a cementing element,

Ihr Verkehr mit Krome war jetzt ein fortwährendes vorsichtiges Lavieren zwischen Klippen. Es herrschte die Atmosphäre äußerster Spannung und verhaltener Erregung.

Beide fühlten die drohende Elektrizität und suchten und flohen sich im blinden Drang der Leidenschaft. (168)

Maleen remains Georg’s wife, fulfilling her responsibilities as a wife, but Krome provides her with the avenue to achieve agency, which is her foremost passion. Maleen’s responsiveness to the person in whom love and duty harmonize is presented as a character trait that the author, Frieda von Bülow, greatly cherishes. Sophie Hoehstetter communicates on Bülow’s relationship with Carl Peters, „Sie konnte die Arbeit, zu der sie ihr starkes nationales Empfinden verpflichtete, unter den Umständen tun, die den

Menschen am meisten beglücken: sie arbeitete gleichzeitig für die Sache des Mannes, den sie liebte und von dem sie geliebt wurde.“⁸⁷

With agency, Maleen sees her worth, her value, and her usefulness as she serves in the interest of the fatherland. Her erotic affection for Krome, which violates the principles of conjugal morality in the public eye, is rendered insignificant in juxtaposition with the services she stands to give to the fatherland as a female colonist. This will become evident towards the end of the novel. If the extra-marital dimension to their relationship is instrumentalized as a means, then it could be justified by the end, baring the overbearing weight of moral consciousness.

A memo from Krome requests her to come over to the *Deutsches Haus*. Ordinarily, Georg would have prevented her from honoring the invitation. But in his absence, Maleen obliges. At the *Deutsches Haus*, she learns that she is the reason Rainer is excluded from the expeditionary team. She protests such a *Haltung* that makes her a burden and a hindrance to the course of the fatherland, instead of a catalyst (122-123). Maleen's protest is not directed at the mere act of keeping Rainer back for her sake, but at two things, first, the fact that Krome would place more value on her than on his national responsibility. To her this is inexcusable from a man who should have known better. This puts a question mark on Krome's integrity as a patriot. Secondly, the realization that Krome thinks of her as weak and fragile and in need of protection. This is the same view that Georg holds of her that she hates. Although such incidents are not repeated in the narrative, it will become evident later that Krome never understood Maleen's personality

⁸⁷ Sophie Hoehstetter, *Frieda Freiin von Bülow: Ein Lebensbild* (Dresden: Verlag von Carl Reißner; 1910) 156. Print.

and agency craving. That Krome lacks the understanding of her orientation is hinted earlier through his comment as Maleen contemplates which tobacco to smoke – an imported one or the one from Georg's farm, „Eigentlich ist es schade, wenn Damen rauchen; – aber freilich, als Gemahlin eines deutschen Tabakspflanzers unserer Kolonie, – das ist ein besonderer Fall“ (63).

So, the question arises if Krome is enlightened enough to recognize the rights of a woman to function in any area of her interest, or just exploiting her colonial enthusiasm to take advantage of her? The author uses this error by Krome to demonstrate the failure of men to fully appreciate the ability of women. She also uses it to underscore the personal ambition that male colonists always build into their so-called patriotism. This argument will become clearer towards the end of the narrative, when Krome becomes a renegade to the German colonial business, and tries to lure Maleen away from her commitment to the course. In that scene, the author complicates the concept of patriotism.

In spite of the failures noted above, for Maleen, Krome continues to emerge as a positive referent, while Georg continues to fade into contempt on matters of the colony. While Maleen believes to have found in Krome a supporter for her agency drive, Georg remains a conservative crony, who refuses to recognize and enhance her ambition. As a result, her gravitation towards Krome and away from Georg continues. However, Maleen's desire for colonial agency is continuously hindered by the abiding presence of Georg, and the conservative *Haltung* of the German Diaspora. As a result, she could only be active to a certain level, and unofficially too.

Maleen falls into deep reflection pondering what the future holds for her as a crisis brews in the colony. While Maleen is worried that the crisis will affect the men in her life – Georg, Rainer and Krome – she is more concerned about Krome, whose obsession with the colonial course could push to fatal extremes (157). Waking from her reflections, she only wonders if Krome will be at the evening gathering at the English consulate, at which she is a guest (160). It is not only Maleen who is obsessed with Krome. Krome’s obsession with her is communicated as he returns from an expedition to find her sick with malaria. He arranges some care for her and returns home. Under the circumstances of caring for her, his obsessive desire to possess her is relayed (179). However, Krome exercises the same measure of restraint as Maleen. He would rather persuade her to divorce Georg, instead of forcing himself in-between them.

The whole essence of agency is the acquisition and exercise of power – power to decide for oneself, power to determine one’s course of ambition, power to influence another’s life, power to determine for someone else, and more. Wildenthal recognizes power as the ultimate objective for Bülow’s female protagonists, “Indeed, almost all of Bülow’s fictional heroines are driven by a desire for power.”⁸⁸ Maleen has undoubtedly achieved the measure of power that allows her to interact with Krome on both defining fronts of their relationship – colonial issues and romance.

When Maleen learns of Krome’s flirting with Maria Beta, the motherless daughter of a German missionary, jealousy drives her into summoning Krome for a confrontation. However, instead of throwing the issue at Krome, she buries her challenge in a thicket of arguments about the risk of such a relationship regarding his racial and positional

⁸⁸ Wildenthal (1998), p. 68.

integrity as well as his mission as a German colonist (145). This power has also afforded her the platform to respond to Krome's overtures without much consideration for what the people would think or say, or whether Georg would find out or not. Instead, she rides the tide of affection with a full sail. A boat ride with Krome is the climax of their romantic escapades (166-3). She is also empowered enough to confess her romantic preference for Krome over Georg in a discussion with Madam Eltville (192-5). Although these emancipatory behaviors are taking place while Georg is away, it is necessary to note that, his absence only generates the conducive atmosphere for what had been lying dormant since the first encounter with Krome.

In spite of the power Maleen has achieved, she is still limited in the area of exercising authority over subjects. The opportunity to do that presents itself as the rebellion breaks out in the colony. She rejects Chester's offer of protective bodyguards (196-97). Under normal circumstances, she would have been grateful for Chester's initiative, but for her consciousness of *Deutschtum*, she rejects the offer. Maleen by rejecting the Chester's offer, asserts her independence. She more or less is saying "I take responsibility for whatever happens." Chester's response to her resolve further highlights the strong will that characterizes her, „Kein Wunder, daß dieser verwünschte Krome in sie vernarrt war. . . . Sie ist wirklich bezaubernd und dabei ist sie doch eine törichte und schlechte Frau, der ich sicherlich mein Haus nicht öffnen würde, wenn es nicht um dieses ausgezeichneten Dietlas willen wäre. Nun, ich habe getan, was ich als Gentleman und Christ zu tun verpflichtet war“ (197).

Chester's response to Maleen's rejection of his offer confirms Maleen's achievement of agency in one hand, and Georg's failure as a German colonist on the

other. It is obvious that Germans in the periphery, who are committed to the protection of German interest, are an enemy to the British. So, it takes indifference to the German course or an anti-German *Haltung* for a German to be a friend of the British. Therefore, Chester's reference to Georg as *ausgezeichnet* is an expression of friendship, and, as such, an evidence of his deficiency in German patriotism. Through his comments, Chester also implicates Konsul von Sylffa as a failure in matters of German colonial interest (198). As we know from *Der Konsul* (1891) and as referenced in *Im Lande der Verheißung* (1899), von Sylffa allowed Berlin to cripple him.

The upheaval in Georg's absence provides Maleen the opportunity to exercise the authority she has always craved. She cultivates a tough attitude in the face of the crisis, taking initiatives and refusing to be objectified in the circumstances. She first rejects the offer of bodyguards from the English Consular. Fürstendank, the Konsul, fails to convince her to go over to the *Deutsches Haus* for refuge (198-200). Maleen elects to stay put and to die along with other Germans, if the situation degenerates to that level. She would rather become a martyr for the fatherland than survive the crisis as a protected person. Her position as a representative of the women requires independence, resoluteness and action. She exploits the prevalent situation to demonstrate her ability to stand on her own without the support (interference) of men.

Notwithstanding the danger in the city, Maleen, equipped with a revolver and accompanied by her houseboy, heads to the plantation to rescue the native farmhands – Jördens and Wischart. She refuses to turn back at the urge of Mohammed bin Ali, who warns her of the dangers of going to the plantation amidst the rebellion. Arriving at the plantation, she tries to persuade the men, against their will, to go with her. She had

probably taken it for granted that, being the wife of the *Bana*, the servants would automatically recognize her as the representative of the *Bana* and comply, „Ich fordere, daß Sie heute in mir die Stellvertreterin meines Mannes sehen und mir gehorchen. Weigern Sie sich, so lasse ich Sie morgen mit Gewalt nach Ungudja bringen. Der Konsul wird mir die Möglichkeit schaffen, diese Maßregel durchzusetzen“ (203-4). But, much to her chagrin, they refuse to obey her orders arguing that only the *Bana* can tell them what to do not the *Bana*'s wife.

Their refusal endorses her status of powerlessness in the colonial setting. Also, her threat, „Der Konsul wird mir die Möglichkeit schaffen, diese Maßregel durchzusetzen,“ invokes the authority of the Konsul, not hers. If Konsul Fürstendank intervenes, it is no more Maleen's authority on display, but rather, that of the Konsul. Maleen blames this fate of powerlessness on Georg (202). In the absence of a proxy from her husband, this effort fails to yield any result as the men remain resolute.

A scenario of power tussle is generated between the colonized African man, who is ready to put himself only under the European man, and the colonizer's European wife, who has not been a part of the European demonstration of superior power, but who seeks to derive empowerment from her male counterpart's position of power. Yes, the threat to use force on them is real, but they would rather wait for the intervention of the Konsul, who they all recognize as the ultimate authority, than to obey the wife of their *Bana*. The deadlock is eventually broken as Maleen threatens not to leave the plantation until the men are ready to leave with her (205).

Maleen is able to get the men to comply by re-assuming the status of a protected person. Her threat not to leave the plantation takes the responsibility for her safety away from her and transfers it to Jördens and Sichart. The remark, „Für die Folgen tragen Sie die Verantwortung,“ reaffirms the men’s position of power and responsibility over her, but not to her. Maleen may well be influential and powerful within the limits provided her by Krome, however, this is just at a background level. The moment she appears on the operational public stage, her relegated position as a woman becomes enduringly manifest.

It is Maleen’s gender that has accounted for her failure to achieve agency on the public stage all this time. Her relationship with Krome, which has offered her some off-the-stage involvement in colonial affairs, turns out to be a major setback to her agency drive via colonialism.

From the point Maleen meets Maria Beta, she tries consistently to have a say in her life. Maleen even tries to influence her being withdrawn from her father and sent abroad or into the convent in order to protect her from the predatory overtures of men. On another occasion, she suggests that Maria be married off as early as possible to avoid her falling into moral degeneracy. In any case, all these attempts fail. Maleen sees a golden opportunity to establish dominance over Maria as the rebellion breaks out, and Maria’s father is killed by the rebelling natives. Maria is rescued by Despini, the Italian cavalier. Maleen requests that Maria be entrusted to her as care giver and mother, but her request is denied by Despini, who would rather have her put in a convent than let her stay with Maleen, „Despini wurde verlegen. ,Ich danke Ihnen tausendmal für Ihre Güte, Madame, aber . . . ich hoffe, daß Maria zu unserer Kirche übertritt, und deshalb möchte ich sie doch

diese vierzehn Tage oder drei Wochen bei den Nonnen lassen““ (212). To Maleen, this was shocking and humiliating. It brought the message of social relegation home to her as a result of her illicit affairs with Krome (212). Maleen realizes to her chagrin that she has to fight her battle now on two fronts – gender and morality.

The non-redeemable nature of Maleen’s status of social relegation within the colonial patriarchal setting is further confirmed as Georg returns from the hinterland to find her sick with malaria. What follows is the restoration of the infantilizing status quo. Although she claims not to be as sick as she appears, Georg disregards her protests and treats her according to his evaluation of the situation,

Schweigend trug er sie hinauf. Oben in der Halle bettete er sie zart und sorgsam auf die Couchette, deckte die buntstreifige Seidendecke über ihre Füße und holte ihr ein Glas alten Portwein.
 ‚Nun, mein Herz; nun werde ich mich mal erst in die Fluten stürzen und reines Zeug anziehen. Dann werden wir beim Essen weiterreden. Aber daß du dich nicht rührst, hörst du? Wenn du dem Ramassan was zu sagen hast, kann der Schlingel kommen. Abdallah, du bleibst bei der Bibi, damit sie dich schicken kann.‘ (221)

By treating Maleen this way, Georg reverses every independence and agency she attained in his absence. She suddenly becomes that child that must be protected and provided for, instead of the adult that can take care of herself. Georg resumes his involvement with Maleen where he had left off – at the bill of conduct. While away in the hinterland, he sent her a letter in which he clearly reiterated his instructions word-for-word. So, as far as he is concerned, Maleen has been standing still all this while. Not because she does not want to move, but because, as it is in Georg’s head, she lacks the ability to move and move right. She is, therefore, waiting for him to come and move her. Meeting Maleen on the floor as he comes into the house becomes a confirmation to him. So he gets down to work, helping her to move. Maleen’s failed protest against being

carried, and her subsequent compliance confirm her mental incapacitation in Georg's presence. She is so dwarfed by his presence that all she can do is yield to his maneuvers.

Maleen's fatal situation is further highlighted by Georg's reaction to her rescue expedition to the plantation. He is grateful that Jördens and Sichart escaped the storming of the plantation by the rebelling natives. However, the atmosphere changes as he learns that Maleen was personally and physically instrumental to their rescue (227). Georg's outburst reflects his *Haltung* towards Maleen's pursuit of agency. Her offence lies in breaking the hedge of protective imprisonment around her. Georg fails to see the noble act of humanity she had carried out, and, locked up in his paranoiac malaise, berates her for venturing out of that hedge. This is because it is within that hedge that he can continue to exercise control over her, but once outside of that hedge, she can achieve agency. If she achieves agency, Georg's ability to control her will wane.

In his rebuke, he directly attacks the very basis upon which Maleen tries to establish her authority in his absence, „Ich fordere, daß Sie heute in mir die Stellvertreterin meines Mannes sehen und mir gehorchen“ (204). Through the remark, „Sie sind meine Beamten, aber nicht deine,“ Georg pulls the carpet from under Maleen's feet. Georg's affirmation, „Weil du nicht dir selbst gehörst, sondern mir,“ places Maleen and the *Beamten* in the same category of the boss' property, but each having a different status. In spite of the difference in status, the bottom line is that no property has authority over the other. Maleen is thus neutralized and reduced to the ordinary level of the protected person she had been before Georg's departure.

Georg's presence extinguishes Maleen's drive for independence, and she relaxes back into his disarming pampering. In this state, she is not going to make any progress in achieving agency for women. With the swing that her life is experiencing – from total dependency to agency, and vice-versa – it appears that the subjugation of women under the patriarchal system is locked up in a steady and progressive continuum. However, the author, who does not lose sight of the target project, finds ways to keep her protagonist on course to pursue agency.

First, Georg has to be removed. He has persistently been the insurmountable hurdle on Maleen's path to agency. The elimination of Georg should not be understood as the author attacking the institution of marriage. But rather, it should be understood as a circumstantial necessity to redeem the project of agency for women. Secondly, Maleen has to be withdrawn from the European community, within which she has become a contemptible figure. It would have been difficult, if not impossible, for her to continue and thrive in Ungudja because, as Schneider argues,

Diese Rolle der Frau als >>passives<< Eigentum des Mannes, in völliger Abhängigkeit und Selbstaufgabe, wird trotz der räumlichen Distanz zur Heimat von der deutschen Gesellschaft in der Kolonie gestützt. Jedes Aufbegehren gegen die tradierte Ordnung wird mit Klatsch und übler Nachrede quittiert und selbst die nächsten Freunde und Familienangehörigen beugen sich der Kraft der Fremdbestimmung.⁸⁹

Thirdly, Maleen will have to break away from the familiar in order to get a fresh start. Her chance to start afresh on a new platform lies within the fulfillment of her vow to her husband to return to her Grandmother in Germany. Fourth, Krome falls out of reckoning with the German colonial authorities in Berlin. He is rumored dead, and that

⁸⁹ Schneider, p. 94.

helps Maleen resettle into a loveless life. The author breaks traditional settings and constraints and erects an environment within which a woman would have to make a choice for independence or self-subsumption under men. This environment does not exclude men for the sake of it, but rather for their failure to support the woman in her striving for agency.

Georg's final wish for Maleen to go live with her grandmother is like sentencing her to early retirement from life. It seems like, in Georg's head, without him Maleen's life has no substance. However, Maleen, under the burden of guilt, carries out these injunctions to the final letter. The death of the grandmother marks the end of the first stage of her colonial involvement. Now, she is free from the restraints that fettered her pursuit of agency on the colonial field – Georg, dead and buried in Africa; Krome, first rumored dead, and, on his reappearance, fails to appeal to Maleen's passions; Ungudja and all the bad memories it represents left behind. Maleen writes to Rainer, „Es ist nicht gut, den Blick nach rückwärts zu wenden, wenn das Schicksal soviel Frühlingshoffnungen zerbrochen hat“ (279). It is time to chart a new course for her life and, like a spell that cannot be exorcized, the African soil emerges as the page where the next chapter of her life will begin.

Finally, Rainer also dies. While the text eliminates Georg and Krome from Maleen's life, it essentializes Rainer for the purpose of keeping the route back to Africa, “The Land of Hope,” open. Rainer, the only man in her life, whose relationship with her is authentic and legitimate, remains the only avenue by which Maleen could get back to Africa. So, the letter communication with Rainer seems to be a dream re-awakening impetus, which kindles the desire to return to Africa. With Maleen's financial support,

Rainer procures some land in a remote area, and initiates the “culturation” process, hoping to settle down there with Maleen.

Maleen sails back to Africa and meets the former Konsul of U. Silffa and his wife, Nelly at the Shepherds Hotel in Egypt. Silffa immediately communicates the sad news of the tragic fate of a German expeditionary team under Lieutenant Derendorff. This news provides the platform for Maleen to pick up issues of Germany’s colonial future in Africa again. She does not hesitate to project her unflinching colonial enthusiasm. While Nelly, with regard to the massacre of young Germans, laments that the colony is costing Germany too much, Maleen does not consider these realities too great a price to pay. Instead, she sees the price paid to obtain a colony as the true validating parameter, „Das teuer Erworbene ist um so viel werter“ (288). This scene would have turned into an embarrassing one for Maleen, whose fanatically patriotic response, considered devaluing by Nelly, provoked a contemptuous reaction, „So spricht eine Frau, die dort ihren Mann hat begraben müssen! Wenn Max dort gestorben wäre, so würde ich das Land mit allem, was darum und daran hängt, bis zu meinem Lebensende verabscheuen! Das weiß der Himmel! Ich würde dem Krome fluchen“ (288).

In this brief encounter, the author presents two German women associated with German colonialism. The distinction between them lies in the measure of agency each one possesses. Maleen’s continued interest in Germany’s colonial future, in spite of what it has cost her, shows a true patriot. Nelly, though a colonist in her own rights, emerges as a female colonist via her husband. However, her unmitigated remark about hating the colony, should her husband die there (whether it is made to deride Maleen or to express a genuine position), reduces her to the level of dependency, lacking authoritative agency.

We should recall that, in *Der Konsul* (1891), Nelly is one of the women that undertook the task of encouraging the German collectiveness as Konsul von Sylffa sought to establish *Deutschtum* among the German Diaspora in U. However, as it now appears, her enthusiasm was indirectly fueled by her relationship with the Konsul, as opposed to any true devotion to the German colonial course.

Mrs. Silffa (this is the same Sylffa in *Der Konsul* (1891), but spelt differently in this text) is the kind of woman that would not threaten the status quo of patriarchal dominance. Although she is involved in the colonial field, she finds her calling within the gendered sphere of care-giving. When it comes to policy, administration, approach, and other issues in governing the colony, she does not push the bounds. This is demonstrated in the continued dialogue between the Silffas and the Waltrons. As the tragedy of the Derendorff team is announced, Rainer offers to become the *Ersatz* for the fallen Lieutenant. Meanwhile, Silffa and Maleen continue their discussion on Germany's East African colonial future. Nelly is the only outsider among the colonial enthusiasts gathered around the table. Nelly's husband "orientedness" is illuminated by her attitude to the discussion between Silffa and Maleen,

Nelly hatte dem jungen Grafen, der ihr von seiner mit Maleen vor kurzem unternommenen Nilfahrt erzählte, nicht sehr aufmerksam zugehört, sondern dies und das aus dem Gespräch der beiden andern aufgefangen und deren Mienenspiel beobachtet. Jetzt legte sie die kleine Hand auf den Arm ihres Gatten und sagte etwas ironisch: ‚Habt ihr mal wieder die Weltgeschichte in Ordnung gebracht?‘ (293)

As the above encounter reveals, in Nelly's views, colonialism has meaning and value for the woman as long as there is a man to lead the way, while the woman functions at the ancillary level. If the man is not there anymore, that marks the end of the colonial

enterprise for the woman. This position depicts the woman as having no personally conceived colonial ambition, rather, her involvement is simply defined and understood through the involvement of the man. It is the existence of a personal ambition that fuels the drive for agency. On the other hand, Maleen finds the presence of the man acceptable as long as he proves himself worthy of leadership in pursuit of the colonial goal. Should he seek to diminish the importance of the defined goal, as in the case of Georg, and, later, Krome, he is not worthy of the following of the woman. Should the man fall in the course, like Derendorff and some others, the woman should pick up the “sword,” cut herself a path, and continue the colonial “crusade.”

This position is reinforced by the way Maleen handles Nelly’s reviling reference to Krome (288). As I have pointed out, Nelly probably made the remark to intimidate Maleen into silence. But, instead of silence, Maleen finds convenience in using Krome as a positive reference in matters of German colonialism. In spite of Silffa rating Krome as a “schwächlicher Ersatz” (288), Krome remains a paramount figure in Germany’s colonial matters by Maleen’s reckoning. Her persistent reference to him as an exemplary German colonizer incites the assumption that, if he returned to the colony, she would still work with him. Unfortunately, Krome, after dealing with ceaseless frustrating maneuvers by Berlin, is facing trial in Germany for charges of inhumanity against natives. He has more or less disappeared from Germany’s colonial landscape altogether. In spite of his being branded a colonial criminal, Maleen is still proud of him, and rates him above those who allowed themselves to be incapacitated by Berlin and, as a result, achieved nothing for the fatherland.

Maleen's position on the role of women in colonial issues is more or less an attack on the patriarchy. Judging by the way she sees the whole enterprise, the indispensability of men is challenged. Silffa senses this development and seeks to defend the status quo of patriarchal dominance by reminding Maleen of the spectatorial status of women in government affairs, „Frauen erwärmen sich aus ihrem innersten Wesen heraus am meisten für das Persönliche, für die einzelne Erscheinung, die Ausnahmeerscheinung, während wir Männer uns viel stärker als Teile des Ganzen fühlen. Das ist so und muß so sein“ (292). In his view, the woman has to remain an outsider, an objectified component of the system, observing and feeling things from a marginal post, while the man should remain the insider, the sole subject of the system making things happen.

It is necessary to note that Silffa's remark comes as a response to Maleen's well-reasoned argument to counter his advocacy for the unconditional self-subsumption of a civil servant under a higher authority. Her argument presents her as one who has cognitive competence and ability in colonial nation-building matters. Her extensive knowledge in colonial matters, her understanding of the German spirit of aggressiveness, and her enthusiasm to apply this spirit to the colonial question are bound-breaking and intimidating to the man. Silffa has no other argument to counter her than to advocate for pacific diplomacy, which did not work for him anyway.

The death of Rainer concludes the chapter of men in Maleen's life. After his death, one would expect her to return to Germany. Instead, she decides to sail further south and deeper into Africa. Although Maleen's thoughts are not communicated to us as to why she decides to travel deeper into Africa, it could be argued, as events would

suggest much later, that she has resolved to continue her life in “The Land of Hope,” which has cost her the two men who meant most to her – her husband and her brother.

On board the ship, the captain points out her brother’s property in the horizon, but tries to dissuade her from considering domicile there (303). However, his efforts find no audience with Maleen, „Oh, doch, es wird gerade etwas für mich sein“, widersprach sie mit einem schwermütigen Lächeln. Einsamkeit bin ich gewöhnt. Und ich taue auch nicht mehr unter gesellige Menschen“ (303). She makes no secret of her willingness to live in isolation from „*gesellige Menschen*.“ By deciding to reside on this island, Maleen concomitantly decides to found her new life on a “virgin” ground, devoid of the predatory and haunting interference of European patriarchy. She generates a stage where her socio-cultural and econo-political predilections could blossom unhindered.

The concept of virgin territory in Germany’s colonial enterprise resurfaces again in Maleen’s choice for an isolated unanchored area. I made this argument in chapter three in association with Robinson’s shipwreck and his eventual landing on an “uninhabited” island. The idea is that Robinson could thrive on that island because there was “no one else” to contest it with him. By the time other Europeans arrived there, he had established himself on the island enough to repel any challenges. In applying this concept of virgin lands to the African experience of German colonists, it could be argued that, the reason Carl Peters failure as discussed in *Ich bin Ich* (1927) is because he had to contend with British, French and Italian interests; and that the reason von Sylffa failed in *Der Konsul* (1891) is because he had to contest Ungudja with the English also. Krome’s fall in *Im Lande der Verheißung* (1899) is also linked to the English presence, with whom he has to

compete in the effort to consolidate the colony under the German imperium. So far, the only colony that was successful is that of Robinson, albeit in the realm of fantasy.

Maleen's ambition to become an active subject of Germany's colonial enterprise would not thrive in any environment where another European power has already established authority. Even under a German flag, she faces a tri-postal opposition, first, the traditional status quo of subsuming women under the authority of men. This, as she has experienced already, would not have yielded any operational space to her. Second, the negative attention she would have attracted for trying to "intrude" on a "strictly-for-men" stage. Third, the same inconsistency in Berlin that has plagued the male colonists would have plagued her as well. Against such a background, she sees her chances in an unanchored area, where, unhindered, she can apply and express herself. In the virgin land, she is not answerable to anyone other than herself and her project. Maleen, being a life witness to Krome's experience, decides to avoid all these pitfalls by electing to go inland, where the British interest had not been registered, where the German society has no presence, and where Berlin's censoring "radar" had not penetrated.

Maleen, however, knows that she needs the seeds and plants and other materials obtainable only from other Europeans. So, her decision to live away from the European community does not mean absolute isolation. As she is not under any illusions about the possibility of negative treatment from other Europeans, she readies herself to accommodate them for the purpose of her mission,

Maleen stand an der Rampe, und während sie wartete, sagte sie sich, daß ein enges Zusammenhalten der führenden Deutschen hier allein schon des Beispiels wegen notwendig sei. Sie dürfte sich nicht irgendeiner Empfindlichkeit hingeben, sondern wollte der jungen Gräfin

Ifershofen einfach herzlich entgegenkommen und eine Freundin aus ihr machen, mochte sie sich nun angezogen fühlen, oder nicht. Hier durften persönliche Neigungen und Abneigungen nicht in Betracht kommen. (315)

Maleen once more trounces the argument that women are given more to emotions and sentiments than reason. She demonstrates the cognitive and rational ability of women by rising above sentiment and emotion in her dealings with the people from whom she does not expect any sympathy.

As expected, negative attitudes did not take long to manifest as Graf and Gräfin Ifershofen try to dissuade her from traveling to Mona (316-17). When Maleen lands on her brother's estate, the first impression the property makes on her, coming from the Europeanized city, is a testimony of the absence of the European violation of African nature,

Eine Viertelstunde später lag das tropfende, tiefende Land wieder im blendenden Sonnenglanz, der sich in tausend Wasserlachen spiegelt und seine weißen Strahlen fröhlich auseinanderspringen ließ. So daß all die gefangenen bunten Farben frei wurden und in den Tropfen funkelten und tanzten.

In dieser afrikanischen Küstenstadt, in der kaum je ein Wagen fuhr und deren Straßen pflasterlos waren, fehlte das metallharte Rasseln und Knarren europäischer Städte, und die stille Luft war erfüllt von lebendigen Stimmen. Die mannshohen Rizinusstauden drängten sich bis in die Hauptstraßen, um Häuser und Hütten blühte und grünte und atmete üppigstes Pflanzenleben.

Zwar bemühte sich die deutsche Verwaltung redlich, deutsche Ordnung in das tropische Chaos zu bringen; aber die gewaltige Werdekraft der heißblutigen Natur ist hier nicht ganz zu besiegen. Die Laternenpfähle faulen ab, die planierten Wege überziehen sich immer und immer wieder mit dichtem Grün, aus den Mauerspalten drängen sich zierliche Papaienschafte der Sonne entgegen (320).

Maleen finds herself in a situation where her fate is in her own hands. Although Maleen chooses this course against the alternative of living among other Europeans, this choice could still be interpreted as fatalism on the basis of her fanatical *Vaterlandsliebe*

and colonial ambitions. As long as she is unwilling to compromise her commitment to, and pursuit of agency within Germany's colonial enterprise, she is like a ship whose course is determined by an invisible rudder (the colonial project). This rudder steers her into spatial isolation in a "virgin" territory where her chances of success lie; a success that translates into a budding satellite Germany in East Africa. This is so because, East Africa was considered both an *Ackerbau-* and a *Handels-Colonie* in Germany's colonial agenda.

As Maleen takes in the scenery of her "paradise," the narrator communicates a Robinson-like scenario,

Maleen erfuhr, was es ist: eine verwöhnte, die Unkenntnis aller praktischen Lebensverhältnisse geliebene Frau zu sein und sich, umgeben von Schwierigkeiten, auf sich selber verlassen zu müssen. Daß nichts für sie geschah, wenn sie es nicht tat, sie selbst mit ihrem eignen Nachdenken und ihren eignen Händen, das war ihr so neu, daß ihr jede Geringfügigkeit zum Erlebnis wurde. (325)

The implication of Maleen's isolation from the Euro-German community could be interpreted along the argument of the unyielding hold of the patriarchy on the colonial business. The men have no problem with the women, so long as the women's ambitions are limited to care-giving. Tipton comments on the public assignation of this role to women by a combined team of women leaders,

Women, they said, should become active in education and social welfare activities precisely because of their feminine qualities. Female virtues could be drawn on to improve society, not because women were or should be equal to men, but because they were different and distinctively qualified to work in 'feminine' areas such as the education of young children, health, and poor relief.⁹⁰

⁹⁰ Taylor, qtd. in Tipton, p. 153.

In reference to such a tradition, there is no place in the business for any woman colonist who wants to function on the public stage. For Maleen, her colonial ambitions veer away from the traditional gendered role for women. Although she recognizes caregiving as a noble role, she does not consider it her calling. For her, involvement in the colonial business for the woman should include exercise of authority and power over colonized subjects. This stance is already referenced in her effort to have Maria under her, and in the encounter with her husband's plantation workers. This power is not conceded her at all because, as Tipton states, "the woman's public space is limited to that part considered an enlarged domestic arena. However, the political decisions that will frame and shape the dimensions of that arena are taken elsewhere, by men."⁹¹ To achieve this power, she needs an environment devoid of European patriarchal influence. Mona could be the place. In Mona, she needs to generate the initiative needed to build up this property from the state of decay. From her temporary residency in the *Herbergshaus*, she takes stock of what she needs to do (335-6). Maleen is now in charge and is positioned to exercise authority.

Her philosophy of „stilles Leiden und stilles, mutiges Handeln“ (326) is applied in the final battle she has to fight against detractors. On the eve of her departure, the Ilfershofens come over to the *Herbergshaus*, still intent on stopping her from travelling to Mona. Resolved to follow through with her program, she walks out on them. Right at that point, Graf Ilfershofen interjects Krome's name in the argument, „Endlich erntet ja nun auch Krome, was er gesäet hat“ (329). The mention of Krome's name is instrumentalized again to the same purpose of taming Maleen's "stubbornness." In any case, this strategy

⁹¹ Tipton, p. 154.

fails yet again. Maleen moves on to Mona as a single German woman colonist. She leaves with no obvious goodwill from anybody and becomes a colonial experiment herself for the group she represents – the women.

At this stage of her striving, she remembers Krome's remark about each of them in Ungudja representing a force of interest back in Germany, „Das, worauf Krome sie vor Jahren in Ungudja aufmerksam gemacht hatte, das trat heute noch augenfälliger hervor: jeder Deutsche, der einigermaßen Charakter hatte, gleichviel ob Mann oder Frau, galt hier als Vertreter irgend einer Richtung oder einer Macht“ (322). One big question is, can a woman do it without the support of a man, and without the support of the already established European system? Maleen's "tomorrow" becomes an uncertain one, and, while her convictions and determination generate hope of success, all the Europeans around her – male and female – wish and pray for failure.

Maleen launches her mission of establishing herself as an independent single German woman colonist in Mona. She recognizes the need to interact with other Europeans, and develops a relational paradigm of professionalism that leaves no room for personality issues (337). Wildenthal comments on her rational approach to issues,

The heroine knows too much about men's frailty to fall again into the subordinated role of the woman in love. However, she is also too passionate and strong-minded simply to withdraw from society, leaving no mark. At this point, she undergoes an education of her national sentiments, and places her idle emotional and intellectual powers in the service of her nation.⁹²

⁹² Wildenthal (1998), p. 65.

The new paradigm of equal regard becomes the *modus operandi*, and promotes professionalism and mutuality of respect, leaving no room for sentimentalities and emotions.

The above guidepost she develops is also a stamp of maturity, which helps her deal with the challenges of being a single female colonist. Her ability to rise above emotions and function within the rational realm lends a firm stand to her belief and strivings to emerge as the pioneer German female colonist. This display of emotional discipline erodes the argument on which the patriarchal dominance of the female is partly based. Sagarra provides an 1876 entry in the Brockhaus *Konversationslexikon*, “Men’s achievements lie in the field of action, communication and creativity, women’s special quality are patience, receptiveness, care for others. . . . Man’s thinking is consistent and logical, woman does not think. She perceives, instinctively, intuitively.”⁹³ But here, Maleen demonstrates the ability for cognitive competence, even above the men in the colonial field, who hold on to the anachronistic belief in the inferiority of women to men.

There is no doubt that Maleen is changing the rule of the game in the colony. Schneider comments,

Es wird also deutlich, dass insbesondere der Aspekt der Geschlechterrollen innerhalb der deutschen Identität einem Wandel unterliegt, welcher durch die neuen Rahmenbedingungen der >>Fremde<< begünstigt wird. Die Protagonistin aus ‚Im Lande der Verheißung‘ emanzipiert sich, baut ein Haus, lebt für sich zurückgezogen und rückt damit an den Rand der deutschen Gesellschaft.⁹⁴

⁹³ Sagarra, p. 154.

⁹⁴ Schneider, p. 94.

Gradually, the animosity ignited by her adventure with Krome is fading away before the progress she is making and the transformation she is bringing onto the colonial scene. The European community nearby is beginning to recognize and respect her as a force within the context of German colonialism in the area. Aware of her rising status and in the bid to broaden her functional horizon, Maleen intervenes in a dispute between two European establishments – the *Baugesellschaft* in Satuta and the representative of the Fabricius Trading Company in Mona. Unable to bring reconciliation on her own, she enlists the services of Graf Ifershofen. It is necessary to note here that Graf Ifershofen is a German colonial official, and should initiate proceedings in disputes of this nature.

Maleen seizes the initiative to pursue peace and *Zusammenwirken* among Germans. A few months earlier, such a move would have provoked gross contempt and, probably, earned her a reprimand from the official. However, this time, owing to her current status, the pattern of the game has changed. Graf Ifershofen neither reprimands nor snubs her. Instead, he grants her attention and puts himself in her service, „Also, ich stehe in ihrer Disposition“ (348). After presenting her concern to him (348-9), Ifershofen responds,

Queli, queli . . . meine Gedanken sind in diesem Fall Ihre Gedanken, Bibi. Aber die Streitigkeiten mit dem neuen Bauleiter aus der Welt schaffen, das heißt ihn selbst aus der Welt schaffen, denn die in unserem Klima epidemische Gereiztheit ist bei ihm chronisch und perniziös. Unter den Schwarzen ist ja leicht Frieden stiften, aber bei den Landsleuten lasse ich die Finger am liebsten davon. (349)

Ifershofen's response reveals two things. First, his lack of power and command as a representative of the German government in Satuta. This state of passivity could be traced back to Berlin, which is reputed to persistently incapacitate her colonial officials

by keeping them away from active colonial matters. Secondly, it highlights the metamorphosis of Maleen's status from a mere contemptible German woman infringing on the exclusively masculine colonial terrain to that of a female colonist of substance. The Graf confesses, „Bibi . . . Ihre Lippen reden Worte der Weisheit, süßer denn Honig und lieblich anzuhören, wie eine Quelle des Waldes“ (350).

From her uncompromising resolve to go unsupported into quasi isolation to the early stages of struggling against opposition and discouragement, to found her project in Mona, and unto renewed interaction with the European community as a figure of authority, Maleen works herself into significance by breaking into the patriarchal and hitherto taboo zone for women – the public stage. This is all due to her success in founding a flourishing farm in Mona without the support of any male colonist. Agriculture is an integral component of Germany's colonial project, and, as Maleen successfully establishes a farm, she proves the capability of women to succeed on the same stage, contrary to the anachronistic debilitating *Haltung* of men towards women.

Maleen has achieved agency at last, and is now very welcome in European circles. Her marital status as a single woman does not count anymore. People seek her friendship and her presence in the European circle. A social gathering at the Ilfershofens provides an occasion for a great confession from the Gräfin (360). In Gräfin Ilfershofen's confession, we see the misconception and misinterpretation of Maleen's drive for self-emancipation. Instead of seeing her as a woman seeking to raise herself above the status of a mere object of history to become the subject of it, she is simply tagged an anti-men feminist, who seeks to subjugate men.

While it could be valid to defend Maleen against the allegation of trying to subjugate men, this defense collapses when Maleen's interaction with black males is brought into focus. The encounter with Jördens and Sichart is an evidence of her desire to establish authority over men. As she becomes a successful independent woman on her estate, she has Black and Arab male servants over whom she exercises authority. Among white males, she functions as an "equal." The idea that the subjugation of racialized males is a defined component in her colonial agenda could be gleaned from Bülow's (the author) views, as reported by Wildenthal, on the relationship between the European (male or female) and the "other,"

Bülow made feminist goals contingent upon the establishment of racial hierarchies. Taken as a whole, Bülow's writings – whether fiction or non-fiction and whether set in Germany or in the colonies – suggest that German women could not and should not be free unless the subordination of a range of racialized male and female 'other', from Jews to Africans, was ensured.⁹⁵

If this interpretation of Bülow factors into Maleen's drive for agency in the colony, then, the allegation of trying to subjugate men is valid, albeit, within a racialized environment. Appraising her in relation to European men, she is simply an ambitious and determined woman, seeking deliverance from the clutches of patriarchal dominance. That is exactly the female colonist the author seeks to create, and she has successfully done that in Maleen. A female colonist ready to submit to the authority of the European man on equal terms, but having enough agency to subjugate and exercise authority over the racialized "other." Friederike Eigler acknowledges this as fulfilled at Maleen's farm, where she is the boss over the land and the workers, "Although she liberates herself from

⁹⁵ Wildenthal (1998), p. 55.

her personal dependency on him, Maleen fulfills the ‘conqueror’s’ legacy by adopting the role of caring ‘mother’ – colonizer towards the colonial land and the African workers.”⁹⁶

Maleen’s final test of strength of character and patriotism comes with the final meeting with Ralf Krome, who has defected to the British after being banished from all German colonial territories. He comes to meet Maleen in Ungudja to win her over to the English side. Maleen demonstrates the non-sentimentality of her patriotism by turning down Krome’s proposal. There are several circumstances that would have justified Maleen’s decamping, first, she had been disappointed by the home government’s mistreatment of colonial servants, who have given so much to procure periphery colonies for Germany; second, Maleen had been furious at the German colonists in the field, who had joined Berlin to castigate Krome as a criminal, forgetting that it was his relentless efforts that secured the colony they live and thrive in now, and finally, Maleen feels sympathy toward Krome for all the injustice done him by Germany and Germans.

However, in spite of all these reasons, Maleen rises above her feelings to reject Krome’s request, „Sie sollten trotz allem und allem Ihr Vaterland nicht beschimpfen! Es ist, wie wenn einer seinen Vater und seine Mutter beschimpft! Vater und Mutter können uns das grausamste Unrecht tun; dennoch sollte uns auch in diesem Fall noch ihr Name heilig sein“ (382). As Krome presses further, „Kommen Sie mit herüber zu dem unendlich viel nobleren Volk der Briten, Sie sollen sehen, wie man Sie dort würdigt. Kommen Sie!“ (383), she unequivocally declares, „Ich!? . . . Nie! Nie! Ich bin eine Deutsche und will nie etwas anderes sein – auch für Sie nicht“ (383). Wildenthal comments on this encounter, “At the conclusion of *In the Promised Land*, Krome goes

⁹⁶ Friederike Eigler, p. 79.

over to the side of the British, who are disputing territory to the north of the colony. Maleen Dietlas makes the difficult but clear choice of her nation over Krome. She accepts Krome with his flaws, but in the end her ultimate loyalty is to her nation.”⁹⁷

The author exploits the discussion between Maleen and Krome to problematize the concept of patriotism. The question lies in the motive behind colonial undertakings: Were the protagonists motivated purely by patriotism without any personal benefits? Were they motivated by personal glory, self-aggrandizement, and economic gains? or Were they motivated by the need to ensure their daily bread? All these possibilities are manifest in the lives of these three colonial protagonists – von Sylffa, Krome, and Maleen – presented by Bülow in the two novels discussed in this chapter.

Both von Sylffa and Krome functioned in the German colony of U. and Ungudja in different capacities; both men went about their official business with great gusto and fanaticism for the fatherland; both were recalled and charged with civil offenses. What separates these men is the way they responded to the crippling treatment from Berlin. As contained in *Der Konsul* (1891) and confirmed in *Im Lande der Verheißung* (1899), Konsul von Sylffa accepted his fate with equanimity, cooperated with Berlin and submitted his will, his enthusiasm, his patriotism to the superior power of the government, the fatherland and the law.

At the Shepherds Hotel, Sylffa advances an argument upholding the same attitude of unreserved submission to the authorities (290). In *Im Lande der Verheißung* (1899), he is on his way to China as a German colonial functionary. So, in spite of the charges of

⁹⁷ Wildenthal (1998), p. 61.

over-stepping his bounds as a Konsul, he continues to enjoy the goodwill of Berlin in different capacities as a colonial official. Although there is no denying Konsul von Sylffa's patriotism, Maleen's counter to his ideal of total submission to the authorities (290) makes one wonder what drives von Sylffa's patriotism, and what his patriotism can achieve on the leash of Berlin, which continues to pull German colonists backwards.

Krome defies the authorities, asserting himself for what he believes is the right thing for the fatherland. Being in the field and seeing the threat to Germany's colonial claims vis-à-vis England and France, he refuses to let the foot off the pedal until he has secured the region for Germany. However, for his insubordination and his methods, he is severely punished by Berlin,

Die Richter gaben zu, daß Krome sich als der Schöpfer einer großen aufblühenden Kolonie um sein Vaterland unstreitig Verdienste erworben habe, allein diese Verdienste, sagten sie, seien dennoch kein Freibrief für Übergriffe und Gewalttätigkeit. Man lebe einmal nicht mehr im Zeitalter der Konquistadoren, und wenn Krome sich auf das Vorgehen jener berufe, so sei es eben zu bedauern, daß er um einige Jahrhunderte zu spät lebe. Da nun aber die Rechtsauffassung des Herrn Krome so wesentlich von der in einem zivilisierten und christlichen Staate herrschenden abweiche, so halte man es nicht für tunlich, ihm je wieder irgend ein Amt im Staate und am allerwenigsten in den Kolonien zu übertragen. Auch müsse ihm der Aufenthalt in deutschen Kolonien verboten bleiben. (361)

Krome responds to this treatment by turning against the fatherland. He defects to Britain, a rival nation to Germany. One then wonders what has been driving his much trumpeted patriotism. Without any recognition from the authorities, the glory he hopes for becomes elusive and, being disappointed, he swears vengeance against the fatherland.

Two incidents cast a shadow of doubt on Krome's patriotism – his withdrawal of Rainer from an expeditionary team so that he could watch over Maleen, and his defection

to the British against the fatherland. The withdrawal of Rainer suggests that he places more value on Maleen than on the national responsibility to which he and Rainer are assigned, and to which Maleen herself is avidly committed. One is made to wonder, whether all this while, Krome uses patriotism as a trope applied to the pursuit of personal gains and glory.

Maleen, as an independent colonial enthusiast, is no less a German patriot involved in Germany's colonial question. Berlin has no hand in her stay in the colony after her husband's death. For her, there is no expectation of any sort from Berlin. Yet, she is so committed to the colonial course that the death of her husband, the death of her brother, the humiliation of her lover, and the maligning by the European community, fail to dampen her patriotism. While von Sylffa and Krome lost just positions, she lost everything that mattered to her. Yet, she holds onto the fatherland. She chooses the fatherland over Krome, the man that matters most to her in the present. Life with Krome would have, at least by projection, assuaged the pain of the loneliness that surrounds her. However, she considers the abnegation of the fatherland too high a sacrifice to make for Krome. She continues her life as a single woman colonist in Africa, unwaveringly committed to the colonial future of Germany without her sight on any compensation or recognition from the same fatherland.

Maleen's vision is that her estate become a resort, where Germans could retire for retreat and recovery from the strain and stress of the African experience,

„Mein Haus,“ sagte sie, nun ihrerseits mit Stolz – „hat die gesundeste Lage weit und breit. Der Seewind bestreicht es von allen Seiten. Die Räume sind groß und luftig, der felsige Boden frei von Fieberherden. Wenn mir der liebe Gott Gelingen schenkt, so daß meine Kulturen Ertrag bringen,

möchte ich hier ein Asyl für unsere Erholungsbedürftigen schaffen. An einem solchen fehlt es.⁴
(391)

While those involved in German periphery colonialism receive recognition and compensation from Berlin, Maleen plans to give to Germany out of her own sweat and resources, without reciprocation. Considering that tradition and culture have projected the man as the true patriot and the woman as a mere appendage, the author may be asking the audience to determine who the true patriot is. Is it the man, who serves the fatherland for position and honor?, the man, who turns against the fatherland in frustration? or the woman, who receives nothing, expects nothing, but has given everything to the course of the fatherland and continues to give unconditionally out of sheer joy and satisfaction?

Maleen revels in her achievement, and in the respect and honor it has brought her (388-9). She becomes the colonial face of Mona and now belongs to the cream of European society in the colony. She personifies Mona, „Ganz Mona bestand freilich aus ihr selbst und ihren vier Tischgenossen“ (353). Being a single woman does not count anymore; rather, what counts is her becoming a positive reference, both in achieving on a nontraditional stage, and in the display of a patriotism that is not aimed at recognition or compensation from the government.

In this text, the author has consistently created scenarios that reasonably challenge the status quo of patriarchal dominance. In Maleen, she configures a protagonist, who defies the patriarchal claim that women are more given to emotions and sentiments than reason. She questions the tradition of women's dependence on men as the means to significance. She complicates the tradition of the woman existing as the man's property in marriage. She proposes a new paradigm for conjugal relationship, whereby reason and

mutual valuation guides the union, and bidirectional enhancement is the rule. She exorcises the spell of indolent and non-reflexive submissiveness of the housewife, and infuses the spirit of the active, functional, and partnership-oriented wife. She invalidates the claim that the woman is eternally inferior to the man.

The emancipation of Maleen opens the door for women to launch out and be achievers on their own, and not via their husbands or via the men around them. That this may be the author's ultimate goal for feminist colonialism receives credence from some of her remarks in relation to the plight of German women,

Wir wollen Mitarbeiterinnen des Mannes sein, treue und freie Weggenossinnen. Nicht das Gleich wollen wir leisten, wie er, sondern ihn auf allen Lebensgebieten ergänzen, als seine andere Menschenhälfte. Um Das zu können, müssen wir uns vor allen Dingen frei entfalten dürfen. Das wir bei freierer Entwicklung unserer weiblichen Wesensart sein und leisten werden, wird erst die Zukunft lehren.⁹⁸

Summing up the message of Bülow's imperial feminism, Wildenthal states,

For Bülow, her imperial feminism was a set of positively held convictions that offered solutions to white women's oppression. It also offered solutions to other issues that a reader must look more closely to find: the upholding of racial hierarchy and a way to overcome gender conflicts among racially superior men and women. Her imperial feminism also offered solutions to German and European women searching for an important public mission after and apart from such conflicts with men of their own colour and class.⁹⁹

The hope for agency for women is seen as a far cry within the geo-political Europe of the time. So, the author chooses a racialized geo-political setting to post her protagonist for an attempt on agency. The fact that Maleen fails within the European

⁹⁸ Frieda von Bülow, „Das Weib in seiner Geschlechtsindividualität,“ *Die Zukunft*, 1897: 601. The Sophia Project 21 July 2011 < <http://sophie.byu.edu/?q=print/node/3708> >.

⁹⁹ Wildenthal (1998), p. 71-2.

community reinforces the author's belief in a racialized space as representing the hope of agency for the woman. Wildenthal shares this view,

Domination over racialised others is revealed as part of establishing a superior partnership between a German man and woman. The colonies are the testing ground on which the 'right' man can properly express his sadism and thereby his suitability to the 'right' woman. In Bülow's thinking, then, the colonies were prerequisite to the development of the German woman as, in her own words, a 'loyal and free companion' of German men.¹⁰⁰

After being neutralized in Ungudja by the European culture and tradition, Maleen returns to Germany, where she fell into complete ignominy. Her living with her grandmother in the old family house could be interpreted as identifying with the evening twilight of life. Reinvigorated by Rainer's letters, she rejects that status and returns to Africa, the racialized space, shuns the cultured non-racialized European microcosm, and places herself in the heart and virgin environment of African nature in Mona. From this behind-the-stage resort, her significance, worth and value to the colonial fate of Germany emerges before her, earning her the respect of all Germans in the area – male and female.

Summary

Germany's colonial enterprise in East Africa was initiated by a private venture with little government interest. So, there was no clearly formulated and implemented approach in the colony. It is as though Germany was prematurely maneuvered onto colonial responsibilities by events and developments within Europe and in the periphery. Inferentially, the periphery colonial question was not an important issue to Bismarck's government at first. Instead, the government favored East European expansion against periphery colonialism. This state of apathy was quite understood by Fabri, who

¹⁰⁰ Wildenthal (1998), p. 70.

problematized it in his treatise. Convinced that the government would not take initiative in colonial acquisition, Fabri dropped the responsibility at the foot of organizations, individuals, and private enterprises.

The individual colonial undertakings attracted the government's attention in the end. These events awakened some interest as reports were relayed home of territories being rapidly acquired through treaties and expeditions. However, the government showed reluctance in getting involved. Meanwhile, Berlin was monitoring how the colonial activities of Germans would be received by other colonial powers, particularly Britain. The fear of an unhealthy response from Britain kept Berlin from taking any firm and decisive stand on colonial issues. So, a "boy on the swing" situation was generated, whereby what is Germany's territory today, could become Britain's tomorrow as Germany makes an effort to avoid any clashes with Britain. Britain, on the other hand, is aware of Germany's desperate effort to avoid clashes with her, and she exploits the situation to undermine Germany's colonial efforts.

Frustrated by the politics of both governments, Peters and his men continue on their campaigns inland. The brutal treatment of natives provokes outcry back home, prompting the blacklisting of the Peters. The portrayals of Carl Peters in *Ich bin Ich* (1927), Max von Sylffa in *Der Konsul* (1891), and Ralph Krome in *Im Lande der Verheißung* (1899) typify this scenario.

Apart from the clashes between natives and Germans on one hand, and between the British and Germans on the other, there is also the clash between the humane principles of the Enlightenment, which Germans give the impression of championing,

and the barbaric activities of the German colonists. There is, therefore, never any harmony between the goal of securing colonies and the means and methods adopted to achieve the goal. This disharmony continues to plague the whole enterprise, resulting in the continuous sanctioning and punishment of colonial officers. As a result, the enterprise lacked the continuity needed for there to emerge a coherent colonial administration.

From literary and historical perspectives, Germans acquired colonies, but were not able to develop colonial policies that would streamline the terms of relationship with the natives to guarantee order, peace and harmony. The outcome was that every colonist on the field had his own idea of how to go about the business, and in most cases, their approaches were oriented away from “humane” considerations for the natives. That accounts for the continued wars between the natives and Germans until the advent of WWI. Against the background of incessant conflicts between German colonizers and the natives, it is obvious that Germany’s fantasy of “model/humane” colonialism and the reality of her colonial involvement went in opposite directions.

Chapter Five

Germany's Colonial Enterprise: The Dilemma

In two previous chapters, I engaged Germany's colonial discourse at the levels of fantasy and reality. While the fantasy phase painted the picture of a smooth sailing colonial enterprise, the reality phase proved otherwise with crises on all sides. The predominance of violence and inhumanity, which, as studies reveal, became the hallmark of Germany's periphery colonialism in Africa, puts into question the cherished fantasy of "model/humane" colonialism. As the fantasy of "model" colonialism met with the reality of colonization, a conflictual relationship developed between reality and fantasy. Under such circumstances, Germany found herself in a great dilemma over what to do and how to do it. *Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary* defines "dilemma" as "a choice or a situation involving choice between equally unsatisfactory alternatives."¹ Germany was in a situation to have to make a choice, but unfortunately, none of the choices satisfied the nation's colonial dreams.

Germany's colonial dilemma arises from conflicts that appeared just as the colonies were being founded. First, there is the dream of "model/humane" colonialism, versus the reality of colonization with its inherent violence and dehumanization. Second, there is the ideal of "familial" colonialism, which excludes German women, versus the determination of German women to be part of the periphery colonial enterprise. Third, there is the matter of private charter companies running the colonies, versus government involvement. Fourth, the quest and drive for global significance, versus the risk of provoking a crisis with other European powers, especially Great Britain. The fifth source

¹ "Dilemma," def. 2a, *Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary* (1988). Print.

of conflict is the importance of natives in the realization of the economic goals of colonialism versus the emptying of the territory (erasure) for *Ackerbau-Colonien*.

In this chapter, using the primary materials already discussed in the previous chapters, I shall be discussing the literary representation of/and the circumstances under which the above conflictual relationships generated Germany's colonial dilemma. This discussion will highlight how Germany found herself in the quagmire of colonialism, and how her desperate effort to rise above that could have influenced her colonial legacy in Africa.

The Enlightenment in Germany's Colonialism Scheme

In chapter two, I hinted at the relevance of Enlightenment thoughts to Germany's colonial enterprise. One of the derivations from that was the idea of cultural relativity, by which any culture is valid within a specific geo-political and temporal environment and atmosphere.² This standpoint challenges the French idea of universal civilization, which is built on the notion of a uniform lifestyle. That is, in order to be civilized, one has to think, feel, speak and act in a particular way irrespective of one's original identity. In contrast, the German idea of culture argues for the diversity and value of any life style relative to particular time, space and people. This eventually led to the concept of "cultural particularism." Harold Mah comments on this counter episteme, "Germans provided the first influential models of cultural particularism opposed to the imposition of a general, overarching standard of universal civilization."³

² Jusdanis, p. 141.

³ Harold Mah, introduction, *Enlightenment Phantasies. Cultural Identity in France and*

The concept of “cultural particularism,” by definition and implication, recognizes a people’s culture as unique and valuable to them so long as it meets their needs irrespective of spatial or temporal location. Jusdanis expounds this view further as one of the key arguments of the Enlightenment,

Informing these Enlightenment thinkers was a universalism of human values and an awareness of the distinctiveness of human societies. . . . Perhaps more than most of his (Herder’s) contemporaries, he propounded the idea that all human groups were unique, that they possess their own measure of happiness, and thus could not be judged by the standards of another society or age.⁴

From the above argument, two possible reactions to foreign cultures emerge. In the first reaction, the foreign culture is judged by the standards of another culture, in this case, the European culture. In comparing the foreign culture with the European culture, the foreign culture is considered a ‘non-culture’ or ‘bad’. This position of euro-centrism vis-à-vis periphery cultures reechoes in Kristin Kopp’s 2009 study, “Since Europe is advanced and non-Europe is backward . . . any ideas that diffuse into Europe must be ancient, savage, atavistic, uncivilized, evil—black magic, vampires, plagues, ‘the bogeyman’ and the like.”⁵ This polar position, which could have its root in the Manichean Principle,⁶ could only derive from a universalist perspective, which is defined as ‘civilization.’ The second reaction, at least in principle, recognizes and appreciates the foreign culture as equally

Germany, 1750-1914. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003) 2. Print.

⁴ Jusdanis, p. 141.

⁵ Kopp (2009), p. 25.

⁶ The Manichean Principle is a polar-dichotomizing principle that emphasizes the irreconcilable struggle between the forces of Good/Light and the forces of Bad/Darkness. See Yuri Stoyanov, *The Other God. Dualist Religions from Antiquity to the Cathar Heresy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000) 107-112. Print.

valid among the people that practice it. This is a reaction that could emanate from the German standpoint of “cultural particularism.”

Juxtaposing these two Enlightenment derivatives, we see the French and their civilization oriented towards the concept of ‘the culture’ as the standard for valuation and the model for cultural conversion. In contrast, the German idea of “cultural particularism” is oriented towards the respect and appreciation of the particularity and sacredness of cultures. This philosophy partly constitutes the foundation for Germany’s fantasy of “model” colonialism, since it provides for the appreciation of alterity. The conjectural argument is that, with a positive *Haltung* towards the natives and their culture, the relationship would be harmonious and thus, facilitate “model” colonialism.

Notwithstanding the distinction between these two concepts – civilization and culture – both are products of the Enlightenment, which has been implicated in imperialism. Berman, discussing the Enlightenment in relation to colonialism argues, “Enlightenment thereby becomes just another name for empire: without Enlightenment, no centralized and rationalized power would have been able to establish networks of control and exterminate everything outside of it that might stand in its path.”⁷ Knellwolf writes about the Enlightenment, “In addition to appropriation for the extension of empire, the Enlightenment continued two other motives: the civilization and spiritual reformation of those colonized. Enlightenment, as a concept, means the bringing of knowledge, morality, and sociability to a dark age of brutish ignorance.”⁸

⁷ Berman (1998), p. 7.

⁸ Knellwolf, p. 21.

Zantop presents the propagation of civilization thus, “Creating civilization defined as both destructive, violent, and as constructive, healing. It implies the elimination, the cutting down of ‘wild growth’ and the construction of a new ‘healthy’ order by erecting clearly defined boundaries.”⁹ Following Knellwolf’s and Zantop’s characterization of the Enlightenment and civilization, one wonders how Germany’s “cultural particularism” would fit into a colonial enterprise that involves races, who are already classified as savage and barbaric in German travelogues, and thus, in need of a wholesome socio-cultural and econo-political overhaul.

Although Germans were emphasizing “cultural particularism,” they were more concerned about challenging the cultural dominance of the French and their claim to cultural superiority. Nevertheless, their approach made some impact on the way culture is perceived in contrast to civilization. Mah comments, “From the rebellion against the idea of universal standards of culture contained in the idea of a dominant French and Enlightenment civilization, we have come to embrace the specifically national, regional, and local as the source of a culture’s deepest values and identity.”¹⁰ It is possible that, while Germans were fighting the French claim, and developing the concept of “cultural particularism,” a concept that recognizes the authenticity of other peoples’ cultures, they did not bring the “exotic” peoples of the periphery into perspective. Indeed, as German colonists began to have dealings with colonial natives, the philosophy of “cultural particularism” faced a difficult challenge.

⁹ Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 54.

¹⁰ Mah, p. 2.

How were the German colonists going to live with the natives in the spirit of “humane/model” colonialism? Was the German culture or the native culture going to be the norm? Was there going to be cultural crossbreeding giving rise to a new (hybrid) cultural paradigm? Were the German colonists going to live without any interaction with the natives as a way of avoiding cultural conflicts/contamination? While cultural pluralism could be a laudable philosophy for its recognition and respect of other peoples and their ways, its practicability within the context of colonialism is highly questionable.

The Dilemma of “Humane/Model” Colonialism

“Humane/Model” colonialism was a dominant component of Germany’s colonial discourse right from its inception. As argued earlier, Germany conceived her colonial dreams partly as an offshoot of other European nations’ colonial enterprise. From this colonial ambition emerged a comparative referencing that generated the mindset of “model” colonialism among Germans. The idea of “model” colonialism, as presented by Zantop, entails a colonial relationship that deviates from the characteristic violations and dehumanization of the native populations. It is thus oriented towards a harmonious co-existence with, and the enhancement of the life and living of native populations. Zantop remarks,

The re-presentation of past heroic ventures and the critique of the ‘excesses’ committed by others provided Germans with spaces for the inscription of their own identities as ‘different’ (= better) colonists, anticipatory identities into which they could slip once the economic and political conditions permitted state-sponsored colonial activity or imperialist expansion on a grand scale.¹¹

¹¹ Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 7.

From a spectatorial position, it was possible for Germans to imagine themselves superior and virtuous colonists. However, when they became colonial masters in Africa, their practices, as studies reveal, deviated from the foundational colonial ideals they had nursed for decades.

The “humane/model” colonialism dilemma in Germany’s colonial enterprise arises from the conflict between the conditions and practices mandated by colonialism on the one hand, and the humane principles of the Enlightenment and “culturedness” on the other. Prior to the acquisition of colonies, the German civil system had always given the impression of a society where humane principles thrive. So, while the colonists were operating according to the challenges in the colonial field, the civil society and the home government tried to regulate their activities along the prescriptions of Enlightenment universal humanity and “culturedness.” The frustrating situation generated by this contradictionality is reflected both by writers and critiques that engage Germany’s colonial enterprise such as Ulrich Wehler and Russell Berman.

The romantic presentation of “humane” colonialism is traceable in the founding works of German colonial discourse such as Reinhold Forster’s *Observations* (1778). Although this is not expressly stated, the arguments that Reinhold Forster makes of a new breed of colonizers that would institute a “humane” colonial system, point to the Germans, the only ones still “absent” from the colonial stage. By accusing other nations of inhumanity, Reinhold Forster creates a space that requires the display of humane tendencies. By inserting Germans in that space, he legitimizes not only German occupancy of the space, but also pins the tag of the ‘better/model/humane’ colonizer on Germans. Adelbert von Chamisso illustrates the “human/model” colonialism in practice

using the experience of German periphery travelers, „Wir durchschweiften täglich einzeln die Insel, schlossen uns jeder Familie an, und schliefen unbesorgt unter ihren Dächern.“¹² For Germans, who do not see colonialism as a necessary undertaking, the argument of bringing a new experience of the friendly European to the colonized people becomes a pretext to do so. Colonialism becomes thus a humanitarian undertaking for the benefit of the colonized.

Such a sentimentalist wish for a “humane” treatment of the natives underscores the following argument by Reinhold Forster,

If therefore the happiness of the savage is not so eligible, as some philosophers will make us believe, who never viewed mankind in this debased situation; it is certainly the wish of humanity, and of real goodness, to see all these nations brought nearer to a more improved, more civilized, and more happy state, without the addition of these evils, which abuses, luxury and vice have introduced among our societies. Human nature is capable of great improvement, if men only knew how to proceed in order to effectuate this great and noble purpose.¹³

Reinhold Forster’s regret over the practice of colonialism indicts other European nations, while at the same time advocating for a new nation with a new approach. As envisioned by Reinhold Forster, the new nation will operate with benevolence.¹⁴

Reinhold Forster’s idea of one family is arguably the foundation for the idea of the “familial” in Germany’s colonial discourse. As delineated by Zantop, German colonial enthusiasts envisioned a colonial relationship that would bring the colonizer and

¹² Adalbert von Chamisso, *Reise um die Welt mit der Romanzoffischen Entdeckungsexpedition* (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1836) 255. Print.

¹³ Forster, p. 199.

¹⁴ Forster, p. 223.

the colonized together in a “familial” setting.¹⁵ In such a setting, all the evils that characterize colonialism disappear. The relationship becomes a paternalistic one in which the colonizing European will assume the status of the father, and the colonized take on the role of the children. A kind of social family emerges in which, unfortunately, there is no position for the ‘mother.’ In such a scenario, the children are under obligation to obey the father in all things, and, because the father is carrying out his duties with benevolence, complete submission to the father’s authority is expected.

As I argued in chapter three, Campe’s *Robinson der Jüngere* (1779) is a demonstration of “humane” colonialism. The kind of relationship that Robinson develops with Freitag, although under unique circumstances, is epitomic of the “familial.” Robinson has the option of either treating Freitag humanely to keep him, or treating him otherwise and lose him. He elects to treat him humanely, and throughout their stay on the island, there is no friction or disagreement between them, other than some unexpressed disharmony resulting from cultural differences. These differences do not give Robinson reason to abhor Freitag, but rather, reinforce the necessity to have him re-oriented along the lines of European culture. Above all, Freitag never expressed nostalgia for his own culture while he was being indoctrinated into the “exotic” European culture.

Freitag’s willing submission to Robinson’s cultural education reflects Germany’s anticipation of willing submission of the natives in gratitude to German colonizers. This is seen in Robinson, who, from the onset of his relationship with Freitag, treated him humanely and did not express overt contempt or aggression towards him for his “primitivism.”

¹⁵ See Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 2.

The “familial” structure of Germany’s colonial vision at the early stage is also reflected in this text. While a plan to bring Freitag’s father to the island fails, he eventually ends up on the island in the same way that Freitag did – a captive for cannibalism. The repetition of the cannibalistic scenario and the rescue are intended to emphasize the humanitarian mission of the German colonists as a redeemer, redeeming the “savage heathens” from themselves. It also sets the stage for unquestionable gratitude from the natives. The author builds a colonial family of perfect harmony under Robinson, who takes on the role of the father.

The Enlightenment/humane ideology of the text is underscored by Robinson’s recognition of Freitag’s humanity above everything else, and by Freitag’s successful transition and integration into the German society without any friction or noted negative experience from the German public on their return to Germany. However smooth-sailing Robinson’s and Freitag’s relationship may have been, it could be seen as justifiable, based on the fact that Freitag owes his life to Robinson for saving him from cannibals. This understandably commands Freitag’s gratitude beyond limits. A transposition of such a fantastic scenario to the reality of colonialism takes a lot for granted. Robinson offers Freitag the security he no longer has, so long as he is separated from his own people. In actual colonialism, the German colonizer did not bring any form of “salvation” to the natives as to command their unwavering submission to his authority.

Reinhold Forster (*Observations*, 1778), in comparing the state of mind of the natives in their ‘backwardness’ to that of Europeans, acknowledges that they will not trade their ‘degenerate’ situation for the best things that the European system has to offer (199). Although the above evaluation counteracts Reinhold Forster’s lamentation of the

corruption, immorality and vices the European way was bringing to the natives, it prefigures what the German culturating mission would be facing in Africa.

Fabri (1879), whose colonial polemics thematize the domestic circumstances that make periphery colonialism mandatory for Germany, also contributes to the argument of “humane” colonialism. His discussion presents Germany’s involvement, above any other reason, as a profound humanitarian venture, „Wir geben dabei willig zu, daß die Einverleibung von Territorien, in welchen verwilderte, oder doch halbbarbarische Zustände herrschen, besonderen Gesichtspunkten unterliegt. Hier kann die Annexion durch eine lebenskräftige europäische Macht oft ein Akt der Humanität, ja wird in allen Fällen als ein Cultur-Fortschritt zu betrachten sein“ (57). From their “humane” views, Germans developed a messianic belief of themselves in relation to colonialism. Based on such a belief, they refused to see themselves as exploiters, and dehumanizers like other Europeans, but rather, as a race designated to bring deliverance to ‘heathen’ and ‘barbaric’ peoples.

This consideration occupies the minds of Germans, and as the colonial enterprise is launched through Carl Peters’ expedition, it became the prism through which the activities of German colonists would be measured. Inasmuch as it is a reasonable argument for the German government to use the humane standards of the Enlightenment to regulate the activities of German colonist, it is necessary to point out that the conception and implications of these principles in relation to colonialism stand on three foundational errors.

First and foremost, there is the inexperience of Germany in colonial matters. The thought of applying “humane” principles (the way Germans have conceived them) to colonization was derived from mere conjectural summations. Germans had not come into real colonial interaction with colonial natives as to know what it takes to get them to submit to a disenfranchising foreign influence. Therefore, considering themselves humanizing apostles, they reveled in the assumption that the natives would welcome them as such. The image of humanizing apostles tends to camouflage the economic component of colonization.

The second misunderstanding is the dichotomy between intellectuals’ watchdogging and the situational realities in the colonies. The whole argument of humaneness and the attribution thereof to Germans is a manipulation of German intellectuals in their bid to generate a communal identity for the anticipated German nation. Therefore, the ideal of the “humane” German is more of a fantasy than a reality of the German public of the time (late 18th and first half of 19th century). In any case, while this philosophy continued to dominate amongst the intellectuals as German colonization in East Africa was launched,¹⁶ the reality in the colonies was conditioning the men on the ground, and pointing them to a different direction.

Hammerstein points out this dilemma succinctly in Bülow’s experience as a single woman colonist, „Doch siegen über Bülows menschliches Mitleid mit dem in seiner Existenz bedrohten Araber die kolonialistischen Expansionswünsche und das nationalistische Bewusstsein der Überlegenheit eines geradezu kometenhaft

¹⁶ See Pesek, p. ...

aufsteigenden Deutschtums.“¹⁷ While humane considerations were present in the colonists mind, the question of Germany’s colonial future and the means of achieving that takes precedence over every other consideration.

Although the “humane” mentality was developed before the launching of the colonial enterprise, it is still questionable how much effort was made to harmonize these Enlightenment views (held by intellectuals), which reflects in the government’s attitude, with the activities of German colonists. So, while intellectuals and politicians demanded “humane” principles, the colonists handled colonialism with the violence, violations and dehumanization inherent in it. In other words, the fantasy of “humane” colonialism and the reality of colonization continue on parallel courses, generating destabilizing tensions in the whole colonial enterprise. Achieving a common ground on how to deal with the colonial issue continued to be elusive.

The third problem is the obsession among Germans to prove themselves “better” than other Europeans. As I have already highlighted, Germany’s fantasies are saturated with the effort to present themselves as “better” colonizers than other Europeans.¹⁸ The claim of being better expresses itself on the “humane” platform, where, as they argue, other Europeans have failed. Having sung the song of “humane” superiority so loud and for so long, there was pressure on both the government and the public to prove the claim on the colonial stage. In order to maintain this claim, the government was reluctant to sanction any approach that deviated from humane principles. Arthur J. Knoll comments, “Colonial Director Gerhard von Buchka (1898-1900) had to warn the governors of the

¹⁷ Hammerstein, p. 155.

¹⁸ Zantop, “Legends,” p. 192-193.

four colonies that the Reichstag and public opinion would draw unfavorable conclusions about the progress of German *Kulturarbeit* there given the excessive statistic of punishments meted out.”¹⁹ While violence, violations and dehumanization was thriving in the colonies, the home populace, Bismarck, and the Reichstag still believed in *Kulturarbeit*, a component of the humanitarian mission argument.

Considering the difficulty of “humane” colonialism, and the insistence of the government on friendly relationship with the colonized and their leaders, the colonists, whose experiences in the field dictate a different approach, were destined for continued frustration. The author hints at the conflict between the envisioned “humane” colonialism and the actual practice of colonialism, as he communicates Carl Peters’ oath to avenge the death of Fühlke on the Somalis (224). The author questions Peters’ resolve against the background of his pre-colonialism Enlightenment *Haltung*, „Galt es daneben viel, an den Somali keine Rache zu nehmen? An fernen schwarzen Wilden, die wie Tiere nach Einem geschnappt hatten, der sie greifen wollte? War solche Rache würdig des Philosophen, der einmal aus Kant und Schopenhauer in sich die große Vollendung gehofft?“ (227). Knoll & Hiery quote Ernst Lieber in a Reichstag debate (1896) on the “primitivity” of Carl Peters’ colonial activities,

Up until now I was of the opinion that, at the end of the 19th century, German colonial administration would be on a different level rather than even at this day trying to excuse a Cortes, a Pizarro, an Almagro and other so-called ‘heroes’ of the same sort from earlier times. . . . No gentlemen, that is not why we have been in favor of colonial policy only to breed German Corteses and German Pizarros!²⁰

¹⁹ Arthur J. Knoll (1995), p. 346.

²⁰ Ernst Lieber “We don’t want a German Cortes,” qtd. in *The German Colonial Experience*, eds. Arthur J. Knoll & Hermann J. Hiery (Lanham: University Press of America, Inc., 2010) 127. Print.

As Zantop points out, Cortes, Pizarro and Almagro are notorious names in Spain's invasion and conquest of the Americas.²¹

Olden evokes Carl Peters' orientation in line with the humane-oriented thoughts of Kant and Schopenhauer, and he highlights the discord between such orientation and the reality of the brutal colonial practice Peters represents. Maud charges him thus in a discussion, „Soviel Tote schon an seinem Weg, soviel Zorn gegen ihn gesammelt, überall, so viel Schuld auf ihn gebürdet. . . . Jeder Schritt den er gegangen, brannte an seinen Sohlen“ (223).

The atrocities committed by Peters against the natives were decried by the German populace and the government. Ernst Lieber laments the brutality of Peters' colonial activities in the same Reichstag speech,

To have a very young woman, really a child still . . . hung . . . that is evidence of such an abnormal hangman mentality that I . . . must hold this Dr. Peters to be a man totally beyond redemption. Therefore, I have to say: to what benefit do we grant year in, year out, millions for the missionization of so-called primitive peoples, and make the greatest sacrifices if then we have to stand accused that some *doctor philosophiae* . . . roams around the dark continent and commits murders with impunity, for which every Arab would have been immediately hanged?²²

The atrocities of Carl Peters in East Africa were so alarming that the government had to recall him. According to Hammerstein, Peters earned himself the nickname, „mkono wa damu“ (Mann mit den blutigen Händen).²³ After a while, he was sent back to East Africa as *Reichskommissar*. Peters exploited this position to further his campaign of brutal inhumanity against the natives. Angry at the treatment he received from Berlin, he gave a

²¹ See Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 116.

²² Ernst Lieber, qtd. in Knoll & Hiery, p. 127.

²³ Hammerstein, p. 155.

free rein to his wrath against the natives. Olden presents Peters' views on how to deal with the natives in order to subjugate and rule them (288-9).

The German government under Bismarck was reluctant to recognize inhumanity and violence as inescapable components of colonization and adjust their attitude commensurately. During a crisis with the Somalis, Bismarck eventually sent German troops to East Africa to support the colonial cause. Although this is an appropriate response to the struggle for sovereignty (the natives), and for subjugation (the colonizers), Bismarck interprets this as a failure on his part. Olden writes,

So geringfügig das Unternehmen, es bog von der bewährten und gepriesenen Linie seiner Politik ab.

So weit also hatte Peters ihn gebracht!

Nun genug! Was dieser Inkommensurable weiter unternahm, sollte er selbst ausbaden.

Nie bekam der Emin-Pascha Komitee ein Wort der Billigung von höchster Stelle. Nur leise, mündlich, durfte Wißmann mitteilen, er habe Befehl, in seinem Machtgebiet die Expedition Peters zu unterstützen. (254)

The reluctance to send troops to East Africa is anchored in two major things, one, the fear of increasing brutality in the colonies, which will definitely damage Germany's claim to "humane" colonialism. Olden communicates the concern back home, „Ewige Flaggenhißerei! Verdamnte Überstürzungs-Politik!“ hieß es in Berlin. „Stänkerei mit der ganzen Welt! Die Engländer, Franzosen, die Araber – alle sehn schon rot!“ (212). Although this was a concern for the German government, Bismarck did not make any effort to temper the culture of total war that has characterized Germany's military expeditions in the 19th century. Instead, in simple terms, he enjoins Wißmann, the commander of the troops, to “produce a victory.”²⁴ According to Olden's text, he was

²⁴ Knoll, p. 79.

sent there „Ordnung zu schaffen“ (254). Wildenthal informs on this from a historical perspective,

Nationalist and procolonial Protestant pastors such as Friedrich Fabri favored a nonconfessional emphasis in the antislavery movement in order to gain Catholic support for a German military intervention. Bismarck finally assented to Fabri's urgings and took up the antislavery cause because it allowed him to represent the conquest of German East Africa in the coastal war of 1888-1890 as a humanitarian deed.²⁵

The second reason for Bismarck's reluctance, as argued by Seligmann and McLean, was the financial implication of a possible prolonged war with the natives.²⁶ I have pointed out earlier that Bismarck favored the running of the colonies by charter companies.²⁷ The absence of armed conflicts would have favored the government's position of no direct participation. But, with the emergence of armed conflicts with the natives, the private companies lacked the resources to prosecute a colonial war,²⁸ and the government was under pressure to commit military resources to the course.

However much Bismarck tried to keep the colonial course off the table of the government financially, the danger of Germany losing face among other colonial powers necessitated military intervention at whatever financial expense. Sippel communicates, „Das Reich war mittlerweile zu tief in die kolonialen Angelegenheiten der DOAG verstrickt, so daß es unbedingt den erheblichen internationalen Prestigeverlust vermeiden wollte, der mit einem Rückzug der privatrechtlich organisierten Gesellschaft aus den von

²⁵ Wildenthal (2001), p. 22.

²⁶ Seligmann and McLean, p. 50-51.

²⁷ Knoll, p. 345.

²⁸ Harald Sippel, „Recht und Herrschaft in kolonialer Frühzeit: Die Rechtsverhältnisse in den Schutzgebieten der Deutsch-Ostafrikanischen Gesellschaft (1885-1890),“ *Studien zur Geschichte des deutschen Kolonialismus in Afrika*, eds. Peter Heine & Ulrich van der Heyden (Pfaffenweiler: Centaurus-Verlagsgesellschaft, 1995) 482. Print.

ihr beanspruchten Gebieten in Ostafrika verbunden gewesen wäre.“²⁹ Bismarck sends troops to East Africa. To the public, they were to help combat slavery and slave trade in the region, but their secret mandate was to support Peters’ enterprise until victory restores calm in the region.

Frieda von Bülow problematizes the Enlightenment colonialism in the novel *Im Lande der Verheißung* (1899). The colonial quagmire of Germans from the Enlightenment perspective is not reflected in her novel *Der Konsul* (1891). This is because Konsul von Sylffa lacks the radical, fanatical enthusiasm responsible for Carl Peters’ brutal approach to colonialism. However, the issue of ‘humane’ colonialism comes up in the British maneuver to sabotage von Sylffa’s efforts. In a discussion with Konsul von Sylffa, Chester alludes to the humanitarian claim as a responsibility they (the British) are carrying, and praises the Germans for their support in their (British) effort to bring civilization to the land,

,Wir sind zwar Rivalen in der geistigen Eroberung dieses Landes . . . allein dies ist ein Wettbestreben, dem nur Segen entblühen kann. Weit entfernt, den Deutschen ihre Erfolge zu mißgönnen, freuen wir uns im Gegentheil darüber, uns bei der großen humanen Aufgabe, diesen Erdtheil der Zivilisation zu gewinnen, von deutscher Seite so kräftig unterstützt zu sehen.‘ (172)

This remark comes at a time that the English and the Germans in U. are having a covert rivalry over control in the area. In referring to Germany’s “humane” colonial *Haltung*, Chester tries to hijack the initiative for “humane” colonialism, which the Germans tend to pride themselves on. This is however, a ploy to temper Konsul von Sylffa’s developing aggressiveness by reminding him of the German “humane” stance.

²⁹ Sippel, p. 482-83.

In *Im Lande der Verheißung* (1899), the dilemma finds greater expression following the aggressiveness of Ralf Krome. His activities and Berlin's reaction to them give prominence to the dilemma of "humane/model" colonialism. Krome launches incessant expeditions into the hinterland, the human cost of which causes concern in Germany, prompting serious reaction from Berlin. Dietlas' presentation of Krome to Maleen (31) gives a hint of his dogged approach and defense of the colonial course.

The desire to both secure and expand is expressed in armed expeditions. For young adventure-seeking Germans, the colonial field became the place to find adventure and achieve glory. Graf Rainer Waltron epitomizes this trend as Maleen speaks of the transformation his life has experienced since he left Germany, „Vor anderthalb Jahren hatte sie ihn nach Afrika hinausziehen sehen als einen noch recht unreifen Jüngling, den die Abenteuer der Wildnis lockten. In dieser Zeit schien er um fast zehn Jahre reifer geworden“ (15). The glory-craving that the colonial wars instigated among young Germans is referenced in a Reichstag debate in 1893/94.³⁰ Kapepwa I. Tambila comments on the same,

For German army personnel, many saw service in the colonial armies as firstly places to rehabilitate themselves for those of their members who had broken the military code of conduct; secondly in times of peace in Germany service in the colonies where there were many ceaseless operations, offered opportunities for early retirement from the army for those who wanted to quit quickly, or very rapid promotion for those officers who wanted to make a quick career in the army.³¹

³⁰ See Knoll, p. 85-86.

³¹ Kapepwa I. Tambila, "The German Invasion and Occupation of East Africa: Policies, Processes and Tactics," *Studien zur Geschichte des deutschen Kolonialismus in Africa*, eds. Peter Heine & Ulrich van der Heyden (Pfaffenweiler: Centaurus-Verlagsgesellschaft, 1995) 503. Print.

There was no question of how the wars were being prosecuted, what mattered was that German ‘heroes’ were putting their lives on the line for the fatherland. The focus on the fatherland and the colonizers as ‘heroes’ directs attention away from the fact that inhumanity was being committed against the natives. Recognized as heroes, the colonizers are exonerated from guilt. The native’s right to live is expressed in his willingness to live for and serve the European. This ideology is succinctly expressed by Paul Rohrbach as he discusses the position of the African natives in the colonial setting,

Only the necessity of losing their free national barbarianism and of becoming a class of servants for the whites provides the natives—historically seen—with an internal right of existence. . . . The idea that the Bantus would have the right to live and die according to their own fashion is absurd. It is true for peoples as well as for individuals that their existence is only justified if they contribute to general progressive development. There is no proof that national independence, national property and political organization among the tribes of Southwest Africa would be an advantage for the evolution of humankind in general or the German people in particular.³²

In the inaugural speech of Count von Götzen, one of the governors sent to East Africa, he did not mince words in stating his commitment to the culture of total war against those who would not submit to German rule,

You know that the Europeans are in possession of ultimate power and that they rule the coast as well as the hinterland. Those who remain true to them will attain honor and peace; but their enemies will be punished as you previously noticed in our battles with the rioters on the coast and in the interior. They were all beaten until they were scattered . . . and whoever wants to work with us so that all of us will be able to acquire something and become happy here in German East Africa, he will do well by us and I will listen to him and support him in all of his endeavors.

³² Paul Rohrbach, *Deutsche Kolonialwirtschaft*, vol. 1. Sudwest-Afrika (Berlin: 1907, 285-288), qtd. in Dominik J. Schaller, “From Conquest to Genocide. Colonial rule in German Southwest Africa and German East Africa,” *Empire, Colony, Genocide. Conquest, Occupation, and Subaltern Resistance in World History*, ed. Dirk A. Moses (New York: Berghahn Books, 2008) 313. Print.

Whoever wants to start war and to disrupt us in our activity, he should think that over very thoroughly and be very careful.³³

With this kind of mentality, there was no restraint to what German colonialists would do to ensure that the natives yielded to German authority.

However, while Krome (in the novel) carried on with his wars of conquest, Berlin tried to regulate the operations of the colonizers to avoid conflict with other powers on the one hand, and scandal on humane principles on the other. Berlin's actions became a fettering hold on the colonists. Krome complains, „Schließlich entscheiden die Tatsachen. . . . Tatsache ist aber, daß sie uns mit ihrer verdammten Schreiberwirtschaft jeden Erfolg im Keim zerstören“ (60). Towards the end of the novel, Peters writes to Maleen, further blaming German intellectuals for the general indecisiveness of the German government and the people on how to handle the colonial enterprise,

Aber ich bin an einem großen Rechenfehler gescheitert: ich vergaß mit dem deutschen Volkscharakter zu rechnen. Dieses viel redende, viel schreibende Volk von Kritikern, Zweiflern, Tadlern und sentimental Ideologen ist eines kraftvollen Willens zur Macht einfach nicht fähig. In seinen Eroberern sieht es Verbrecher. Nur zu! Wir wollen sehen, wohin das Schiff treibt, mit Männern am Steuer, wie die, die mich gerichtet haben. (364)

Krome, believing to know what was best for the fatherland, resolves to forge ahead with his colonial project notwithstanding Berlin's position (61). He makes no pretense of his disregard for the *Humanitätsphilosophie* of Germans. He refers to them as „Humanitätsapostel, die in jeder notwendigen und nützlichen Härte eine aus Willkür und Privatvergnügen ausgeübte Grausamkeit wittern“ (114). He talks about his operational principles in dealing with the natives (113-114).

³³ Knoll & Hiery, p. 101.

Berlin preaches and desires colonial activities “humane” enough to boost Germany’s claim and image as the most cultured and civilized nation of Europe. The national portrait of “culturedness” is held as a component of German national ethos. At the inauguration of Kaiser Wilhelm I as King of Prussia in 1871, following the defeat of France and the attendant founding of the *Reich*, the King invoked this ethos in his speech, “God may grant Us and Our successors to the imperial crown the ability to forever augment the German Empire, not by conquest in war, but in goods and gifts of peace in the area of national welfare, freedom and civilization.”³⁴ This ethos, which, according to Knoll and Hiery, is ancient, found a convenient copulation with the Enlightenment principles of universal humanity. Discussing Lessing’s idea of enlightened nationalism and cosmopolitanism, Redekop argues, “‘The public’ stood somewhere between the two, absorbing elements of each. Lessing strove to conceptualize and constitute a more inclusive public sphere of enlightened interaction, inhabited by a public able to develop and improve itself morally and culturally, confident and cognizant of its own identity yet aware of its close relationship to humanity at large.”³⁵

However, as presented in the texts, Germany’s failure to regulate the activities of her colonists, such as Carl Peters (*Ich bin Ich*, 1927) and Ralf Krome (*Im Lande der Verheißung*, 1899), turns the fantasy of “humane” augmentation of the Reich through “goods and gifts of peace” on its head. The reality of brutal wars in Africa threatened this claim and disquieted the Berlin government. Schaller remarks, “Furthermore, politicians in Berlin were afraid that the reputation of Germany as a *Kulturnation* . . . might suffer

³⁴ Kaiser Wilhelm I., qtd. in Knoll & Hiery, p. 27.

³⁵ Redekop, p. 59.

since the oppression of the Africans had been received internationally as exceptionally ruthless.”³⁶

Although the inhuman operations of the colonists are not sanctioned by the government, Berlin still finds itself under the inextricable obligation to send troops to support the colonists who lacked the necessities to fight the war successfully. Arne Perras comments, “The chancellor felt obliged to take that step because giving up East Africa would have meant too heavy a blow to his own and Germany’s prestige. He acted as the custodian of national identity and fulfilled nationalist demands.”³⁷ Pesek comments on the rising importance of the colonial project,

1886 gab Bismarck den Financiers der DOAG eine weitreichende Garantie des Reiches. Das machte den Weg frei für ein Engagement bedeutender Industrieller und Bankiers. Auch der deutsche Kaiser erwarb nun Anteile. Die politischen und wirtschaftlichen Eliten machten sich das koloniale Projekt von Peters zu eigen. Als es 1889 scheiterte, war es längst zu einem Prestigeprojekt geworden, das man nicht ohne weiteres fallen lassen konnte.³⁸

By sending troops to East Africa, Berlin endorsed the inhumanity of her colonial agents. So, it seems that of all the things Germany had to consider in her colonial activities, national identity, prestige and honor weighed the highest and were never to be compromised.

The Gender Dilemma

Germany’s colonial concept presupposes a close relationship with the natives that would facilitate their elevation from a “barbaric” and “primitive” state to a “cultured” and

³⁶ Schaller, p. 296.

³⁷ Perras, p. 165.

³⁸ Pesek, p. 180.

civilized state of existence. The envisioned “familial” setting, to use Zantop’s codification,³⁹ would encourage miscegenation between the two races, occasioning racial upliftment. However, in the grand scheme of things, there was no provision for the German woman as a participant. On the one hand, there is the conflict between the ideal of “familial” colonialism and the absence of German women in the colonial grand scheme. On the other hand, there is the interest and desire of women to be actively involved in periphery colonialism. This generates a dilemma for the colonial authorities. As Wildenthal observes, “Formal overseas empire was important to German women, but German women were not important to the men who dominated that empire.”⁴⁰

The German patriarchal structure fenced German women out of public significance, arguing that the woman’s place is in the home and her assignment is to rear children and to provide support for her husband. Ann Taylor Allen remarks, “In the early 19th century, ideals of maternal behavior were further influenced by the development of new definitions of the family as a private sphere, separated from economically productive activity and serving as a center only of unpaid housework, child-rearing, and emotional intimacy.”⁴¹ Periphery colonialism was quartered within the public sphere, and as such, initially outside the reach of the women. So, the idea of “familial” colonial setting that does not involve the woman becomes problematic right from the onset.

The question is, whether German colonists envisaged a colonial “familial” without mothers, or whether the colonial space was expected to provide the mothers for

³⁹ Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 2.

⁴⁰ Wildenthal (2001), p. 2.

⁴¹ Allen (1991), p. 28.

the “familial.” Whatever the expectation, German women did not wait for the outcome, but made moves to assert themselves. Although the system had opened up for women to function as Catholic missionaries, wives of Protestant missionaries or care-givers, these were duties that they had to perform within the leeway provided by men. That does not therefore translate into agency for women. The whole sense of colonial involvement for women was the achievement of agency, which was denied them in the German society. Women’s determination to be a factor in Germany’s periphery colonialism became a problem that both the male colonizers and the German government had to deal with.

The representation of the colonial field as the man’s world is already demonstrated by Campe in *Robinson der Jüngere* (1779). The only female figures in the colonial island are the native wives of the Spaniards (460). Judging from this scenario, it could be argued that the colonies were expected to provide the mothers for the “familial.” Therefore, German women seemed to have no place in such a setup. However, Campe’s fictional colony does not encounter the women’s emancipation agitation that was beginning to emerge in Europe. The emancipation issues of the 19th century are more evident in Olden’s *Ich bin Ich* (1927) and in Bülow’s *Der Konsul* (1891) and *Im Lande der Verheißung* (1899).

As I have already pointed out, periphery colonialism offered German women the opportunity to pursue agency outside the native environment that has imposed socio-political limitations on them. For them, the periphery is interpreted as a space for emancipation. Their envisioned emancipation expresses itself in two ways – first, imposing themselves on the public stage by being in the colonial field, and second, by forcing themselves in the space between the native woman and the German man. As

Wildenthal recognizes, German women had to justify their necessity to the colonial enterprise by emphasizing the nursing need of German men and the “need for white women as potential mothers who could alleviate the purported dangers of race-mixing.”⁴² So, while German men, by default, created the space for the native women to become the colonial mothers, as could be deduced from *Robinson der Jüngere*, German women were not ready to concede that position to native women.

German women were eventually conceded a role in periphery colonialism following the “enlarged domestic arena” concept.⁴³ Although this adjustment brought a significant improvement to the status of women, their role did not significantly deviate from care-giving. The only thing was that the spectrum was extended beyond the home. Allen comments on the location of women in the German society,

Women . . . should become active in education and social welfare activities precisely because of their feminine qualities. Female virtues could be drawn on to improve society, not because women were or should be equal to men, but because they were different and distinctively qualified to work in feminine areas such as the education of young children, health, and poor relief.⁴⁴

The expanded private sphere avails women the opportunity to express their public-space enthusiasm through nursing, which became the justification for their presence in the colonial field. Wildenthal comments, “Colonial nursing long dominated procolonial women’s activism: for the first twenty years of Germany’s colonial empire, that first

⁴² Wildenthal (1998), p. 54.

⁴³ See Tipton, p. 154.

⁴⁴ Tipton, p. 153.

association remained the only organized outlet for colonialist women outside church or other male-run auspices.”⁴⁵

In Olden’s *Ich bin Ich* (1927), Frieda von Bülow, Germany’s pioneer woman colonist, sails to East Africa to establish nursing stations in the region. However, her ambition was not just limited to the back-stage service of care-giving, but rather, it extends to being involved in areas where she could exercise authority and agency. But, as Olden writes, the colonial enterprise was conceived as a place for *Blaustriumpfe* (206). However, Bülow was not to be deterred. Ironically, she did not intend to occupy a space in the safety of an administrative setup, but rather offers to be a part of the expeditionary team, where her skills as a nurse would be of use to wounded German ‘heroes.’ Olden writes,

Jetzt wollte sie Peters helfen!

Nicht daheim mit wollenen Bauchbinden und literarisch-weiblicher Handarbeit –. Nein, draußen, am Schaft der Fahne!

Wo Männer kämpfen, gibt es Wunden. Die Tropen sind voll Tücke: Malaria, Schwarzwasserfieber, Küstenfieber. (208)

Bülow’s preference for the men’s arena, the battlefield, over a medical facility in the safety of the town, hints at a desire to rise above backstage/ancillary duties. It suggests a desire to be on the stage (the battle zone), where the risk of racial corruption/pollution is likely to take place as the German man encounters the native woman. Schneider identifies this shielding role of German women in the colony,

Dabei fuße der Nationalismus des »Eigenen« auf der Idee einer “racially and morally ‘pure’ germanness”, welche nur durch die essentielle Rolle der Frau zur Aufrechterhaltung der Reinheit erfüllt werden könne. Dadurch ergebe sich in Frieda von Bülows Roman [*Verheißung*] eine

⁴⁵ Wildenthal (2001), p. 13.

Doppelfunktion für die Frau: 'They were subject to the sexual/racial politics of patriarchal society that instrumentalized them for the sake of continued white male domination, while, at the same time, they were participating subjects in the colonial cause.'⁴⁶

It is in the expedition hinterland also that the wounded soldiers are and need immediate attention. Katharina von Hammerstein informs of Bülow's participation in an expedition into the hinterland along Peters and his men.⁴⁷

So, German women's agency seeking, as projected by Bülow as a historical figure and her fictional protagonist, Maleen, aims beyond the gendered role of care-giving on the backstage of colonialism. Bülow, although a historical figure, satisfies the "shielding" needs as she enters into a romantic relationship with Carl Peters. As a fictional persona, she instrumentalizes herself in the novel *Im Lande der Verheißung* (1899) as representing the agency aspiration of German women via periphery colonial involvement.

As communicated by Hammerstein, meeting and falling in love with Peters provided an added motivation for Bülow, not the impetus for her colonial undertakings.⁴⁸ Developments in the colonial mission tend to suggest that, although the romance mattered for Bülow, it did not overshadow her colonial ambitions, to which Peters was significant. Everything Bülow undertook was aimed at the achievement of agency in the service of the fatherland. Therefore, so long as Peters remained committed to the colonial needs of Germany, even though their romance had collapsed, he remained a worthy German to her, and deserving of loyal following. Olden remarks on this selfless patriotism of Bülow,

⁴⁶ Schneider, p. 89.

⁴⁷ Hammerstein, p.152.

⁴⁸ Hammerstein, p. 151.

Eine Frau wie die Bülow liebt den sinkenden Helden feuriger noch als den siegenden.
Solange sie Peters im Marsch sah, mitreißend in seinem fanatischen Plan – skrupellos in seinen Mitteln, aber mit dem Gestus des Patrioten, der nicht für sich siegt, – bewunderte sie ihn und zwang sich zu seinen würdigen Erfolgen. (239-40)

It was only when Peters turned his back on the fatherland that he lost significance for Bülow.⁴⁹ However, she still continued to defend him publicly. In defense of Peters, she berates the German society and government for maltreating such a patriot who had given so much for the course of the fatherland. Wildenthal states,

Nevertheless, Bülow defended Peters publicly with an editorial in *Die Zukunft*. In true radical nationalist style, she blamed the German public for shortsighted moralizing that cost Germany its most gifted colonial politician. She insisted that ‘freedom of decision’ must be granted to a great colonizer. That was, she claimed, little enough reward for the dangers he had faced.⁵⁰

If Bülow’s colonial attitude and involvement, as communicated by Olden, represents an emerging orientation among German women, then a new phenomenon was developing that the German colonial enterprise had to reckon with. Tipton reports, “Another look at the increasing emphasis on the differences between the sexes in public discourse, and another glance at the idealized domestic interior, suggest that the *Bürgertum* wanted its private sphere confined not only against the threat of external disorder, but also against the threat of female emancipation.”⁵¹ Should women be allowed ascent onto the public stage, or should efforts be made to contain their aspirations to the public stage? There is no gainsaying the need for German women on the colonial space, but how to respond to, integrate, and accommodate their aspirations beyond the gendered ancillary sphere remains a puzzle between reason and sentiment. Should the men open up

⁴⁹ Wildenthal (1998), p. 59.

⁵⁰ Wildenthal (1998), p. 60.

⁵¹ Tipton, p. 75.

the public stage to the women or continue the limiting tradition and inflexibility, which, as Wildenthal observes, constitute the problems to German women's progress?⁵²

In Bülow's *Der Konsul* (1891), the significance of women in colonialism is highlighted, although it still remains a private arrangement that does not involve the Berlin government. Whether or not their status is official, the women fulfill the designated role of care-giving in the novel. Women like Mrs. Gabelsberger, Nelly Donglar and Joseffa Lindenlaub, who represent contrasting and contradictory personalities, find their roles in the colony as the needs arise. While Joseffa assumes the role of satisfying the physical needs of German males in U., the other women find agency in health and compassion-related needs of Germans.

Furthermore, Nelly becomes a significant figure in the English/German rivalry in U. In spite of almost being betrothed to St. Clair, the British, their whole relationship collapses as Nelly develops a patriotic nationalism that makes Konsul von Sylffa a more favorable candidate for marriage. In her response to the call of patriotism, Nelly becomes an enthusiastic defender of the German course, a mobilizer of Germans in U., a motivator to the Konsul himself, a supporter of other German women, a crusader for moral improvement, and more. All of these examples underscore the role of women in the colonial field that hint at their desire to function beyond the backstage.

One subtle strategy Bülow uses to highlight the transformation of the status of women in the colony is the relationship between Nelly (the Donglars) and St. Clair. Although the narrator locates this relationship within the absence of German umbrella

⁵² Wildenthal (1998), p. 63.

identity, it is used to communicate the colonial insignificance of the Donglars in particular and the Germans in U. in general.

The author goes beyond winning over the Donglars to Germanness, and turns Nelly into an agent for the awakening of Germanness among the German Diaspora in U. Nelly's transformation responds to the provision of an enabling environment. In the absence of restrictions from her brother or from the society, she was able to blossom within her own capacity. Wildenthal remarks, "Yet Nelly Donglar has undergone a colonial education and becomes an exponent to the best kind of German nationalism"⁵³ This scenario is the main advocacy of women's emancipation movement of the time, an equal opportunity that will facilitate the free development of women's potentials. Helene Lange, one of the contemporary feminist activists of the 19th century, states, "Das lag für mich nur in dem Gedanken . . . daß Gleichberechtigung also nicht verlangt werden müsse um der Gleichheit, sondern um der Ungleichheit der Geschlechter willen, daß die einseitig männliche Kultur durch eine weibliche ergänzt werden müsse."⁵⁴ The same idea of freedom of development echoes in Bülow's declaration on the aspired inter-gender relationship,

Wir wollen Mitarbeiterinnen des Mannes sein, treue und freie Weggenossinnen. Nicht das Gleiche wollen wir leisten, wie er, sondern ihn auf allen Lebensgebieten ergänzen, als seine andere Menschenhälfte. Um Das zu können, müssen wir uns vor allen Dingen frei entfalten dürfen. Was wir bei freierer Entwicklung unserer weiblichen Wesensart sein und leisten werden, wird erst die Zukunft lehren.⁵⁵

⁵³ Wildenthal (2001), p. 61.

⁵⁴ Helene Lange, *Lebenserinnerungen* (Berlin: F. H. Herbig GmbH, 1925) 111-112. Print.

⁵⁵ Bülow (1897), p. 601.

While gender controversy is somehow muted in *Der Konsul* (1891), Bülow gives it more prominence in her later novel *Im Lande der Verheißung* (1899). Using Maleen Dietlas as both protagonist and bait, Bülow projects the gendering of Germany's colonial enterprise to her audience. In Maleen, we see a woman who puts the love of the fatherland above personal interests. For her, the elements of love, dedication, respect, and commitment to a relationship are determined by the level of a man's dedication to the course of the fatherland. It is on this ground that Ralf Krome, the voracious colonist, earns Maleen's honor and respect above her husband, Dietlas. Although her patriotism and enthusiasm for Germany's colonial needs are without reservations, she earns no recognition among the men in Ungudja or from Berlin. Instead, she is regarded with contempt by both German men and women for daring to venture onto the arena of men.

Maleen's return to Africa to embark on a farming project as a single lady could be read as the beginning of feminist colonialism. Defying all the odds, she establishes herself as a colonial force in East Africa. She establishes a farm, builds a large house, and intends her property to become a place of convalescence for wounded Germans in East Africa. Hoehstatter, commenting on Bülow's (likely fictionalized in the novel as Maleen) experience as a female colonist, recognizes this as the greatest evidence of the power of her personal character, „Sie kam, von Mißtrauen empfangen, sie kam unter Deutsche, die schon einfach der Frau mißtrauten, die, alleinstehend, den Mut zu einer Niederlassung besaß. Als sie ging, hatte sie Menschen hinter sich, die sie bedauernd und

schmerzlich bewegt scheiden sahen, denen ihr Mut und Charakter Hochachtung und Bewunderung abgenötigt.“⁵⁶

Through willpower and wisdom, Maleen is able to achieve success without leaning on any man. Her achievement demonstrated not only the ability of a woman to succeed on the public stage, but also the fallacy of feminine emotionality against masculine rationality on which the exclusion of the woman from the public space is partly based. She deals a direct blow to the myth of the inferiority of women to men. Ralf Krome points out to Maleen that in Ungudja she represents the women (35). The natural corollary to Maleen's legacy is that more women will recognize and aspire to the colonial field as the stage where they can pursue and achieve agency on their own.

There is no contesting Maleen's achievement as a single woman colonist. The big question remains, how Berlin and the colonial office would respond to the incontestable significance of women in the colonial field, not as appendage to men, but as free functioning colonial agents. With the tradition of relegating women to the background, and the unwillingness of the men to shift away from such a tradition, Berlin and Germany's colonial enterprise are in crises over how to deal with German women's interest and enthusiasm for colonial agency.

Historically, Bülow, who, according to Hoechstatter's remark, earned the respect and recognition of fellow colonists in East Africa, was eventually forced to return to Germany on the simple ground of being a single woman. This demonstrates the unwillingness of Berlin to grant women the freedom of agency outside the impetus

⁵⁶ Hoechstatter (1910), 169-70.

provided by men. The unpleasantness of either of the options – conceding women the freedom of agency or restricting their development – depending on the perspective from which one views the situation, generates the gender dilemma in Germany’s colonial discourse.

The Involvement Dilemma

Germany’s colonial enterprise was initiated, not through any governmental legislative procedure, but rather through the operations of private establishments and individuals. As Pesek informs, „Der Aufstieg des Kaiserreichs zur Kolonialmacht vollzog sich nicht nach einer kohärenten politischen Strategie, sondern war ein Gemenge von individuellen Initiativen und zufälligen Gelegenheiten.“⁵⁷ However, this is not unique to Germany in any way, but rather, the norm with all colonizing nations. Sir Walter Raleigh, the pioneer of British colonizing ventures in the Americas, made his voyage and discoveries in the Americas before the British crown got involved.⁵⁸ However, the state did not delay to invest interest and resources in the periphery enterprise as soon as the prospect of economic and expansionist benefits was identified. In the case of Germany, it took long to get the government involved in the periphery colonial enterprise. Moreover, even when the government eventually got involved, the question of authority and control over the territories was the next issue. Some historical accounts hold that trading companies that were thriving under the administration in place did not care about the involvement of the German government.⁵⁹ This scenario was evident in Zanzibar, where

⁵⁷ Pesek, p. 166.

⁵⁸ See Montrose (1991), p. 1-41.

⁵⁹ See Seligmann and Mclean, p. 162.

German businesses were thriving under the collaborative administration of the British and Sultan Said Bargasch.⁶⁰

The companies, which embarked on territorial acquisition in combination with trading activities, or experienced predatory interferences, requested the involvement of the German government to authenticate their colonial claims or for protection. Townsend's discussion of the Fiji episode is epitomic of this situation of the ill-treatment of Germans by other European powers.⁶¹ In any case, the agitation of private establishments for government involvement was high. However, Berlin expected the private establishments to shoulder the cost of running the colonies. Seligmann and McLean state,

It has always been Bismarck's view that overseas empire was liable to be a financial burden rather than a blessing for the Reich. Particularly worrying was the possibility that the seizure of colonies would necessitate expensive colonial administrations as such an outcome would necessitate the Reich government seeking additional financial measures from the Reichstag, a body whose influence Bismarck did not want to see increased.⁶²

Notwithstanding Berlins reluctance, the multi-dimensionality of colonial enterprise mandates the merging of both government and private interests.

The question is, whether Berlin should get into the colonial enterprise at least to protect the interests of German trading companies, or abandon them to the 'goodwill' of other European governments. This is a dilemma scenario because Berlin would have to deal with other European powers in order to successfully intervene in the interest of

⁶⁰ Wehler, p. 334.

⁶¹ See Tawnsend, p. 34.

⁶² Seligmann & McLean, p. 51.

German companies. Against this background, how much willingness and bargaining power did Berlin possess? Streese informs on Bismarck's predicament,

Insofern sah Bismarck politisch keine direkte Notwendigkeit zur internationalen Expansion, und er zögerte, dem Drängen des ‚Deutschen Kolonialvereins‘ . . . und des Handelskapitals hinsichtlich der politischen Etablierung von Kolonien nachzugeben, vor allem, um die für Deutschlands Position in Europa entscheidenden Bündnisse nicht zu irritieren.⁶³

Financing colonialism was also a source of dichotomy between Berlin and private business establishments. Otto Pflanze communicates on Bismarck's position,

Consequently, his [Bismarck's] intention was to hand the administration of the new colonies over to private companies that would exercise sovereign rights there under imperial charter. As he put it, in a speech to the Reichstag in November 1885, ‘my goal in those regions is the governing merchant and not the governing bureaucrat – not the governing military and Prussian official.’⁶⁴

The emergent circumstance from the East African scenario is that the German companies were not politically colonial, so they enjoyed unrestricted and profitable business atmosphere under the administration until Peters arrived.⁶⁵

As Peters secretly departed for East Africa, Berlin succinctly informed him not to count on the support of the government. Wehler reports, „Aber da er vor der Abreise nicht noch einmal persönlich erschienen war, schlug Busch ein Telegramm an den deutschen Konsul in Sansibar des Inhalts vor, daß Peters auf den Reichsschutz nicht rechnen, sondern nur auf eigene Faust vorgehen könne.“⁶⁶ In Olden's *Ich bin Ich* (1927), Peters is heard reporting this referenced denial of state recognition to his team,

⁶³ Streese, p. 35.

⁶⁴ Otto Pflanze, *Bismarck and the Development of Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990) 113. Print.

⁶⁵ See Perras, p. 162-163.

⁶⁶ Wehler (1969), p. 341.

„Vorgestern hat mir unser Konsul in Sansibar einen Erlaß des Reichskanzlers vorgelegt: unsere Expedition genießt für unser Leben wie für unsere Erwerbungen keinerlei Reichsschutz!“ (171). Although Berlin already had a Konsul in Zanzibar, it was Peters who introduced active German colonial maneuvers in the area. So, the government’s denial of support also meant the isolation of the team by the official German representation in East Africa. Peters shows no reversal or weakness in his response to Berlin,

Als Peters, der am 4. November mit seinen Begleitern in Sansibar eintrat, den abkühlenden Bescheid erhielt, blieb ihm nichts anderes übrig, als sofort zurückzukabeln, „daß wir sicherlich nicht versuchen würden, in etwaigen selbstverschuldeten Schwierigkeiten durch Appell an den Reichsschutz die hohe Reichsregierung mit zu verwickeln.“⁶⁷

In spite of the unfriendly situation, Peters carried on with his expedition, parallel to the activities of the Germans in Zanzibar. However, this situation was destined to change as Peters launched intensive media propaganda of success in territorial acquisition. In response to that, popular opinion began to swing in his favor.

Peters and his *Gesellschaft* were eventually granted state recognition and support in February 1885, and on the 3rd of March the same year a public announcement was made.⁶⁸ Olden communicates this event, though with a different date (198-99). So, Peters becomes a national hero all of a sudden. As I pointed out in chapter four, the granting of state support became an impetus to forge ahead more radically with his plans. His attempt to establish a German protectorate over an area controlled by the Sultan generated a tri-

⁶⁷ Wehler, p. 341.

⁶⁸ See Deutsch, p. 212.

dimensional tension between the German presence in Zanzibar and the Sultan on the one hand, and between Berlin and London on the other. I discussed this issue in Chapter four.

As I pointed out in chapter four, Berlin's support for Peters in the Sultan Bargasch crisis was apparently a gamble to take advantage of Britain being in crisis with Russia.⁶⁹ Berlin did not envisage London getting embroiled in another crisis with another European power. Britain conceded the rights over the territories to Germany. As Wehler comments, this was a great victory for Bismarck, „Dieses Abkommen bedeutete sicher ‘einen Triumph Bismarcks’, der trotz der gewaltigen Ausdehnung des Gebiets noch immer verhältnismäßig begrenzte Ziele ebenso beharrlich verfolgte, wie er die zeitweilige Schwäche Londons ohne Bedenken ausnutzte.“⁷⁰ The *Schwäche* referred to above is the tension between Russia and Britain. This problem is acknowledged by Olden (201).

Peters continues to act belligerently towards Britain. At one point in Olden's text, he tells Sir Stanley, the Belgian colonial representative in Zanzibar, „Ost-Afrika gehört uns Gentlemen! Wenn's Euch nicht paßt, führen wir Krieg“ (218). Bismarck, recognizing the importance of the goodwill of Britain in her expansionist program to the East (Europe), realizes that Peters' activities, if not checked, will jeopardize Berlin's chances with England. Berlin swings back to an anti-Peters position. Wehler states,

Als Peters sich nun wieder der gewaltigen Erwerbungen der DOAG rühmte, hielt Bismarck fest: ‚Was heißt Erwerbung? Ein Stück Papier mit Negerkreuzen darunter. Die Sicherstellung, soweit sie überhaupt erreicht, d. h. gegen europäische Rivalen, liegt erst in unserem Abkommen mit England.‘ daß er es den ‚deutschen Afrikafanatikern mit leeren Taschen und vollen Mäulern‘ nicht recht machen konnte . . . sondern daß sie ‚ein großes Geschrei wegen Aufgabe der

⁶⁹ Lowe, p.8.

⁷⁰ Wehler, p. 358.

panafrikanischen Kolonisationsprojekte erheben⁷¹ würden, war ihm bewußt, aber die ‚definitive Abmachung mit England‘ besaß für ihn den entscheidenden ‚Wert.⁷¹

As could be gleaned from the discussion so far, Peters’ expedition forced Bismarck to expand his colonial considerations to include a political dimension of direct government involvement, even military involvement which, as Wehler quotes him, Bismarck never anticipated, „Die Möglichkeit militärischer Expeditionen ist meiner Ansicht nach absolut ausgeschlossen . . . ich würde lieber die ganzen ostafrikanischen Kolonialversuche aufgeben als militärischen Unternehmungen des Reiches im Inneren zustimmen.“⁷²

In spite of his aversion to military involvement, Berlin found herself in a state of dilemma when the crisis broke out in 1889. The DOAG (Deutsch-Ostafrikanische Gesellschaft), which was running the affairs of the colony, lacked the resources to prosecute a war. If Berlin would not commit troops to East Africa, the natives would win against the German colonists, and Germany would lose face, and be regarded as a mere puppet power. On the other hand, deploying troops to East Africa may set the precedence for militarized colonial enterprise that will, among other things, damage Germany’s self-image as a cultured and humane nation. Bismarck decided to send troops. Olden records Bismarck’s regret in selling himself to Peters to the extent of having to endorse military intervention to help his course (254).

At the point where Bismarck had to send troops to East Africa, his stand vis-à-vis Peters’ colonial project became non-committal. However, it is necessary to note that the

⁷¹ Wehler, p. 358-9.

⁷² Wehler, p. 362.

withdrawal of support from Peters was a political maneuver. Although this is not represented in Olden's text, historical sources inform that the inability of the charter company to prosecute the war, which prompted the deployment of German troops, occasioned, as Harald Sippel writes, the takeover of the colony by the military.⁷³

From the foregoing, it becomes obvious that Berlin was inconsistent in her attitude towards periphery colonialism, and this could be traced to her unpreparedness for periphery colonial enterprise. Not being prepared is reflected in Berlin not having a clear-cut policy in place how to deal with periphery colonialism. As Arthur J. Knoll observes, Berlin's approach to colonial administration was rather haphazard.⁷⁴ When the reality of colonization and the fantasy of paradisiacal colonialism proved to be in conflict, Berlin was in a great dilemma over how to protect the young nation's image as a *Kulturnation* and a great European power. So, marooned on the crossroads of decision, Germany became inconsistent on matters of periphery colonialism.

The plan of leaving colonial affairs in the hands of charter companies would have worked out if there were no moves to acquire territories. Berlin could simply send a Konsul in the capacity of Fürchtendank (*Der Konsul*, 1891), who would just be there ceremonially; let the trading companies carry on with their businesses, depending on the "goodwill" of other colonial powers, and, in the case of East Africa, the "goodwill" of the local administration. Perhaps, there would not be any cause for alarm, Berlin would be at peace with herself, the fantasy of "humane" and *Kulturhaltung* would continue to survive. However, this can only be possible in the absence of territorial acquisition.

⁷³ Sippel, p. 482.

⁷⁴ Knoll (1995), p. 344.

But as soon as the question of a “place in the sun” was raised, and private individuals and trading companies were ready to find one for Germany, the aloofness of Berlin could no longer be sustained, because, private individuals and companies could not compete with other European governments or with provoked natives, who had to fight to protect their sovereignty. It required the German government to establish a position in response to other governments for any colonization project to be meaningful. The lack of conclusive positioning on the side of Berlin generates the involvement dilemma, and this, in turn, accounts, to a reasonable extent, for the instabilities in the colonies for as long as they lasted. Olden’s and Bülow’s texts projected this dilemma through Berlin’s handling of Germany’s colonial functionaries.

The Power Dilemma

In regards to Germany’s situation and prospects for global greatness, Bernhard Förster, one of Germany’s philosophers of the late 19th century, argues that “every organism, if it is vital and viable, exhibits the tendency towards the expansion, the enlargement, and the augmentation of its being.”⁷⁵ As could be gleaned from this statement, Förster sees the latent greatness of Germany, evident from the wars against Austria and France, and he is under no illusion that Germany possessed the capability to become a global power. So, he advocates the extension of the nationalist effort onto periphery expansionism as the path to global prominence.

⁷⁵ See Bernhard Förster, “Ein Deutschland der Zukunft,” *Bayreuther Blätter* 6. (1883): 44-56, qtd. in Robert Holub “Nietzsche’s Colonialist Imagination: Nueva Germania, Good Europeanism, and Great Politics,” *The Imperialist Imagination*, eds. Sara Friedrichsmeyer, Sara Lennox, and Susanne Zantop (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998) 36. Print.

When Prussia defeated Austria in 1866, the victory was attributed to her rapid industrialization, which had given birth to railroads, trains and more sophisticated weaponry. Using railroads, Germany could easily move large numbers of troops and weapons quickly from one location to another. This was a maneuver the enemies could not match. Austria was a dominant power alongside Prussia in the German confederation, as well as one of the powers in Europe. So, her defeat by a Prussian-led *Kleindeutsche* army was a signal for Prussia's budding military prowess. The victory against France was the culminating evidence. With Austria and France humbled, Britain became the next hurdle on Germany's march towards the zenith of European power status.⁷⁶ The existence of Britain and what it represented in Germany's power ambition generated the power dilemma in Germany's periphery colonial enterprise in East Africa.

Colonialism advocates such as Fabri unequivocally stated that the foundation of Britain's global power status was her immense colonial possessions in the periphery (39-40). This prompts advocacy for Germany's periphery colonial involvement in pursuit of European and global power status. This condition reechoes in Kristin Kopp's discussion of Germany's colonizing intentions towards Poland as a way of taking "her place alongside other strong and modern nations."⁷⁷

I already pointed out that England was both a motivation and a stumbling block in Germany's colonial question. This dual significance of Britain to Germany's colonial ambition reappears in Germany's striving for power in that, while she is the enemy that must be neutralized if the dream is to be achieved, she is also the enemy too great to be

⁷⁶ See Förster et al. (1988), p. 109.

⁷⁷ Kristin Kopp, p. 18.

provoked, if the dream must be preserved. Fabri recognizes Germany's apprehensions about provoking England, but plays down the risk using a moral argument, „England, das doch hier wesentlich allein in Betracht käme, hätte jedenfalls am wenigsten ein moralisches Recht, der Inangriffnahme einer deutschen Colonial-Politik sich entgegenzustellen; und es ist ja auch wirklich kein Gedanke daran, daß es versuchen würde, solches zu thun“ (57). While Fabri neither advocates confrontation with England nor giving up the periphery colonial dream, his recourse to moral questions underscores the inherency of the fear of England in Germany's power ambition.

In the previous chapter, I highlighted how England features in the lives of Germany's colonial protagonists both in fiction and reality – Campe's Robinson and Olden's Peters. While England is a passive reality in Robinson's life (18th century), she was a very active factor in Peters' existence. Peters' encounter with England – nation and people – generated a strong hatred in him against the English. It is possible that Peters transposed his position of subservience to the Louistones onto the German/British unequal relationship.

His manipulation of personal affairs onto the national issues generates a desire for revenge, and that would turn out to be a part motivation in Peters' colonial drive. For Peters, the greatness of England meant the weakness of Germany, a situation which he wanted reversed. Wehler quotes Peters, „Der deutschen Öffentlichkeit gegenüber band Peters . . . die ‚Zukunft der Nationalität‘ an den Erfolg der deutschen Expansion. Nur dadurch könne sie der Degradierung des Reiches zum zweitrangigen Staat oder sogar der

Absorbierung durch das Angelsachsentum entgehen.“⁷⁸ In *Im Lande der Verheißung* (1899), Krome (who could be the fictional Peters) is obsessed with dealing with England, „Dann kam er auf seine Pläne zurück: wie der englische Einfluß in Ungudja bekämpft und der deutsche gestärkt werden müsse . . .“ (34). The obsession with neutralizing England is not a personal thing for Peters, but rather a phenomenon among many Germans, who have been led to see Britain as the stumbling block to Germany’s colonial future.⁷⁹

The British position towards German colonists in Ungudja could be gleaned from the interaction between Chester and Maleen on her way to the *Deutsches Haus*. From their brief interaction, one could understand that the British are just lying low, watching the German maneuvers, and waiting for the right time to drop the wedge on their course. Chester tells Maleen,

Mir fällt nur der König Rehobeam ein, der sagte: ‚Mein Vater hat euch mit Ruten gezüchtigt, ich aber will euch mit Skorpionen züchtigen!‘ Wir waren hier in Ungudja froh, als wir glücklich ihren ‚schneidigen‘ Konsul Silffa loswaren . . . und nun setzt sich uns dieser schlimme Krome auf die Nase, der noch zehnmal unangenehmer ist. Ich hab ihm aber neulich gesagt: ‚An dem Tag, an dem Sie ein Haifisch überschluckt, Doktor, illuminiere ich.‘ (121-2)

While this statement reveals animosity, the contempt with which the Germans regard the British is overtly expressed as Maleen rejects the offer of protective security as the crisis starts. Her reaction is depersonalized to convey negative national sentiments (197-8).

Olden presents the sudden emergence of the Imperial British East African Company in 1885 as one of the maneuvers by the British to hinder Germany’s colonial

⁷⁸ Wehler, p. 339.

⁷⁹ Lowe, p. 97.

drive in East Africa (217). The company was founded as a counter to Peters' *Deutsch Ostafrikanische Gesellschaft* founded in 1884 for the East African colonial enterprise.

While most colonial agitators such as Peters pressed for a face-off with Britain in East Africa, Berlin, quite aware of the dangers of a confrontation with Britain, was reluctant to follow that path. To the colonists, the demonstration of Germany's military might and colonialism are two inseparable phenomena, and dealing with Britain on the colonial field remains the final hurdle on Germany's path to world power status. It is, therefore, no wonder that Peters sends this note of encouragement to all Germans in the Diaspora, „Das deutsche Reich mehr und mehr erstarkend aus Jahrhunderte langer Ohnmacht, beginnt mit Nachdruck, hinüberzugreifen über die Weltmeere“ (232).

The establishment of a German protectorate over the East African coast, which infringes on the traditional trading sphere of Sultan Bargasch, becomes a source of continued problems with the British. This initiated another dimension to the power dilemma in East Africa.

Although the British conceded the right of a protectorate to Germany, the expectations of how to run the protectorate ran into problems between Berlin and Carl Peters and his men. Berlin advocated a friendly relationship with the Sultan that would recognize, respect, and enhance his sovereignty, hoping that such an approach would avail the Germans the opportunity to consolidate their hold on the territory without attracting any negative attention from rival powers. Wehler comments,

Ein Informal Empire hätte Bismarck wohl auch in Sansibar vollauf genügt. Man wird auch feststellen können, daß Bismarck von dem damals so häufigen europäischen Superioritätsdünkel im Verhältnis zu dem Sultan so gut wie frei war. Er behandelte Said Bargasch im Grunde wie

einen kleinen europäischen Souverän, den er vor der erwünschten Zusammenarbeit unter Druck setzte; er nahm ihn als politische Potenz in Ostafrika durchaus ernst und suchte kontinuierlich nach Wegen ihn für die deutschen Absichten zu gewinnen, anstatt ihn – wie es der Mentalität der GfDK (Gesellschaft für Deutschen Kolonien) Spitze entsprochen hätte – zu beseitigen.⁸⁰

On the other hand, Peters and his society favored a complete subjugation of the Sultan, and, in defiance to Berlin's stance, pursued this objective. As Olden records, this led to more serious problems with England, prompting a bi-national conference in Scotland (232). As contained in Olden's text, Peters' continuous provocative colonial drive and the continued agitation from Britain causes outcry in Germany „Er (Peters) verdirbt Deutschland und Deutschland ihn“ (223). In response to the tension, Berlin changes her language to emphasize the primacy of Britain's goodwill in Germany's European power politics over Peters' colonial ambition in East Africa.⁸¹

Although it is not clearly stated, that Berlin's soft-pedaling on Peters' radical colonial drive was in response to British discomfort, it emerges as a genuine reason when one considers the enthusiasm with which Bismarck supported Peters earlier – wooing bankers and private financiers for him, mandating the trading companies, O'swald and Hansing, to cooperate with and support his society (DOAG), and advancing him money from the state treasury. The suddenness and the extremeness of the turnaround point to something more dreadful than mere domestic politics, as some scholars such as Lowe argue.⁸² As the diplomatic atmosphere between Britain and Germany began to take a downturn, Bismarck, conscious of Germany's sour relationship with Russia and France, had to act fast. Lowe states,

⁸⁰ Wehler, p. 346-7.

⁸¹ Lowe, p. 100.

⁸² Lowe, p. 99.

Bismarck was reported to have emphasized in December 1888 that ‘a good understanding with England means much more to him than the whole of east Africa.’ The dangers to Germany’s security arising from its unsatisfactory relations with France and Russia, highlighted by Boulangism and pan-Slavism, seemed real enough. There were therefore good grounds for Bismarck’s curt rejoinder to pressure from the colonial propagandist Karl Peters for a more aggressive stance towards British claims in East Africa, in the oft-quoted phrase ‘my map of Africa lies in Europe.’⁸³

It is important to note that, in spite of Berlin’s desire for a “humane” colonial practice, the colonists persistently sought the complete subjugation, and in some cases, annihilation of the natives if they offered any serious resistance. Lemkin comments on how German colonialists treated native dignitaries,

In the German colonies no attempt was made to respect native tribal customs or to invest the chiefs with their former dignity and authority. The chiefs were deprived of their privileges and the only authority permitted them was that delegated to them by the German officials, such authority being solely used for the purpose of recruiting forced labour. If the chiefs failed to cooperate in everything demanded of them, they were systematically ill-treated, flogged and imprisoned, even for the most trivial offenses.⁸⁴

It should not be a surprise then, the way the German colonists treated the local leaders. In the first place, they did not regard or respect them as worthy representatives of the locals. While the British system, using the Indirect Rule approach, recognized and reinforced the position of local leaders, and, through their cooperation, were able to maintain socio-political stability to some extent, the Germans regarded the Chiefs as their employees, or hindrances when they displayed reluctance to carry out their bidding. Thus, they made efforts to neutralize their status. Knoll and Hiery comment, “Chiefs here were essentially functionaries, rungs in the lower ranks of the administration, whom the Germans thought

⁸³ Lowe, p. 100.

⁸⁴ Raphael Lemkin, “Empire, Colony, Genocide. Keywords and the Philosophy of History,” *Empire, Colony, Genocide. Conquest, Occupation, and Subaltern Resistance in World History*, ed. Dirk A. Moses (New York: Berghahn Books) 11-12. Print.

could be changed or transferred when necessary. Generally, the Germans were not interested in the chief as the legitimate representative of the local population.”⁸⁵ Schaller links the development of hostilities between Germans and Herero>Nama natives partly to the German colonists attempt to completely dissolve the native political structure in order to establish absolute German supremacy.⁸⁶

I have already referenced Fabri’s morality argument to downplay the possibility of British opposition.⁸⁷ It is possible that when Bismarck elected to support Peters’ expeditionary drive, he was banking on the same presumption of British indifference or “moral obligation” to concede space to Germany. If this was the situation, as I presume, then Berlin’s aggressive posture towards Britain in relation to the Zanzibar stand-off as discussed in Olden’s novel, is not a show of power per se, but a mere power gamble. It was therefore Britain’s diplomacy of avoiding conflict with two nations at the same time that gave Germany victory. So, Peters’ maneuver to build on that victory was a miscalculation.

It could be argued that, while Germany dreamt of becoming a global power, she did not take stock of the possible challenges on the path to that aspired status. This inferred characterization of Germans is given expression in Bülow’s novel *Im Lande der Verheißung* (1899) as other Europeans in Ungundja characterize Rainer Waltron,

Alles in allem erschien er den Nichtdeutschen von Ungudja wie eine Verkörperung seines Volkes mit dessen Vorzügen und Schwächen: Kraft und Ungestüm, Kühnheit und Kurzsichtigkeit, Gutherzigkeit und Unklarheit des Überblicks. . . . ‘Vor allem fehlt den Deutschen der

⁸⁵ Knoll and Hiery, p. 94.

⁸⁶ Schaller, p. 300.

⁸⁷ See Fabri, p 57-58.

Wirklichkeitssinn.' . . . 'Es fehlt ihnen das Tastgefühl der Seele'. . . sie fassen immer gleich mit groben Fingern zu und wissen nicht zu differenzieren.' (6)

When Germany's power gamble failed against Britain's determination to protect her colonial interest against German incursions, Germany's ambition for global significance through periphery colonialism ran into a concrete wall.

Having lost grounds to England, Germany had to establish herself as a power in order to be respected among the Africans, who Germans consider inferior by all standards. They took out their frustration and anger on the natives, unleashing their military culture of total war against them. This posture accounts for the continued punitive and annihilative wars waged against the natives in all German colonial territories in Africa – East Africa, South-West Africa, Cameroon, and Dahomey. The climax of this were the Herero/Nama wars (1904-1907) that almost decimated the native populations.⁸⁸ Following developments in the African periphery, Germany slipped from the feeling of guaranteed position of a dominant power to a position of again needing to prove that their power status is not a fluke, but real.

The Erasure Dilemma

Merriam Webster's Dictionary defines the word "erase" as, "to remove from existence or memory as if by erasing," or "to nullify the effect of or force of."⁸⁹ Going by the above definitions, to erase within the context of colonialism implies to silence a people, to reduce them to a lower level than they were; to deny their existence; to convert their means of subsistence into colonial property; and, in extreme cases, to practically

⁸⁸ See Steinmentz and Hell, p. 156-157.

⁸⁹ "Erase." 2a, b. *Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary*, (1988). Print.

remove them from their space either by exiling, incarceration in a concentration camp, or annihilation by war, starvation, through blockade in order to generate space for the colonizers settlement. As Tifflin and Lawson observe, “Only empty space can be settled, so the space had to be made empty by ignoring or dehumanizing the inhabitants.”⁹⁰

The politics of colonization was established, among other things, principally on the assumption of empty space in the periphery. Travel literatures of the 17th and 18th centuries, such as Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) and Robert Louis Stevenson’s *Treasure Island* (1883), communicate the notion of emptiness. Where they recognize habitation, the population/space ratio is so disproportionate that it amounts to the same emptiness. Tifflin and Lawson have argued the role of travel writings in generating the platform for colonization by “conceptually depopulating the countries . . . by looking through the native and denying his/her existence. These were necessary practices for invoking the *terra nullius* upon which the now-disputed legality of imperial settlement (as opposed to invasion) was based.”⁹¹

A notion of empty space in the periphery was necessary to legitimize colonization, since it suggested the colonization and culturation of un-peopled space, rather than people and space. This scenario was carved out and delivered by periphery researchers such as Sir Walter Raleigh, Johann Reinhold Forster, and many more. Alexander Honold comments, „Die phänomenale Evidenz dieses leeren Raumes ist ein wichtiger Bestandteil des Kolonialisierungsprozesses selbst und begründet zugleich den

⁹⁰ Chris Tifflin and Alan Lawson, *De-Scripting Empire: Post-Colonialism and Textuality* (New York: Routledge, 1994) 5. Print.

⁹¹ Tifflin & Lawson, p. 5.

Mythos, mit dem die Kolonisatoren ihre historische Mission legitimieren.“⁹² Contrary to reality, the European visitors consciously emptied out the lands in order to present their enterprise as a harmless venture, and thus win support for colonization. Considering the oppressive rule in Europe of the time, prompting a desire to escape, the notion of empty space somewhere out there offered an appetizing alternative to Europe. Honold presents the German situation that favored the desire for periphery expansion,

Jene ‘Entwurzelten’ bildeten das überschüssige, freigesetzte Bevölkerungspotential, das durch den Rückgang der Agrarwirtschaft zur Landflucht gezwungen wurde und in den großen Städten die industrielle ‘Reservearmee . . . und das Lumpenproletariat verstärkte. Die armutsbedingte Migration, die Erosion tradierter Formen der Seßhaftigkeit im Zeichen der Massen- und Maschinenarbeit, all die Formen und Symptome aufgelöster Ortsbindungen wurden im späten 19. Jahrhundert zur Quelle sozialer Ängste und Phantasmagorien.⁹³

So, Germany, like other European nations, was in crisis and looking for a way to avert the threat of national implosion. The notion of tremendous unoccupied space in the periphery was, therefore, welcome news. German colonial writers, discussed in the previous chapters, adopted the same colonial geography of erasure to varying extents.

Johann Reinhold Forster’s *Observations* (1778) played with the idea of erasure. Casual or lack of interest in the natives of the periphery during the age of discovery is traceable in Reinhold Forster’s text. In the first four chapters of his report, Reinhold Forster focuses on the non-human components of the regions. The human dimension becomes a subject of focus in the fifth chapter. This could be read as a categorization in terms of importance to the European, and the wealth of the regions come first before the people.

⁹² Honold (2003), p. 97-98.

⁹³ Honold, p. 95.

In Reinhold Forster's discussion of the flora and fauna, the politics of erasure is manifest as he describes the vastness of natural resources that are lying untapped, or the fertility of the land that is not exploited with improved agricultural techniques. "The falling leaves, the rotting mossy plants, and various other circumstances increase the mould and form a deeper soil, more and more capable of bearing larger plants. Thus they all enlarge the vegetable system and rescue new animated parts of the creation from their inactive, chaotic state" (43). This description suggests the absence of intentional human activities to exploit the richness of the land. He communicates that at the start of the text,

Several of the larger isles of this kind are regularly inhabited, some are only resorted to, now and then by the inhabitants of the neighbouring high isles, for the purposes of fishing, fowling and turtling; some others are absolutely uninhabited, though they are furnished with coco nut-trees and are often resorted to in great flocks by man of war birds, boobies, gulls, terns and some petrels.
(26)

The absence of human beings in these islands calls for population increase from without.

Reinhold Forster's computation of population/landmass ratio reveals a great disproportion (152), and conveys the notion of untapped natural resources waiting for cultivation. The politics of erasure occurs in colonial literatures in various formats – as a complete absence of humans in a vast expanse of land, or as a region occupied by a people still pre-modal and too barbaric to keep existing on their own. In such a case, they must be civilized/culturated or "removed." In some cases, they are civilized, but practice a non-Christian religion. So, they are ripe for a Christianizing crusade by the "christinians," to use Knellwolf's term.⁹⁴ Whatever is the case, colonial writers always found grounds to legitimize the takeover of the land. In her discussion of Germany's

⁹⁴ Knellwolf, p. 24.

colonial engagement in Poland using Gustav Freitags *Soll und Haben* (1855), Kristine Kopp sums up the instrumentalization of colonial literatures to legitimize colonial takeover, “*Soll und Haben* thus mobilizes a standard colonial trope of ‘chaos that calls for restoration of order, of absence that calls for affirming presence, of natural abundance that awaits the creative hand of technology.’”⁹⁵ This is more or less the summary constitution of colonial novels.

Although Reinhold Forster praises the existential simplicity and humanity of the natives (223), he still elevates the European experience above theirs, thus presenting the native way as deficient, needing the infusion of the European experience for improvement, “It is certainly the wish of humanity, and of real goodness, to see all these nations brought nearer to a more improved, more civilized, and more happy state, without the addition of these evils, which abuses, luxury and vice have introduced among our societies” (199). It is evident that the use of the term “humanity” and “real goodness” is attributed to the European and the European system against the natives and their system. The implication of generating a necessity that can be realized only from a foreign intervention is colonization.

As I have argued in chapter three, the ideal of “humanity” and “real goodness” opens up the colonial arena for the German colonist, who, according to the rhetoric of German colonial writings, possesses the knowledge and skills to implement a “humane” colonialism that would introduce the colonized to “real goodness.” This is evident considering the fact that Reinhold Forster had condemned the colonizing activities of

⁹⁵ Kopp (2009), p. 23.

other European nations as inhuman and irresponsible (199). Reinhold Forster thus creates space for the anticipated emerging German colonists to occupy.

His argument that the inhabitants of the isles will not be able to make any progress “if left on their own” (238) emphasizes the advocacy for colonization. This evaluation of the natives finds resonance many years later in Germany’s conceptualization of Poland as future subject state under Germany. Kopp argues,

Through a conceptual positioning of the Poles as a ‘weaker race,’ and thus as the dependent recipients of German innovation and stewardship, the Polish demand for an independent state could be delegitimized; the Poles, according to this argument, would be unable to bring a stable and successful state into existence, and would thus fare better under German control.⁹⁶

This features as a cardinal argument in Germany’s interest in colonialism, and gives it the impression of a humanitarian state, working for the all-round “redemption” of the periphery races.

Reinhold Forster’s opinion above indicates that the formation of a powerful nation out of the numerous isles is a necessity for progress. However, he identifies progress as “improvement in science, morality, arts, manufactures, or husbandry” (238). These are elements that characterize European civilization and culture, and upon which the Europeans have established their claim of superiority over other peoples, and legitimized their mission of ‘civilizing’ the rest of the world through colonialism.

The mission of civilizing the world encounters the mission of Christianizing the world conceptually and operationally, and functions with the same mandate developed by the Spanish conquistadors in the Americas. According to historical evidence,

⁹⁶ Kopp (2009), p. 18.

Christianization was fronted as the pretext for the invasion of the Americas, and, as recorded in the mandate of the Spanish crown, the only option open to the natives was subscription to the Christian faith.⁹⁷ Based on the above maxim, the natives were reduced to mere natural creatures, not human enough. The implication of this is the absence of human feelings towards them. The deadening of human feelings towards the natives was necessary, and it provided a fitting platform for the conscious efforts made towards emptying the land for settlement colonialism. Helmut Walser Smith comments on the stripping of the humanity of the natives and its consequences,

In such massacres—whether perpetrated by the British in India, the Belgians in the Congo, or the Americans in the Philippines—white men reduced Indians, Africans, or Filipinos to the status of ‘natural’ human beings. Consequently, as Arendt pointed out, the victims lacked ‘a specifically human reality, so that when European men massacred them they somehow were not aware that they had committed murder.’⁹⁸

Erasure finds outlet in the proclaimed mission of civilization/Christianization. By wearing the garb of a crusader of the Christian faith among ‘heathens,’ the European colonist generates a legitimizing environment that earns him the approval of both the secular and the religious minded home-based European to propagate the Christian faith, even if it meant uprooting the people who do not submit to it. Herbert Lüthy puts the deceit of the claim of civilization/Christianization thus, „doch, wo immer Kolonialpolitik über die reine Machtausübung hinaus eine innere Rechtfertigung suchte, hat sie die Kolonisation als Erziehungswerk verstanden, das sein eigenes Ende anstrebt: die Emanzipation.“⁹⁹

⁹⁷ See Moses, p. 17-18.

⁹⁸ Smith, p. 110.

⁹⁹ Lüthy, p. 363.

It is on the basis of the marriage of civilization with Christianization that some of the East African communities under Bargasch's domain, who were already "civilized," did not merit the right of self governance, and must be subjugated by the Christian German colonists. According to Sippel, „Nach den Vorstellungen des DOAG-Generalbevollmächtigten sollte das islamische Recht nach der Übernahme des Küstenstreifens durch die DOAG nur noch für ehe-, familien- sowie erbrechtliche Angelegenheiten durch den Kadi Anwendung finden. In allen übrigen zivilrechtlichen Angelegenheiten maßte sich die DOAG Jurisdiktion an.“¹⁰⁰ The application of civilizing/Christianizing responsibility towards the colonized was also widely criticized in Britain as a "mere subterfuge, artfully contrived to blind democratic electorates to what was being done behind their backs."¹⁰¹ As in Germany's case, there were also a few British citizens who never approved of the whole idea of colonialism. They recognized colonialism for what it was, and were not deceived by the camouflage of civilization/Christianization.

The emptying out of the territories, therefore, does not necessarily mean the presentation of space without inhabitants. Rather, it also includes the space inhabited by people who do not deserve it unless they yield to the Christianizing/civilizing mission of the European. From whichever side one evaluates the implications of the erasure, the land belongs to the European, either by reason of being 'unoccupied,' or by reason of the European being the 'redeemer' of land and people, or still by the natives being undeserving occupants. The future German colonist, marketed as the "model" colonist,

¹⁰⁰ Sippel, p. 477.

¹⁰¹ George Lichtheim, *Imperialism* (New York: Praeger, 1971) 74. Print.

would launch into the periphery with the presupposition of not meeting any resistance in the periphery because, the land is unoccupied, or because the inhabitants will be grateful to him for his redemptory work among them. John K. Noyes speaks of the erasure of African natives from the land, “While colonial expansion removed Africans from their land, colonial ideology told a story about nomadic Africans who depart without returning; and while colonialism obliterated the voices of Africans, it visualized them as those who cannot narrate the experience of wandering.”¹⁰² The denial of presence and voice converge in the conjecture of erasure, and eliminates the chances of resistance. However, because the scenario of emptiness is a misleading conjecture of periphery writings, the reality was destined to produce a different experience.

While the concept of erasure is a subtext in Reinhold Forster’s *Observations* (1778), Campe gives it more prominence in *Robinson der Jüngere*. The summary idea of the text is that of an un-peopled land waiting for the German colonist to claim, populate and cultivate on the principles of universal humanity. Robinson, could not thrive in an established socio-political and civilized environment. His chance to thrive lies in founding a virgin civilization from scratch in a virgin space. To realize this ideal, the author has to create a land, depopulate it entirely for Robinson to occupy. Reusch communicates on the frenzied craving among Germans for a return to nature, and how the *Robinsonade* genre responded to the craving, “In the corresponding literary genre, the

¹⁰² John K. Noyes, “National Identity, Nomadism, and Narration in Gustav Frenssen’s *Peter Moor’s Journey to Southwest Africa*,” Friedrichsmeyer et al. p. 105.

robinsonade, an ideal German cultural utopia, tends to be (re)created via a return to a natural state.”¹⁰³

In the design of the novel, the “humane” component of Germany’s early colonial rhetoric plays a role. The author aims for an erasure without inhumanity. According to John Locke’s discussion of *Vacuum domicillem*, any space that is unoccupied or uncultivated is virtually open and available for anyone to claim.¹⁰⁴ This would justify Robinson’s domination of the island. However, a delicate implication lurks behind Campe’s impression of erasure without violence. The absence of resident natives in the island does not mean ‘unpossessed.’ The notion of such spaces dominated Germany’s colonial imaginations and generated the hope and confidence of finding virgin lands for *Ackerbau-Colonien* and *Straf-Colonien* as articulated later by Fabri in *Bedarf Deutschland der Colonien* (1879).¹⁰⁵ As paradisiacal as Campe’s configuration of his colonial space and endeavor may seem, the concept of erasure, however much he tries to conceal it, remains the obvious bedrock of the design. Having emptied out the land before planting Robinson there, every other person becomes a trespasser. Even the natives, to whom the island for years has been a place of resort for rituals, become trespassers, and Robinson would fight them off on sight.

The appearance of natives on the island stands as evidence that the space is not as vacant as Campe wants it to be. If Campe had recognized this, it would have put a

¹⁰³ Reusch, p. 112.

¹⁰⁴ See Robert Nelson, introduction, “Colonialism in Europe? The Case against Salt Water,” *Germans, Poland, and Colonial Expansion to the East*, ed. Nelson (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2009) 5. Print.

¹⁰⁵ See Breuning & Chamberlain, introduction, p. 16-26.

question mark on the justice of Robinson's claim to the island. However, Campe deals with this possible evidence of colonial violation by making sure that the natives and Europeans that Robinson encounters on the island are an "unworthy" lot. By making them cannibals, bandits, and pirates, Campe reinforces their undesirability on the island. The scenario of using the island as a resort for cannibalistic practices strengthens Robinson's domination of the island and the need to transform it into the cradle of cultivation in the region. It becomes the 'new world' and will harvest the wild and corrupted species of the 'old world,' and regenerate them to inhabit it. In Robinson's 'new world,' cultivation, civilization, and Christianization are implemented. He is indeed the 'redeemer of land and people'. Robinson's island actualizes Reinhold Forster's dream to see the lives of the peoples improved through civilization without the evils that plague European society.¹⁰⁶

Robinson's civilizing mission prefigures the projection of the aspired German nation, to be part of the grand scheme of "bringing civilization to the rest of the world"¹⁰⁷ For Germans, this argument is particularly important, since it fits into their self-image of being better colonizers. Presenting civilization as the principal project seems to relegate the economic dimension of colonialism to the background.

It should be noted that there is no German among the people implicated in the vices recorded in *Robinson der Jüngere*. The Spanish, the English, the Portuguese, and the natives are all implicated in the vices. In this scenario, the German stands out as the only person still innocent. Thus, he is the one qualified and capable of founding the 'new

¹⁰⁶ Forster, p. 199.

¹⁰⁷ Kopp, p. 18.

world,' and laying down the foundational principles that would guarantee that civilization, culture, humanity and enlightened way of life thrive. In Robinson's 'new world,' the 'cannibals' get civilized, and the European bandits and pirates are given another chance at life to get reformed and enlightened. The author paints a landscape on which only the German, who, from the German perspective, is innocent of colonial guilt, and who is horrified by the inhumanity of European civilization, is morally, logically and intellectually qualified to usher in this new dawn of Enlightenment reality, and this project can only be realized on a *terra nullius*.

From Campe's paradise island, where neither protest nor resistance is experienced as the land is taken, Fabri takes up the discourse in *Bedarf Deutschland der Colonien?* (1879). In this text, the politics of erasure is evident. Fabri, in spite of the expansive presence of the British and the French in the periphery, is still hopeful of finding virgin territories for his *Ackerbau-* and *Straf-Colonien*. He poses the question, „Wo aber sollen für Deutschland heute noch Colonien gefunden werden? Ist nicht bereits Alles besetzt und vergeben?“ (65). Taking up the discourse of *Straf-Colonien* first, he suggests territories that would serve the purpose,

So möchten die Inselgruppen östlich von Neu-Guinea, nördlich von Neu-Caledonien für genannten Zweck sich empfehlen: wie auch der östliche schmale Theil von Neu-Guinea, der bedeutende Boden-Erhebungen zeigt, klimatisch eine derartige Niederlassung vielleicht zulassen könnte. Auch der nördliche Theil Patagoniens (möglicherweise auch die Falklands-Inseln) und die Inselgruppe Chiloe an der Südwest-Küste Amerikas könnten in Betracht kommen. (67)

For the *Ackerbau-Colonien*, Fabri states, „Am schwierigsten liegt die Frage in Bezug auf Ackerbau-Colonien. Und gerade diese wären im Blick auf unsere wirthschaftlich wie national so bedeutungsvolle deutsche Auswanderung vor allem

wünschenswerth, ja nöthig“ (67). He recommends the exploration of regions in South America – Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina and Chile – for the purpose (68-69).

Fabri does not consider whether these territories are occupied or not. All that matters is whether any other colonial power has established presence there or not. In the absence of such, the territory is then available for German colonizers to occupy. The territories are treated as existing without humans and the Germans are going to be the first humans to populate it. Herein is the politics of erasure at its height. Because periphery natives do not qualify as human beings, colonial invasion becomes a mere occupation of space, not an invasion of space and people.

This view of the native inhabitants as not quite human re-echoes in the speech of Bebel during a debate in the Reichstag years later over the treatment of native Africans by German colonists. Smith writes, “As in Bebel’s provocative speech, something more was at stake: the perception, shared across a large range of the political spectrum, that black Africans, a different race, were not just a different people; they were not a people . . . at all; and for some, they were not people, that is, humans.”¹⁰⁸

The scenario colonial literatures set before the German colonist was one of either virgin territories, or territories occupied by natural (non-human) beings. So, the colonists only needed to march into the territory to take it. They were expected to deal with any resistance without any feeling of guilt. Against such a background, brutality was given a thriving platform by the elimination of the impulse that would have ignited the conscience with the alarm of inhumanity. The outcome is, as Smith states, “The

¹⁰⁸ Smith (1998), p. 111-112.

increasing willingness to accept brutality in the service of an idea and the increasing blindness to the violence done, not to nations or classes, but to humans. And this was possible, I would submit, because—increasingly—they did not see that the individual humans involved were quite as human as a white man or a white woman.”¹⁰⁹

It is the scenario of easy and uncontested acquisition that prepared the grounds for the erasure dilemma in Germany’s colonial experience. As the colonists came in, they realized that first, the territories were not as unoccupied as Campe and other colonial writers had represented them, and, second, that the inhabitants of the territories were not sub-humans, but complete humans with affective and cognitive abilities like the Europeans, and that they were capable of responding to experiences – positive or negative, good or bad – accordingly. The colonists’ denial of their humanity turns out to be a prominent factor in the crisis that characterized Germany’s African colonialism.

The erasure in the form of failure to recognize the native’s habitation of the territories dominates in Olden’s novel *Ich bin Ich* (1927). Wherever Peters and his men looked, they were greeted by the Union Jack, and that suggested that the probability of virgin territories in the East African region was very remote. Nevertheless, they hoped to find areas where the British had not hoisted the Union Jack. It becomes the task of the colonizer to effect the erasure, and this is accomplished using the guile of treaty, or overt violence. Both options are open to the colonizer, following John Locke’s philosophy of *Vacuum domicillem*.

¹⁰⁹ Smith (1998), p. 123.

The Lockean argument has been identified as pivotal in the European attitude of and approach to land seizure in the periphery. Robert L. Nelson discusses the Lockean idea in the context of Germany's colonial ambition in the East (Poland),

Haunting many of these German visions of the East is the Lockean idea of the *vacuum domicillem*. Founded in the era of natural law . . . is the notion that land that was not 'worked' was no one's property. An extension of this was the idea that those who did not work the land . . . were just a part of the natural, 'un-owned' landscape. Hence, land unworked by 'advanced' human beings was 'empty,' the vacuum. Further, land (and people) outside the fully civilized (worked) space (*ius gentium*), was a land without law, where people could act without fear of legal retribution. This powerful vision, theorized in the 1600s . . . can be traced down through the centuries in the manner with which colonial lands were conceived by colonizing powers.¹¹⁰

Although Nelson invokes the Lockean argument in relation to Germany's eastern European colonial expansion, the same principle guided Germany's dealings in their periphery colonialism. The notion of emptiness, which Nelson identifies as "a fundamental component of any colonial project,"¹¹¹ features dominantly in Peters' operations.

Peters' unreserved adoption of violence is evident in most of his communications either to individuals or the colonial office. An example is a letter to his mother on February 9, 1884, „Mein Nimbus ist noch nie so groß gewesen wie gerade jetzt. . . . Gnade Gott meinen Feinden . . . ich will sie erbarmungslos zertreten. Ich will meine Gegner nur nieder am Boden sehen. Leider führt mein Weg über Leichen.“¹¹² Standing on the argument of the non-humanity of the natives, he is not under any burden of conscience in his crusade of brutality and inhumanity.

¹¹⁰ Nelson, introduction, p. 5.

¹¹¹ Nelson, p. 5.

¹¹² Wehler, p. 338.

It is necessary to note here that it is not just Peters' expeditions that account for the inhumanities associated with Germany's colonial past in East Africa. Rather, the trading companies, which assumed administrative responsibilities in East Africa, after Bismarck and the colonial office had mandated a quasi merger with Peters' Gesellschaft, did not shun brutality. Bullock remarks,

For the natives, however, the shifting of responsibility from the state to private companies, subject to no administrative control and interested only in making profits from their colonial adventures, was a disastrous policy. Every evil and abuse associated with the commercial exploitation of primitive peoples and lands was allowed to develop unchecked. The worst record is to be found in East Africa where the exploits of the adventurer Karl Peters caused a serious revolt in 1888 and forced the Imperial Government to intervene.¹¹³

It could be argued that, in Germany's colonial enterprise, two doctrines were constantly in conflict – the Enlightenment doctrine of universal humanity, and the colonial doctrine of the non-humanity of the natives. The second doctrine was favored by the colonists. Tambila comments on how the regard of natives as non-humans was incorporated into the constitution of the colonial army,

It has to be a force which would have absolutely no qualms of conscience about firing a maxim heavy machine gun into a mass of poorly armed spearwielding locals, cutting to pieces their women and children, burning their villages and taking their livestock as booty. They were conscienced to look at the local people as fair game, that is to look at them not as humans but as Washenzi who could thus be killed without too much of a psychological load.¹¹⁴

¹¹³ A.L.C. Bullock, *Germany's Colonial Demands* (Westport: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1975) 89. Print.

¹¹⁴ Kapepwa, p. 502.

The meeting point of these two dichotomized doctrines is the granting of imperial recognition to Peters' colonial enterprise, which indirectly translates into the endorsement of the campaign of erasure.¹¹⁵

Whichever form of erasure takes place, it negates the doctrine of universal humanity. Olden presents Peters' whole enterprise as nothing but a crusade of erasure. In the whole text, no significance is accorded the natives. Instead, they are only at the receiving end of Peters' actions. They are being hunted, intimidated, and conned into signing treaties of phony protection. They are recruited to hunt their own people, and their women are being raped, and taken as slaves and concubines.

The climax of Peters' crusade of erasure is communicated towards the end of the novel as he executes two of the Africans in his captivity: one male servant is executed on the basis of a sponsored testimony of stealing, and one of his concubines is executed for running away a second time. The woman's attempt to run away amounts to a reversal of her status of 'non-existence' (erasure) under which she lives since her captivity. The mere thought of running away translates into self-subjectification, and the act transposes her from the realm of 'non-existence' to the realm of functional existence. She expresses a preference, a will, and a desire. These are behaviors not expected of the subalterns. After all, she is not human and is not expected to function cognitively. Having violated the code of 'non-existent,' she pronounces the death sentence on herself. This is the conjectural logic of Peters' court of colonial justice.

¹¹⁵ Wehler, p. 338.

The most obvious evidence of erasure in Germany's colonial enterprise is the German war against the Herero and Nama from 1904-07. The brutality with which General Lothar von Trotha decimated these groups attests to the well-defined doctrine of erasure, which, under the new Kaiser, Wilhelm II, received full support from the German government. Hull comments, "Public opinion, the Kaiser, and General Staff were of one mind in demanding a clear victory of weapons."¹¹⁶ Southwest Africa had been designated by German colonists as an *Ackerbau-Colonie*. Thus envisaged, it had to be cleared out for German settlers. Knoll comments, "The difference (in war expenditure), of course, was that Southwest Africa was 'white man's country', much as Kenya was for the British. The home government acted to protect its settlers from expulsion by the Herero and the Nama after the settlers had successfully encroached upon their land and deprived local people of their livelihood."¹¹⁷ Isabel Hall gives an account of how the German settlers systematically occasioned the war through provocative treatment of the natives.¹¹⁸

As Hull states, the arriving German colonists met a different reality from what colonial geography and literature of erasure may have communicated. Georg in Bülow's *Im Lande der Verheißung* (1899) recognizes this and it probably accounts for his apathy towards the colonial enterprise in the name of the fatherland. He confesses to Maleen, „Und zum zweiten sehen sie mit der Zeit ein, daß nicht alles Andersartige hier so dumm ist, wie sie anfangs glauben, sondern daß die Einheimischen und hier Angewesenen meist sehr wohl wissen, warum sie die Dinge so machen und nicht anders“ (19).

¹¹⁶ Hull (2005), p. 13.

¹¹⁷ Knoll, p. 347.

¹¹⁸ Hull (2005), p. 8.

As in the case of South-West Africa, they found native inhabitants that were rich in livestock, and exploiting the natural resources according to their recognized needs. Dominik Schaller identifies three factors that hindered the establishment of German rule in South-West Africa,

The colonizers could not legitimize their claim to power by pointing to the argument of the alleged culturelessness of the indigenous population . . . the *res nullius* argument failed in Southwest Africa because both Nama and Herero practiced sophisticated and intensive animal husbandry that depended on grasslands . . . the desire to pursue imperialist policies and to conquer overseas territories was not matched by the readiness to invest necessary resources.¹¹⁹

German colonists found out that the land was heavily populated by a people who thrived in livestock farming. They were therefore numerically dwarfed. So, the colonial geography of emptiness fooled the colonists. The heavy population which promised measureless amount of labor; the immensity and richness of the grazing land, which guaranteed successful livestock farming, and the immensity of the natives' livestock, which represented wealth, stirred the colonists' greed and made the politics of erasure all the more irresistible.

The German colonists, seeking avenues to actualize erasure, resorted to provocative behaviors towards the natives. As the natives protested against the systematic politics of erasure by the German colonists, their protest provided the colonists with a reason to launch the grand design of total annihilation blatantly. The erasure was perfected as the Herero and the Nama were completely removed from the landscape.

¹¹⁹ Schaller, p. 299.

General von Trotha was handed an operational ‘blank check’ by Kaiser Wilhelm II, and he did not fail in effecting the erasure of the native presence from the land.¹²⁰

The culture of handing German colonial commanders an operational ‘blank check’ is also recorded in the East African campaign under Wißmann. As Olden informs, Wißmann was given the order, „Ordnung zu schaffen“ (254). Historically, Knoll and Hiery state that Wißmann was simply mandated to “produce a victory.”¹²¹

As I have argued earlier in chapter four, the dilemma of the German government regarding the politics of erasure is most manifest in this development. While condemning the inhuman activities of German colonists, the government still sees it necessary to send troops to support their efforts against the natives. A cautionary note to Wißmann to observe the principles of humanity in his expeditions would probably have tempered the ferocity of the campaign. The elevation of victory above humanity and civility has been identified as a principal component of German military culture, and this makes the issuance of a ‘blank check’ to German commanders a normalcy.¹²²

The quagmire of the government is that of either 1) reversing the course of erasure so as to sustain her claim to universal humanity, or 2) allowing and supporting the politics of erasure, directly or indirectly, to safeguard the fragile prestige and honor of Germany as a great nation. For a nation reveling in the fantasy of invincibility, victory at

¹²⁰ See Steinmetz and Hell, pp. 159-60.

¹²¹ Knoll and Hiery, 79.

¹²² Hull (2005), p. 116.

all costs became the only authenticating reality. However, as I have pointed out in chapter two, this whole display of total-war-oriented militarism stems from fear.¹²³

From the scenario generated by Germany's militarization of her colonial activities, a double bind between the politics of erasure and fear emerges, and that explains why German colonists always pursued the policy of erasure in their military campaigns against the natives. Hull identifies the fear of weakness as the main driving force behind Germany's belligerence and display of violence and force.¹²⁴ So, in the case of East Africa, inasmuch as Berlin understood the implications of a military expedition in the colony, preserving the status of greatness weighs much more than pursuing and protecting the image of civility and culturedness through the principles of universal humanity. In such a crossroad situation, sending troops to East Africa became the only favorable option. So, the question becomes, 1) Where is the validity of Bismarck's trumpeted friendly treatment of the natives? 2) Who is supposed to enforce the practice of "humane/model" colonialism in the periphery, if Berlin reasons up a justification to support brutality and violence against colonial natives?

Bülow's novels *Der Konsul* (1891) and *Im Lande der Verheißung* (1899) are also rife with the politics of erasure. However, *Der Konsul* (1891) reflects less on that in comparison to *Im Lande der Verheißung* (1899). The reason could be that the main focus of *Der Konsul* (1891) is the European community in U. Little attention is given to the natives and their environment. Konsul von Sylffa, the main protagonist of the narrative, concentrates his activities within and among the Germans in U, and was minimally

¹²³ Hull (2005), p. 165.

¹²⁴ Hull (2005), p. 175.

involved with issues that would have translated into direct acts of erasure. Konsul von Sylffa's colonizing activities were, as I have argued in chapter four, oriented more towards founding a base that would support further colonizing endeavors.

Be it as it may, *Der Konsul* (1891) shares a commonality of erasure maneuvers in the way the text is landscaped. The whole text revolves around the European circle in U. with only casual references to the natives. In such cases, they are projected as indolent, passive "objects" that lack the ability and need for agency. By the elimination of their physical presence and the stifling of their voices, Bülow successfully achieves the erasure of the native population in harmony with other pro-colonialism writings of the time. The land, the trading routes, the harbors, the coastal beaches, and all the natural endowments of the territory are presented as un-possessed and unexploited, waiting to be claimed and harnessed. Therefore, the German, who comes and claims them, has neither robbed nor usurped any property. The fact that Sultan Bargasch had established a flourishing trading network from the hinterland to the coasts and unto India is a reality submerged by the German colonial drive in the novel.

Bülow creates the scenario of a bi-directional crisis that recognizes the Germans and the British and eliminates the third party to the crisis – Sultan Bargasch – by taking away his agency. The Sultan is not considered by the Germans as significant, while the British simply instrumentalize him for their opposition to the Germans. The implication of the erasure in *Der Konsul* is, first, the portrait of a landscape that has no inhabitants, thus available for the European to occupy without any human account. Second, it gives the impression of a dormant indifferent native population to whom the imposition of European rule is not a problem, but rather a welcome development. The kind of scenario

in *Der Konsul* (1891) would not be a problem to the German colonial ideal of “model” colonialism, since such a landscape eliminates the chances of human casualties.

In both impressions of erasure generated by Bülow’s text, the German colonist is a civilizing and culturating agent to the region. Devoid of native populations, or having native populations to whom foreign dominance is welcome, the East African region designed by Bülow has the preconditions to make a “model/humane” colonizer of the Germans. So, it could be argued that the politics of erasure in *Der Konsul* (1891) is expressed more through a strategic narrative design of silence, rather than through active and direct colonizing operations.

Im Lande der Verheißung (1899) presents a unique dimension to the politics of erasure – the gender erasure. The gender crisis of Germany’s colonial enterprise emerges again in the erasure discourse via the relationship between Maleen and her husband on the one hand, and on the other, her relationship with Ralph Krome. While the attempt of erasure with Ralph Krome is minimal, the Maleen/Georg relationship is encapsulated within the concept of erasure – Georg’s relentless effort to render Maleen colonially insignificant versus Maleen’s fruitless struggle to escape insignificance.

Georg’s treatment of Maleen translates into efforts to erase her from the stage of significance. The narrator informs, „Und er hatte sie lieb und sorgte für sie – wie sorgte er für sie! Wirklich, er trug sie auf Händen und verlor nie ein Wort darüber, weil es ihm einfach natürlich war. Sie fing schon an bequem und dick zu werden über dieser Verwöhnung“ (21-22). The narrator continues, „Von dem unruhigen, ernsten, leidenschaftlichen Innenleben dieses ‚Frauchens‘ wußte er nichts und wollte er nichts

wissen; seine Phantasie schuf kecklich aus ihr, was er in ihr haben wollte: ein kindisches Wesen, das er liebkosen, verhätscheln und schützen konnte“ (174).

In the previous chapter, I argued on Dietlas' infantilizing treatment of Maleen, aimed at undermining her striving for agency. By the same infantilizing treatment, Dietlas, who could feature as the representation of the German traditional regard for women, expresses the struggle of the German patriarchy to erase the female from the public stage of the colonial landscape. The conflict between the couple, when transposed onto the colonial stage, translates into an erasure dilemma for the German colonial enterprise.

Georg and Maleen have an argument while discussing the possibility of her catching the Malaria fever. Georg commits to returning her to Germany after the first experience of the fever. The argument arises from Georg's language, which makes Maleen look more like a parcel and not a human being,

„Wir wollen es lieber nicht darauf ankommen lassen, daß das Fieber erst Maleen belehrt. Besser bewahrt als beklagt. Das sag ich dir, mein Kind: nach dem ersten ernstesten Fieber schick ich dich postwendend zurück zur Großmama.“

„Schicken! . . . ‘schicken, – wie ein Paket! Würdest du dir das gefallen lassen, Rainer, dich so einfach schicken zu lassen?’ . . .

„Nein. Ich bin nicht sein Beamter und nicht seine Dienerin. Ich bin kein Ding.“

Georg faßte sie lachend beim Kinn.

„Freilich bist du ein Ding! Ein ‚arg lieb’s Ding‘, wie der Süddeutsche sagt, und besonders spaßhaft, wenn’s auftrumpft.“ (76-7)

Georg persistently regards Maleen as a thing and suppresses her every thought of becoming a subject component of the community. Agency is associated with being a

subject component of any setting and not a mere object of it. Objectifying Maleen is a strategy Georg adopts to permanently keep her off the colonial stage.

In relation to the native population, voicelessness, absence, and active expeditionary missions dominate. Maleen's encounter with the farm hands – Jördens and Wischart – exemplifies an erasure effort. Her attempt to impose her will on them, while featuring as an attempt to erase their agency, is equally an attempt to reverse her erasure through agency. The absence of the *Bana*, Mr. Dietlas, the agent of her erasure, provides her the opportunity to take a chance at agency. Her visit to the farm opens the window through which the existence of Jördens and Wischart is given effect in the narration (200-9). However, her determination to exploit the absence of the *Bana* to establish her own agency threatens the functional existence of these men, and, by the same token, makes her an agent of erasure.

As Maleen returns to Africa to establish a plantation in Mona, she positions herself for a more active role in the politics of erasure. The sketching of the area betrays no impression of human existence prior to Maleen's arrival. The conversation with the captain of the boat en route to East Africa reinforces the erasure of natives, „Aber, gnädige Frau, das Nest ist gottverlassen einsam. Bleiben Sie nicht dort. Es ist nichts für Sie“ (303).

The captain's warning that the place is „gottverlassen einsam“ is problematic. Does it mean that there is no human life at all in the island, or that there are no Europeans there? It could be argued that „gottverlassen einsam“ means the absence of Europeans in the island. To the captain then, as far as there are no Europeans in the area, there are no

human beings there. It is only through Maleen's presence that the existence of human beings is communicated. It seems that as Maleen comes into the area, she brings light and life, and, as a result, native life emerged, albeit, not living. No wonder then that the community of Europeans around her constitutes „ganz Mona,“ which „bestand freilich aus ihr selbst und ihren vier Tischgenossen“ (353). Discussing Bulow's representation of the natives, Schneider states, „Sie sind im von Bülow'schen Deutsch-Afrika nur noch lebende Automaten, vorprogrammiert auf einen perfekten Service, herausgeputzte Marionetten, die bei entsprechender Handhabung willig jede Art von Befehl ausführen.“¹²⁵

The author's configuration here reinforces the philosophy of Christianization/civilization that allows the native the privilege of life on the condition that he submits to the Christian European. On Maleen's plantation, the significance of the other humans (all native) is to give essence to her existence as an independent colonial agent. It is, therefore, the need to authenticate her agency that generates existence for the natives. Otherwise, they would not exist – they are erased. Hammerstein identifies this as a tendency in Bülow's colonial writings, where the natives are recognized,

Das Anderssein der Kolonisierten wird als Kontrastfolie genutzt, um die Überlegenheit der deutschen Kolonialherren und –damen hervorzuheben, eine Rechtfertigung für die koloniale Übernahme Ostafrikas durch die Deutschen zu schaffen und insgesamt in Abgrenzung gegen dieses Andere ein stolzes deutsch-nationales Selbstgefühl zu befördern.¹²⁶

The scenario above poses a big problem for the German colonial interest on the grounds that, Berlin's envisioned “humane” relationship with the colonized people is

¹²⁵ Schneider, p. 87.

¹²⁶ Hammerstein, p. 157.

subverted through the politics of erasure. The politics of erasure tries to eliminate conflicts with the subalterns, and where it fails, it is exposed as the actual inhumanity practiced against the subalterns. So, does Berlin endorse such a colonizing approach that clears the land of its inhabitants to make room for *Ackerbau-Colonie*? I also wish to reiterate here that the conflictual relationship between Berlin and the German colonist in the field arise from the lack of a clear-cut and coherent colonial policy, something that suggests Germany's unpreparedness for colonial enterprise.¹²⁷

While German colonial military carried out a campaign of annihilative erasure against the natives, the agrarian community, which depended on native labor, disapproved of such erasure. According to Schaller, "Paul Rohrback . . . commissioner on settler affairs (*Ansiedlungskommissar*) in German South-West Africa and one of the most influential public intellectuals in Germany, condemned the radical warfare in the colony and its economic consequences and stated that 'Southwest Africa with natives was of much value . . . than without.'"¹²⁸ At a Reichstag meeting in 1894, Eugen Richter laments the situation in East Africa, "East Africa is more and more taking the shape of a military practice field."¹²⁹

With all the evidence and outcry that have emerged from East Africa regarding the brutality and incessant warfare of German colonists (politics of erasure), Berlin fails to take any decisive stand to effectively reverse the trend. Instead, Berlin continues to switch governors and Konsuls, a practice that always proved unsuccessful. Berlin does

¹²⁷ See Perras, p. 154-5.

¹²⁸ Schaller, p. 297.

¹²⁹ Statement of Eugen Richter in the Reichstag, February 17, 1894, *Reichstag Verhandlungen*, vol. 134, 1893-94, p. 1291, qtd. in Knoll and Hiery, p. 86.

not take strong measures to halt the erasure campaigns because of the fear of losing face as a European power.¹³⁰ In addition, Berlin believes that stopping the erasure campaigns would encourage native rebellion against Germans. Unfortunately for Germany, as these instabilities and the attendant brutality from the colonists continued, the other European powers were watching, plotting how to rid the colonial field of Germans. The First World War provided the colonial powers with the platform to achieve that. Germany was forced to forfeit her colonies under the accusation of practices that betray the European claim to civilization and culturedness.

Summary

Germany's colonial discourse could stand out as both an accident and as a design of history. Its historicity has generated fictional writings, such as those engaged in this project. I have used these texts, which I consider to be a fictionalized reality, to illustrate the dilemma in Germany's colonial discourse, having frequent recourse to historical evidence to further enhance the historicity of the texts. The texts discussed in this project demonstrate, among other things, the unstable nature of Germany's colonial enterprise right from the outset. When Germany's colonial enterprise is compared to those of other European nations such as France and Britain, how systematized they were, one wonders what went wrong with Germany's enterprise.

Whether Germany feigned ignorance of violence and inhumanity as inherent components of colonialism, or she did not realize that, is not the question. Whatever was the case, venturing into the colonial field, the challenges of colonialism hit them

¹³⁰ See Sippel, p. 482-83.

unprepared. They had to face problems that were excluded from their fantasy. Having launched onto the colonial field relatively unprepared, it was difficult to develop a feasible response to the challenges. The irreconcilable conflict between the ideal of “model/humane” colonialism and the reality of inhumanity in colonialism generated a permanent state of instability.

Germany’s inability to resolve issues such as the argument of Enlightenment colonialism, which turned out to be an impracticable approach to colonialism; the place of women in relation to the public stage, which was facing serious challenges at the time; the debate over the role of the government versus private establishments in the colonial enterprise; the need for settlement space, which could mandate annihilative erasure, and the need for local labor, and much more, generated a multi-dimensionality of inconsistencies that led to a lack of direction. The consequence of this situation was a continuous grappling with situations as they emerged, and a resultant arbitrary use of brutal force without restraint. This constituted the dilemma from which Germany never recovered to insure a sustainable and successful colonial enterprise.

Chapter Six

Conclusion

Germany's colonial discourse presents a lot of questions that call for literary and historical research. An integrative investigation of the different dimensions of Germany's societal realities of the late 18th and early 19th centuries open up a better understanding of her colonial enterprise. The need for a multi-dimensional investigation necessitated the adoption of New Historicism approach as the principal epistemic paradigm for this project. A combination of literary and non-literary sources offered reasonable insight into the complexities of Germany's colonial enterprise.

The final segment of this project is a recapping of the discussions in the previous chapters. I will briefly touch on chapters one and two, since they constitute the methodology and literature review respectively. The three research approaches used in this project – New Historicism, Cultural Studies and Post-Colonialism – are applied to the analysis of the texts engaged in this project. However, the dominant approach is New Historicism, which advocates the integration of extra-textual realities of any text of a particular space and time.¹ The adoption of New Historicism enabled the combination of historical and literary information in this project. Colonialism is an econo-political venture, shrouded in historicized reality, and captured, retained, and reflected in literary configurations. The three paradigms – Cultural Studies, New Historicism, and Postcolonialism – presented the stage on which the three dimensions of societal reality – political, economic, and social – could be studied with symbiotically enhancing effects.

¹ See Myers, p. 27-36.

From the New Historicist perspective, the texts studied in this project qualify as genuine reflections of societal realities of the time and space.

In chapter two, the Review of Secondary Literatures, I elaborated on the different societal circumstances associated with the rise of colonial frenzy in the German society towards the end of the 19th century. It is established that Germany's entrance in the periphery colonial race has its root in the socio-cultural and econo-political changes in the society. Various texts reveal that colony acquisition was considered the only remedy to the threat of national implosion forecast by German scholars such as Fabri.² While the resurgence of colonial politics is attributable to domestic circumstances, it was literature on the periphery that sustained the appetite for colonial experience during the period of colonial hiatus.

Literary configurations of the periphery drew from German periphery research writings by Georg Forster, Johann Reinhold Forster, Alexander von Humboldt, Johann Gottfried Herder, Karl Friedrich Philipp von Martius, Johann Baptist von Spix, and Neuwied-Wied, just to name a few. Such reports, as is evident in Reinhold Forster's *Observations* (1778), provided the materials and space for authors to generate periphery worlds that captivated the imagination of the middle class Germans.³ So, the literary texts were not mere speculations of imagination, but rather, exploited scholarly research findings.

² Fabri's discussion of periphery colonialism unequivocally hinges Germany's survival and success in world ranking onto that. Adducing various reasons from different aspects of German society, he treats periphery colonialism as the only antidote to the gloomy future of Germany.

³ See Appendix, "Popular Passages"

At the same time that the colonial appetite was growing in response to political, social and economic developments in the society, German philosophers and scholars, operating from an Enlightenment perspective, were trying to generate a nationalist portrait of the “true” German, which would set him apart and above other Europeans.⁴ So, on the platform of European brutality against periphery peoples, middle class Germans, influenced by the Enlightenment thoughts of universal humanity as propagated by men like Lessing, Kant and others,⁵ were made to think of themselves as the apostle of humane relations destined for the redemption of the periphery peoples and space. Out of this self-conception was born the fantasy of “model/humane” colonialism.

From Olden’s and Bülow’s texts, it could be deduced that, although, as Zantop points out, Germany’s colonial projections experienced some adjustments in the course over time, the German polity never gave up the fantasy of “model/humane” colonialism. How the interaction of fantasy and reality became a determinant of Germany’s colonial portrait is one of the principal foci of this project. It was established that, owing to the governments continued advocacy for “humane” and friendly relations between the colonists and natives, which conflicted with the violence and inhumanity inherent in colonialism, Germany’s colonial enterprise in Africa was plagued with instability and policy inconsistency.

I have argued that the fantasy phase of Germany’s colonial discourse was generated and sustained by literary and non-literary texts. Reinhold Forster’s *Observations* (1778) laid the foundation for the generation of such fantasies. Veering

⁴ See Hertz, p. 30.

⁵ Hertz, p. 32.

away from the esoteric scientific parlance, Reinhold Forster used narrative and common communicative language that the common literate would understand. His coloring of the periphery, the narrative strategy, and above all, the calling for “devout and skilled Europeans” to go in and dominate, created a vacuum which looked obviously desirous of the German’s intervention. Writers exploited the richness of Reinhold Forster’s report to create a paradise out of the periphery.⁶

On the subject of the instrumentalization of intellectualism, one cannot state unequivocally that German intellectualism was or was not instrumentalized. Both possibilities are apparent in the politics of intellectualism. Hertz communicates, “It is characteristic that Fichte and other representatives of the national movement should see the problem of liberation as one of education. Along with this idea was the notion that it was Germany’s mission to guide all nations towards world citizenship and intellectual perfection.”⁷ “World citizenship” points towards universal humanity. One needs to be human to become a citizen of the world. However, the emphasis on universal humanity gave way to racio-centrism, when, as Lowood observes, *Vaterlandsliebe* took preeminence over *Menschenliebe* as intellectualism became one of the principal pedestals on which periphery exploration thrived.⁸

The paradigmatic shift from *Menschenliebe* to *Vaterlandsliebe* occasioned the erection of borders for *Eingrenzung/Ausgrenzung*, and out of this emerged the quest to maintain the status quo of hierarchical and bordered society using the proceeds of

⁶ See http://books.google.com/books/about/Observations_made_during_a_voyage_round.html?id=Xvod6ICJxiUC.

⁷ Hertz, p. 29.

⁸ See Lowood, p. 196, 212.

intellectualism, guns included. The merging of Enlightenment humane ideals and intellectualism generated the concept of humanitarianism within the colonial enterprise, and it was this, above everything else, that legitimized periphery colonialism for the Germans. Apart from that, humanitarianism also provided the camouflage for the application of German intellectualism as an instrument for the subjugation of “otherness.”⁹

On the role of the literary texts, Campe’s *Robinson* (1779) presents a paradise-like colonial atmosphere that encompasses every dimension of Germany’s colonial projection. The text projects colonialism as a business of the unaffiliated in the society, and the colonial field the stage where people, who do not fit in the socio-political order of German society, have the opportunity to thrive. Because the German colonist is an “outsider” at home, he could not count on any government support from home, and as such, lacks the platform to compete against other Europeans. This circumstance necessitated the search for virgin territories. The notion of virgin territories is also invoked for the preservation of the purity of the “model” German colonizer as he faces the challenges of being a ‘true’ German in every sense of the word and the phantasmagoria built into it.¹⁰

Robinson (1779) emerges as an experiment to test the ascribed qualities of the ‘true’ German, and his success or failure would translate into an impetus for periphery adventures. Robinson’s success generated a fervent desire for periphery experience among middle class Germans. Its impact is obvious in Fabri’s strong advocacy to find

⁹ See Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 95.

¹⁰ See Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 89.

space in the periphery for *Ackerbau-Colonien*. On the popularity of *Robinson* (1779) Zantop writes that, by 1831 the text had experienced 24 editions, and 117 editions by 1897.¹¹ Considering how difficult it was for Germans to travel beyond Europe, as remarked by Zantop,¹² literatures of the periphery became a means of bringing the colonial life into the German home. Coincidentally, as Klaus Ehlert writes, the period that experienced the pro-colonialism texts was also the period that Germany was experiencing tremendous rise in literacy among the middle class.¹³ Guido Abbatistta writes on the effect of periphery literatures generally, “These European impressions and observations were recorded in a vast historical, juridical, religious and philosophical literature. Its rapid growth accompanied the process of European expansion in the New World, providing the educated European public with an opportunity to familiarize itself with phenomena from the other side of the Atlantic.”¹⁴

Fictional colonial encounters presented in fantabulous ways, such as Campe’s text, had a great appeal for literate Germans. The imaginations they provoked of a better world out there are partly instrumental to the mass emigration of Germans in the 19th century. Reusch informs, “These tropes of desire were transmitted through literature that was increasingly disseminated due to the ‘reading revolution,’ meeting the rising demand of an educated middle class.”¹⁵ Having saturated the heart of Germans with these fantasies, it did not take long after the political and economic turnaround in the 19th

¹¹ Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 103.

¹² Zantop, *Fantasies*, p.33.

¹³ Beutin et al., p. 338.

¹⁴ “Guido Abbatistta, “European Encouters in the Age of Expansion,” European History Online (EGO), Institute of European History (IEH), Mainz 2011. Web. 20 Dec. 2011. <http://www.ieg-ego.eu/abbattistag-2011-en>.

¹⁵ Reusch, p. 105.

century for colonial agitation to gather momentum, prompting the launching of Germany's colonial mission in the early 1880s. The emergent scenario is that periphery literatures, represented by Campe's text, consistently oiled the colonial machine while it could not be driven, and colonial politics, epitomized by Fabri's text, emerged after the founding of the Reich to drive the machine into the colonial field.

While writers generated and sustained the fantasy of a periphery paradise, colonial agitators such as Fabri, initiated a new dimension that sought to copulate the advocacy of fantasy texts with the reality of German society. Contrary to Campe's text, Fabri does not see colonialism as the business of the unaffiliated, but rather as a joint business between citizens and government. So, he features more or less as a harmonizing apostle between private sector needs and governmental necessities. His three types of colonies – *Ackerbau-*, *Handels-* and *Straf-Colonien* – sum up the colonial needs of Germany. His colonial advocacy, thus, became the doctrine, which many future colonialists would follow.

It is also necessary to point out that, unlike the fantasy literatures, most of which reflected the lofty ideal of "humane/model" colonialism, Fabri introduced the existence of inhuman treatment of the natives in his arguments, "Lange Zeit war freilich auch ihre Politik nicht nur durch und durch selbstsüchtig, sondern ebenso gewaltthätig" (34). However, he viewed forced labor as a humane act of cultural enhancement (37). He also did not pretend about the economic impetus that determines colonialism. So, being closer to reality than the literary fantasies, his work introduces the conflictual relationship between the ideal of "humane/model" colonialism, and the realities of colonialism – violence.

Fabri introduces the reality of British dominance, and the challenges it poses for Germany's colonial and world power ambition. He recognizes Britain as the only hurdle on Germany's path. However, not willing to weaken the colonial enthusiasm on the grounds of British dominance, he uses arguments of moral obligation to down-play the threat.¹⁶ While Fabri's realist approach to Germany's colonial question deviates from the fantasy approach by recognizing the threat, his downplaying the reality generates a new form of fantasy in front of realistic adversity. Fabri's form of fantasy, which projects indifference onto a real threat, turned out to be significant in Germany's colonial enterprise. In summary, his treatise was oracular as, shortly after its publication, Carl Peters and his team embarked on their trip to East Africa.¹⁷

Fabri's work more or less laid the groundwork for the way the German colonial enterprise was to be pursued. His proposals of *Ackerbau-Colonien*, *Handels-Colonien* and *Straf-Colonien* were the formula followed by Germany's colonial pioneers. This explains why Southwest Africa featured as *Ackerbau-Colonie*, and German East Africa as both *Ackerbau-* and *Handels-Colonie*,¹⁸ while Dahomey (present day Benin Republic) and Cameroon were considered *Handels-Colonien* due to the unfriendly tropical climate of the West-African region. However, in following to his views of harsh treatment of the natives of the *Handels-Colonien*, caning was an integral component of the German colonial administration in Togo such that the French and the English referred to Togolese

¹⁶ See Fabri, p. 57.

¹⁷ Wehler, p. 340.

¹⁸ Wehler, p. 340.

natives as ‚Kinder der Kette und des Prügels.‘¹⁹ Trutz von Trotha comments, „In seiner großen Monographie über die deutsche Kolonialherrschaft in Togo hat Peter Sebald diese nachbarliche Sicht der Verhältnisse in Togo bestätigt: Die Prügelstrafe war in den Beziehungen zwischen den deutschen Eroberern und den Afrikanern immer gegenwärtig und hatte einen festen Platz in der kolonialen Rechtsordnung.“²⁰

Fabri’s argument for a naval force comparable to the British was contingent upon colonial possessions and reasonable maritime business that would need protection. Naval maneuver became the strategy by which Germans sought to enforce their prominence on the colonial field. Each time there was a problem, whether with natives or rival European powers, they would send a naval ship to the area as a show of power. The army was also made available for colonial missions as recorded in Olden’s text with the Somali crisis as an example.

Ninety years separate Campe’s text (1779) and Fabri’s text (1879). However, colonial literatures continued to appear within time. Fabri’s polemics would have been premature if it appeared while Germany was still incapable of colonial engagements. It took the founding of the Reich in 1871 for colonial agitation to become reasonable. So, between the 17th century, when Brandenburg-Prussia gave up her colony in Großfriedrichsburg in the Gold Coast, and the time of active colonialism in the early 1880s, it would seem like there is a break in Germany’s colonial discourse. But, if one considers the continued projection of the periphery world in literatures with the aim of

¹⁹ Trutz von Trotha, ‚One for the Kaiser.‘ *Beobachtungen zur politischen Soziologie der Prügelstrafe am Beispiel des ‚Schutzgebietes Togo,‘*“ *Studien zur Geschichte des deutschen Kolonialismus in Afrika*, eds. Peter Heine & Ulrich van der Heyden (Pfaffenweiler: Centaurus-Verlagsgesellschaft, 1995) 521. Print.

²⁰ Trotha, p. 520.

keeping the colonial appetite aglow, it could be argued that the discourse continued, albeit without any political dimension to it.

Any argument for continuity in Germany's colonial discourse would be discredited, if continuity means practical colonial activities. However, if every activity that is oriented towards colonialism, including efforts to sustain the colonial appetite of Germans (while Germany was not ready for colonial undertakings), is considered, then, the argument for continuity in Germany's colonial discourse would be valid, although more prominent at certain times. The 'relay relationship,' a term I have discussed earlier, between the texts discussed in this project underscores the argument for continuity. Although the initial colonial participation of Germans (the episode of the Welser merchant company in the present day Venezuela, and Großfriedrichsburg in the Gold Coast) did not last long, colonial appetite continued to survive, not through colonial politics, but rather through colonial (periphery) novels. So, while periphery colonialism ceased to be a discourse of politics, it remained a discourse of literary configurations.

Reinhold Forster's text and its equivalents, which arose from the application of scientific knowledge to periphery research, were foundational to the colonial thoughts and imaginations specific to the Germans – the "humane/model" colonial thought. Campe's fictional text and a host of others downloaded this ideal of "humane/model" colonialism and gave it a graspable shape in the minds of Germans. Their demonstration of the "humane/model" colonialism, and the ease of its execution, dwarfed the doubts and fears associated with the periphery. Zantop remarks,

Krusoe's story then is the true colonial legacy; it fires up the imagination and creates desire—a desire for adventure, a desire for the exotic, a desire for a utopian island, for a place where one can

rule according to one's own dictates, free from paternal rule, where one can work with docile natives, or shoot those who refuse to give up their territories or savage ways. Not surprisingly, Campe's competitor Johann Carl Wezel, who had simultaneously produced a much more realistic Robinson adaptation, found few readers for his portrayal of failed colonization: nobody wanted to read about the pitfalls of private property and 'real' colonialism with its injustice, egotism, envy, cheating, internal strife, brutality, and inequality.²¹

Zantop reinforces the argument for continuity as she identifies how the past (which constituted the literary and scholarly discourses) was consulted in order to validate the colonial present, "Through representations of colonial scenarios and identificatory strategies (e.g. by inventing German protagonists), novels or plays anchored these perceptions in the imagination of their readers. The trend towards both actualization and historicization responded to a need to survey the colonial past in order to understand and legitimize the present."²²

In support of the continuity argument, Olden's text could be read as a corollary to Fabri's text. Relationally speaking, Fabri drew up the recipe, which Peters followed in Olden's narrative. A juxtaposition of Olden's text with historical evidence reveals its historicity. One outstanding evidence is the crisis with the natives and the attendant militarization of Germany's colonial enterprise. The crisis over Sultan Bargasch initiated the first reality of dilemma, how to handle the natives and their leaders. This dilemma emerges from the conflict between Berlin's advocacy for a friendly relationship with native leaders, and the colonists' preference for complete subjugation. Both Olden and Bülow give account of the Bargasch crisis in their texts – *Ich bin Ich* (1927) and *Der Konsul* (1891).

²¹ Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 115-6.

²² Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 36.

The crisis with the rebelling natives, which prompted the deployment of German troops, initiated the power dilemma in Germany's colonial enterprise. Because the deployment of the military was meant as a show of power, it featured also as a challenge to other established powers in the region, including Britain. A British disaffection was the outcome of this, prompting the German government to reconsider her benefits and risks in periphery colonialism.²³ With British opposition intensifying, Bismarck diplomatically de-emphasized periphery colonialism in favor of his Eastern European project, in which he needed Britain's support.²⁴

Apart from the power dilemma, the militarization and its attendant annihilative warring against the natives, opened up the "humane/model" colonialism dilemma. Although, as Olden writes and as historical evidence attests to, Peters carried out his colonial campaign with brutality, the military expeditions appended the label of brutality and violence on Germany's colonial enterprise more incontestably. Germany, which claimed to be the most cultured and humane European nation, was caught in the cycle of incessant punitive, and sometimes, annihilative wars against the natives. The notion of "humane/model" colonialism is exposed to be a mere fantastic projection, developed from a spectatorial position, but which collapsed on the stage of the reality of colonialism.

The dream of "model/humane" colonialism was further undermined by the absolute primacy of national glory, and its transposition onto periphery colonialism. Although Bismarck's government continued to demand a friendly relationship with the

²³ See Olden, p. 216

²⁴ Wehler, p. 364.

colonized natives and their leaders, he could not sustain that any further as Germany's reputation as a European power became threatened. So, the need to protect and enhance Germany's image as a European power inalienably comes head-to-head with the need to protect her image as the culture and humane champion of civilization. The unresolved conflict between these two aspirations accounted partly for Germany's problems in achieving stable and consistent colonial system in East Africa.

Against this background, oppression, subjugation, armed intimidation, and all-out-war against the natives, which was the approach used by German colonists, emerge as a logical consequence of unclear understanding and vision of colonialism. Zantop uses Rainer Koch's argument to buttress this situation,

As Rainer Koch notes, the self-understanding of Germans as disinterested objective judges of the crimes of others led to a lack of critical self-reflection. Certainly, no evil designs lurked behind these revisionist writings. Their well-intended humanity, their struggle for objectivity, their rationality and sense of justice are apparent to today's readers, as are their blindnesses.²⁵

„Der Engländer,“ one of the persona in Bülow's *Im Lande der Verheißung* (1899), alludes to the same problem, „Vor allem fehlt den Deutschen der Wirklichkeitssinn. . . . Es fehlt ihnen das Tastgefühl der Seele . . . sie fassen immer gleich mit groben Fingern zu, wissen nicht zu differenzieren.“ (8) Were Germans substantially informed about colonialism, they would have had the opportunity of developing realistic colonial visions and policies. However, because they concentrated much of their attention on other colonial powers, and derived their colonial projections from their activities, they became deficient on how to make their own enterprise a success. As Zantop argues,

²⁵ Zantop, *Fantasies*, p. 40.

The enforced abstention from imperialism, furthermore, created a special role for German ‘armchair colonialists’: that of critical bystander who felt free to denounce and condemn the atrocities committed by others. It fostered a moral high ground, a sense of ‘difference,’ and desire for action—‘we’ would not repeat the mistakes that ‘they’ had made. This outsider status kept Germans from taking a good look at their own investment in colonialism and the politics of race, both before and after the actual acquisition of colonies in the 1880s.²⁶

Germany’s colonial politics and colonial literature have such a mutually enhancing relationship that, to separate them would create an unbridgeable chasm in Germany’s colonial discourse. With the politics of colonialism in hiatus for a long time, it was literature that sustained the parlance and parole until the Germans were able again to pick up the politics thereof towards the end of the 19th century, and the politics relied on and borrowed heavily from the warehouse of literary texts.

The relational mutuality between colonial literature and colonial politics is further evidenced by Bülow’s *Im Lande der Verheißung* (1899). Although a fictional text, the locale, the characters, the events, and the circumstances that constitute the narrative, find a seamless correspondence with Germany’s colonial politics in East Africa. The operations of Ralph Krome, possibly the fictional persona for Carl Peters, are typical of the operations of Carl Peters in reality. The cunning maneuvers by which he wrested the sovereignty of the natives from them, the drive for complete subjugation of the natives, the passionate hatred for the English, the overstepping of the bounds set by the Berlin government, and his relationship with Maleen, all have their correspondents in reality. His fall out with the Berlin government, which led to his banishment from Germany’s colonial space, and his eventual defection to England, are all historical.

²⁶ Zantop “Legends,” p. 193.

Maleen, the female protagonist of the text, could pass as a fictionalized Frieda von Bülow. Her amorous relationship with Dr. Krome, her unyielding quest for colonial agency, and her determination to leave her mark on the colonial field, in spite of the social and political opposition, fit into Bülow's portraiture. Although Bülow's forced withdrawal from the colony by the Berlin government is not accounted for in the text, the disinterestedness of the government in her role as a colonial agent points to a government disapproval of her continued residence in Africa as a single female colonist. Summarily speaking, Maleen's experience as a female colonist, which was a manifestation of the quest of German women for agency in the public space, a problem which generated the gender dilemma in Germany's colonial discourse, could be read as a portrayal of Bülow's experience in reality.

Colonialism is an enterprise that thrives on coercion, violence, and inhumanity. However, diplomacy is required alongside the force. The absence of diplomacy to elicit the loyalty of the colonized would generate situations for genocide. The application of diplomacy in dealing with a situation requires a clear understanding of the situation, as well as the people with whom one intends to deal with. This accounts for the British adoption of the Indirect Rule system in Nigeria. This is also evident in the Zanzibar scenario, where they, using the Sultan, successfully exercised control over the region without crisis. Their Indirect Rule system of administration was successful in limiting tension between them and the natives.

The British colony in India, which Reinhold Forster referenced in his text, was administered by the East India Company using the Indirect Rule system. Although there were problems and frictions in the colony between the British and Indians natives, these

problems arose more from the rivalry between the ruling princes as they jostled for favor from the imperial officers.²⁷

In the case of Germans, the reverse was the case. The desire to subalternate the natives dominated German colonists. Hannah Arendt provides the reason, why the subalternation of the natives was strong among German colonists, “The full impact of the African experience was first realized by leaders of the mob, like Carl Peters, who decided that they too had to belong to a master race.”²⁸ So, as I argued in the previous chapters, Germany’s desire to prove that they also “belong to a master race” complicated the relationship with the colonized, and any act of insubordination from the natives was deemed a threat to national esteem, and had to be dealt with summarily. Robert J.C. Young discusses how the experience of persecution generates the tendency to persecute a vulnerable “other,” “On the other hand, at the same time, the settlers who went to those regions . . . as a result of persecution, forced migration or simple poverty . . . themselves became the oppressors of the indigenous people who already occupied the land: persecuted minorities emigrating and then themselves persecuting minorities had been a common story of colonialism.”²⁹ Germany, a persecuted nation, became a persecuting nation against colonized natives in the bid to prove that they also belong.

On the question whether Germans had a choice, it could be argued that the conflictual relationship between the ambitions built into the colonial enterprise complicated the question of choice. As I argued in chapter five, their whole enterprise

²⁷ See Stephen R. Ashton, *British Policy Towards the Indian States 1905-1939* (London: Curzon Press Ltd., 1982) 4. Print.

²⁸ Arendt (1973), 206.

²⁹ Young (2001), 20.

and how they operated seemed always in response to events as they unfolded. That this was the situation is not surprising when one considers, as Arendt argues, that the people that constituted the foundational population for Germany's colonial endeavor were "outcasts,"

The superfluous men, 'the Bohemians of the four continents' who came rushing down to the Cape, still had much in common with the old adventurers. They too felt 'Ship me somewheres east of Suez where the best is like the worst,/Where there aren't no Ten Commandments, an' a man can raise a thirst.' The difference was not their morality or immorality, but rather that the decision to join this crowd 'of all nations and colors' was no longer up to them; that they had not stepped out of society but had been spat out by it; that they were not enterprising beyond the permitted limits of civilization but simply victims without use or function.³⁰

It is necessary to note here that this characterization of the pioneers of Germany's "place in the sun" was not particular to Germans. The same case was applicable to the British, and probably the French too. However, for these other nations, it did not take long before the respective home governments got involved in support of their adventurous "outcasts," who had realized the possibility of wealth in the periphery.

With the Germans, the case was different. Due to the absence of a German nation, and the government's initial apathy towards periphery colonialism under Bismarck, government presence was long in coming for the German Diaspora (the imperial patriarchs), and by the time it came, the culture of individuation, which tended towards "un-civilizedness" and "un-culturedness" had deepened among them. Bülow recognizes the culture of individuation as one of the attractions of the periphery enterprise, „Die Arbeit unter Wilden hat ihren hohen Reiz einzig darin, daß sie der Individualität freien Spielraum gewährt. Freiheit der Entschließungen ist aber auch für den Kolonisorator das

³⁰ Arendt, p. 189.

Allerwichtigste: ist sie ihm doch der Ersatz für die Sicherheit geordneter Verhältnisse und für Alles, was sonst in der civilisirten Welt den Einzelnen stützt.“³¹ This is highlighted in Bülow’s novel *Der Konsul* (1891), where the German Diaspora, before the arrival of Konsul von Sylffa, occupied the lowest rung of the socio-cultural stratum in U. (56/70).

Unfortunately for the fate of Germany’s colonial ambition, when the time was ripe, it was people like Carl Peters, who had imbibed the doctrine of Social Darwinism, that took the initiative for East Africa. So, armed with such a racial ideology, they were bound to express their racial superiority against the natives in the language of force, violence, and annihilative subjugation. It is necessary to note here that racial discourse, which was built into Germany’s formal colonial enterprise, subverted the discourse and practice of miscegenation, which thrived under Germany’s imperial patriarchs. These two colonial philosophies merge in the experience of missionary Beta in Bülow’s novel *Im Lande der Verheißung* (1899). Married to a native woman, he enjoyed a harmonious relationship with the natives until formal colonization destroyed that relationship, leading to his death at the hands of rebelling natives.

It could be argued that the toppling of “familial” relationship of miscegenation (practiced by the imperial patriarchs) by the politics of racial separation reflects the difference between informal and formal colonialism. Because formal colonialism is political and highly racialized, it could not accommodate any valuation of the natives, even on a sexualized platform.

³¹ Frieda von Bülow, „Ein Mann über Bord,“ *Die Zukunft*, 1897: 554. 17 May 2011. The Sophie Project <http://sophie.byu.edu/?q=print/node/3709>.

It has been argued that Germany's culture of brutal militarism arises to some extent from an inferiority complex and fear of insecurity, vis-à-vis other European nations.³² For many years, Germans lagged behind other Europeans in various ways. Socio-culturally, Germans lagged behind the Italians, the Russians, the British, and the French. As I highlighted earlier, about the middle of 18th century, German elites favored French, English, and Italian culture and arts to the discredit of any German version. This is also possibly traceable to the absence of a unifying political identity. So each autonomous state arguably tended towards any culture that it favored outside her borders.

Economically, Germans also lagged behind France, Britain, and the Netherlands. These three nations were able to build up the economy with which they could support their periphery enterprises. The healthy economic leaning afforded them the cushion necessary to build up their colonial acquisitions to become beneficial ventures. The lack of a unifying political identity made this impossible for Germans, and they had to achieve that first before entering the colonial race to compete with other European nations.

Militarily, Germans featured as the weeping people of the European politics of domination for a long time. The Thirty Year War ravaged Germany in various dimensions. While Germans were still recovering from that, the Napoleonic Wars of Conquest began, and they fell easy victims to it. Germans remained subjugated by Napoleon until 1813. The defeat of Napoleon in 1813-1815 and the failure of the Princes to fulfill their promises of constitutional rule and unification, in combination with transformative tendencies unfolding in the society "tiefgreifende politische und soziale Strukturveränderungen, Erfindungen und Entdeckungen in Naturwissenschaft und

³² Hall (2003), p. 147.

Technik³³ opened the door to multi-dimensional internal crisis leading to the revolution of 1848. Although the revolution was quelled, and stringent measures put in place to deter further revolutionary attempts, the body politics remained restless, and the polity continued to weaken. This was the state of things until the speedy turn around in the 19th century.

The turnaround, which registered itself in intellectualism, industrialization, and militarism, generated the feeling of ‘having arrived’ among Germans, and the need to further the new status was projected onto periphery colonialism. Overwhelmed by the desire to prove their worth among other European nations, caution, reasonableness, civility, and culture slipped away from Germany’s colonial enterprise, and the consequence was a colonial enterprise that thrived on the principle of force and violence.

The symbiosis of Germany’s colonial politics and her colonial literature offers a platform on which Germany’s colonial episode could be better and more insurably evaluated. The combination of literary and non-literary materials in this project to remap Germany’s colonial discourse from fantasy to reality has not failed in providing enough intra-communicative insight into the circumstances that combined to condition Germany’s colonial enterprise and generated the legacy of often brutal barbarism with which it is credited.

³³ See Beutin et al., p. 239.

Definition of Terms

The terms below are defined relative to their use in this document. The purpose is to enhance the understanding of their use in this project. However, for the terms that have a dictionary meaning, the definitions do not deviate from the dictionary definition, but rather, acquire a connotative dimension arising from its use here.

Bana: A Swahili term for master.

Bounce-off-image: This is a term I have used in relation to how Germany developed her colonial image. It suggests an image developed, not out of the appraisal of any “national character” evident in a collectivity, but rather an image derived from the evaluation and interpretation of the other. In the context of Germany’s colonial discourse, her colonial image is derived from her evaluation and interpretation of the colonial operations of other European nations.

Familial: Is a component of the German fantasy of “model/human” colonialism which, as Zantop describes it, implies a colonial family setting of a de-eroticized educational patriarchal father-child bond and an eroticized matrimonial union between the male colonizer and the colonized female.

Geography of erasure: This is the mapping of the periphery by Europeans in such a way that presents the periphery as an empty space without inhabitants. The geography of erasure projects the future colonist as the colonizer of space but not of people.

Germanness: This is a term that designates the characteristics that Germans believe make them unique. As I argued later in this project, conscious effort was being made in the 18th century to develop certain behavioral patterns that Germans were expected to cultivate. This was in the bid to foster a gravitation towards a commonality that would generate the identity of sameness and uniqueness.

Model/humane Colonialism: This entails, Zantop discusses, a “familial” relationship of a de-eroticized patriarchal bond between the German father and native children on one hand, and an eroticized relationship between the German colonizer and the native woman.³⁴ This “familial” setting was envisaged to facilitate a peaceful, smooth-running, and symbiotically enhancing colonialism, whereby the native children and woman will willingly submit unreservedly to the authority of the patriarchal German father and “husband.” In such a relationship, there will be no room for violence or inhumanity, since there is bi-directional benefit and enhancement.

Periphery: Periphery is a term used to designate the extra-European geographic targets for colonization. It is, simply put, the “other” of Euro.

Place in the sun: This is a quote by Emperor Wilhelm II, which both expresses the fantasy about the periphery and describes the periphery among German colonial propagandists. It is so-coined to elicit romantic appetite for periphery experience.

³⁴ Zantop (1997), p. 2.

The sun becomes a metaphor for vigor, vibrancy, freedom, longevity and might in contrast to the asphyxiating European atmosphere of the 18th and 19th centuries.

Imperial patriarchs: This term refers to Germans who had already established themselves in the periphery before Germany's formal colonialism began. They practiced informal colonialism, and of a friendly and harmonious relationship with the natives. They married natives, lived among them, associated with them in the way that other Europeans did not. Their colonial practices could be viewed as efforts to practicalize the notion of "model/humane" colonialism. See Lora Wildenthal, *German Women for Empire, 1884-1945* (2001).

Intentionality: This is a term I used to designate the argument that tends to dichotomize between colonialism and imperialism on the grounds that imperialism was politically intentional while colonialism was not. For more on this see Wolfgang J. Mommsen, *Theories of Imperialism* (1980; 70-112).

Men on the spot: A term used by Wolfgang Mommsen (1980; 104) to designate European imperialist agents who were physically involved in the administration of the periphery colonies.

Politics of erasure: This is a term that summarizes the colonizers' efforts to generate the impression of an empty space by either refusing to recognize the presence of natives in the space, or by actively effecting their erasure by neutralizing their agency through absolute subjugation, or practically removing them from the space through genocidal approaches such as wars of annihilation, shepherding them into concentration camps, or using blockade to starve them to death.

Rupanda Sharo: A Swahili term, which means "the conqueror of towns." It was a nickname used for Peters by East African natives due to his ravaging expeditions in the area.

Temporality: Temporality is a term I have used in reference to the attempt to differential between imperialism and colonialism in periphery enterprise using the argument of period. According to the debate, the difference between the two lies in the fact that, while colonialism had been going on for centuries back, imperialism, which implies direct political involvement in the periphery, started in the 19th century. For more on this argument see Wolfgang J. Mommsen, *Theories of Imperialism* (1980; 70-112).

Tri-postal: I have used this term to designate three perspectives or angles or positions from which effects – actions or reactions – could be generated.

Unaffiliated: This term refers to the marginalized members of the German society. Owing to the class-consciousness of the German society uptill the eighteenth century, the chances of upward movement in the social stratum was almost unimaginable. It was the level of the society locked within this stasis that first migration into the periphery as a life chance.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Bülow, Frieda von. *Der Konsul. Vaterländischer Roman aus unseren Tagen*. Berlin: F. Fontane, 1891. Print.

Bülow, Frieda von. „Das Weib in seiner Geschlechtsindividualität.“ <http://sophie.byu.edu/?q=print/node/3708>. The Sophie Project, n.d. Web. 21 July 2011.

Bülow, Frieda von. „Ein Mann über Bord.“ <http://sophie.byu.edu/?q=print/node/3709>. The Sophie Project, n. d. Web. May 17th, 2011.

--- *Im Lande der Verheißung: Ein deutscher Kolonialroman*. 3rd ed. Dresden: Verlag von Carl Reißner, 1899. Print.

Campe, Heinrich Joachim. *Robinson der Jüngere. Ein Lesebuch für Kinder zur allgemeinen Schulencyklopädie Gehörig*. 4th ed. Braunschweig: Verlage der Schulbuchhandlung, 1779. Print.

Chamisso, Adelbert von. *Reise um die Welt mit der Romanzoffischen Entdeckungsexpedition*. Leipzig: Weidmann, 1836. Print.

Fabri, Friedrich. *Bedarf Deutschland der Kolonien. Eine politisch-ökonomische Betrachtung*. Gotha: F.A. Perthes, 1879. Print.

Fabri, Friedrich. „Deutsch-Ostafrika 1.“ *Kölnische Zeitung*, 16 July 1886. Bundesarchiv Berlin. Print.

Forster, Reinhold Johann. *Observations Made during a Voyage round the World*. 1778. Ed. Nicholas Thomas, Harriet Guest, Michael Dettelbach. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1996. Print.

Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim. “Die Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts.” 1778. *Gotthold Ephraim Lessings Werke* (8. Bd.). Ed. Karl Eibl & Herbert Georg Göpfert. München: Carl Hanser Verlag, 1970. Print.

Olden, Balder. *Ich bin Ich. Der Roman Carl Peters*. Berlin: Deutsche Verlagsaktiengesellschaft, 1927. Print.

Secondary Sources

- Abbattista, Guido. "European Encounters in the Age of Expansion." <http://www.ieg-ego.eu/abbattistag-2011-en>. European History Online (EHO), Institute of European History (IEH), 2011. Web. 20 Dec. 2011.
- Adesanmi, Pius. "Of Postcolonial Entanglement and Durée: Reflections on the Francophone African Novel." *Comparative Literature* 56.3 (2004): 227-42. Print.
- Allen, Ann Taylor. *Feminism and Motherhood in Germany, 1800-1914*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1991. Print.
- Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt Brace & Jovanovich 1973. Print.
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin, eds. *The Post-Colonial Reader*. London: Routledge, 1995. Print.
- Ashton, R. Stephen. *British Policy Towards the Indian States 1905-1939* (London: Curzon Press Ltd., 1982). Print.
- Assmann, Jan. *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis, Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*. München: C.H. Beck 1999. Print.
- Baldyga, Natalya. "Political Bodies and Bodies Politic: Cultural Identity in G.E. Lessing's *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*." *Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation* 43.3 (2002): 253-267. Print.
- Bass, D. Jeff. "The Perversion of Empire: Edmund Burke and the Nature of Imperial Responsibility," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 81 (1995): 208-227. Print.
- Baumgart, Winfried. "German Imperialism in historical Perspective." *Germans in the Tropics: Essays in German Colonial History*. Eds. Arthur J. Knoll and Lewis H. Gann. New York: Greenwood, 1987. 151-64. Print.
- Berman, Russell. *Enlightenment or Empire: Colonial Discourse in German Culture*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998. Print.
- Berman, Russell. "Der ewige Zweite: Deutschlands Sekundärkolonialismus." *Phantasiereiche: zur Kulturgeschichte des Deutschen Kolonialismus*. Ed. Birthe Kundrus. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 2003. 19-32. Print.
- Beutin Wolfgang, Klaus Ehlert, Wolfgang Emmerich, Christine Kanz, Bernd Lutz, Volker Meid, Michael Opitz, Carola Opitz-Wiemers, Ralf Schnell, Peter Stein and Inge Stephan, eds. *Deutsche Literaturgeschichte: von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*. 6th ed. Stuttgart: Metzlersche Verlagslexikon, 2001. Print.

- Breuning, E.C.M. and Muriel Evelyn Chamberlain. Introduction. *Bedarf Deutschland der Kolonien?/Does Germany need Colonies?* New York: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1998. Print.
- Bullock, A.L.C. *Germany's Colonial Demands*. Westport: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1975. Print.
- Campt, Tina, Pascal Grosse, and Yara-Colette Lemke-Muniz de Faria. "Blacks, Germans, and the Politics of Imperial Imagination, 1920-60." *The Imperialist Imagination. German Colonialism and its Legacy*. Ed. Sara Friedrichsmeyer, Sara Lennox, and Susanne Zantop. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press (1998): 205-229. Print.
- Cobbett, William. *The Parliamentary history of England from the earliest period to the year 1803*. London: T.C Hansard, 1806-1820. vol. 17, col. 463. Print.
- Conrad, Sebastian and Shalini Randeria. „Geteilte Geschichte – Europa in einer postkolonialen Welt.“ *Jenseits des Eurozentrismus. Postkoloniale Perspektiven in den Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften*. Eds. Sebastian Conrad und Shalini Randeria. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 2002. Print.
- Dettelbach, Michael. Introduction. “‘A kind of Linnaean Being’: Forster and Eighteenth-Century Natural History.” *Observations made during a Voyage round the World*. By Johann Reinhold Forster. Ed. Nicholas Thomas, Harriet Guest, Michael Dettelbach. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1996. lv-lxxiv. Print.
- Deutsch, Jan-Georg. „Inventing and East African Empire: The Zanzibar Delimitation Commission of 1885/86.” *Studien zur Geschichte des deutschen Kolonialismus in Africa*. Ed. Peter Heine & Ulrich van der Heyden. Pfaffenweiler: Centaurus-Verlagsgesellschaft, 1995. 210-19. Print.
- Dimock, Wai-Chee. “Feminism, New Historicism, and the Reader.” *American Literature: A Journal of Literary History, Criticism and Bibliography* 63.4 (1991): 601-22. Print.
- Doninelli, Luca. “The Manichean Abstraction. The Reality of Desire.” <http://www.traces-cl.com/july03/themanich.html>. Web. 20 Oct, 2012.
- Drew, Julie. "Cultural Composition: Stuart Hall on Ethnicity and the Discursive Turn." *Race, Rhetoric, and the Postcolonial*. Eds. Olson, Gary A. and Lynn Worsham. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999. 205-39. Print.
- Dülmen, van Richard. Introduction. *The Society of the Enlightenment. The Rise of the Middle Class and Enlightenment Culture in Germany*. Trans. Anthony Williams. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992. Print.

- During, Simon. "New Historicism." *Text and Performance Quarterly* 11.3 (1991): 171-89. Print.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Shakespeare and Society. Critical Studies in Shakespearean Drama*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1967. 39-65. Print.
- *The Idea of Culture*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 2000. Print.
- Edwards, Tony. "Interpretation, Explanation, and the Study of Culture." *Critical Quarterly* 34.3 (1994): 96-106. Print.
- Eigler, Friederike. "Engendering German Nationalism: Gender and Race in Frieda von Bulow's Colonial Writings." *The Imperialist Imagination: German Colonialism and its Legacy*. Ed. Sara Friedrichsmeyer, Sara Lennox, and Susanne Zantop. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1998. Print.
- Eley, Howard Geoff. *From Unification to Nazism. Reinterpreting the German Past*. Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1986. Print.
- Eley, Howard Geoff and James Retallack. *Wilhelminism and Its Legacies. German Modernities, Imperialism and the Meaning of Reform, 1890 – 1930*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2003. Print.
- Ehlert, Klaus. „Realismus und Grunderzeit.“ *Deutsche Literatur Geschichte*. Eds. Beutin Wolfgang, Klaus Ehlert, Wolfgang Emmerich, Christine Kanz, Bernd Lutz, Volker Meid, Michael Opitz, Carola Opitz-Wiemers, Ralf Schnell, Peter Stein and Inge Stephan, eds. *Deutsche Literaturgeschichte: von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*. 6th ed. Stuttgart: Metzlersche Verlagslexikon, 2001. 293-341. Print.
- Elliott, J.E. "Paradigms Retained: Cultural Theory, Critical Practice." *Comparative Literature* 50.1 (1998): 57-91. Print.
- Eze, Chukwudi Emmanuel, ed. *Race and the Enlightenment: A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 1997. Print.
- Farrell, J. Thomas. "Walter Ong's Thought as Framework and Orientation for Cultural Studies in the Humanities." *Ronascence: Essays on Values in Literature* 55.4 (2003): 339-54. Print.
- Förster, Bernhard. „Ein Deutschland der Zukunft.“ *Bayreuther Blätter* 6 (1883): 44-56. Print.
- Freudenthal, Gad. "Aaron Salomon Gumpertz, Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, and the First Call for an Improvement of the Civil Rights of Jews in Germany (1753)." *AJS Review* 29.2 (2005): 299-353. Print.

- Friedrichsmeyer, Sara, Sara Lennox and Susanne Zantop, eds. *The Imperialist Imagination. German Colonialism and its Legacy*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998. Print.
- Geertz, Clifford. „Dichte Beschreibung. Bemerkungen zu einer deutenden Theorie von Kultur.“ *Dichte Beschreibung. Beiträge zum Verstehen kultureller Systeme*. Frankfurt/M: Suhrkamp Taschenbuch Wissenschaft, 1987. 7-43. Print.
- Germany. Bundestag Publication. *Fragen an die deutsche Geschichte*. Bonn: Bundestag Publication 1989. Print.
- Gewald, Jan-Bart. “The Herero genocide: German unity, settlers, soldiers, and ideas.” *Die (koloniale) Begegnungen: Afrikanerinnen in Deutschland 1880-1945, Deutsche in Afrika 1880-1918*. Ed. Beckhaus-Gerst, Marianne & Reinhard Klein-Arendt. Frankfurt/M: Peter Lang, 2003. 109-127. Print.
- Giesen, Bernhard. *Intellectuals and the Nation. Collective Identity in a German Axial Age*. Trans. Nicholas Levis & Amos Weisz. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Print.
- Gilman, Sander. *Difference and Pathology: Stereotypes of Sexuality, Race and Madness*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985. Print.
- Goetschel, Willi. “Lessing’s ‘Jewish’ Question.” *Germanic Review* 78.1 (2003): 62-73. Print.
- Goetschel, Willi. “Lessing and the Jews.” *A Companion to the Works of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing*. Eds. Fischer, Barbara and Thomas C. Fox. New York: Camden House, 2005. 185-208. Print.
- Gohrisch, Jana. “Cultural Exchange and the Representation of History in Postcolonial Literature.” *European Journal of English Studies* 10.3 (2006): 231-47. Print.
- Glaser, Horst Albert. „Lessing’s Kampf gegen die ‚Tragodie Classique‘ in der Hamburgischen Dramaturgie.“ *Les Lettres Françaises dans les Revues Allemandes du XVIIIe Siècle (Die französische Literatur in den deutschen Zeitschriften des 18. Jahrhunderts)*. Ed. Pierre-André Bois, Roland Krebs et Jean Moes. Bern: Peter Lang, 1997. 123-32. Print.
- Grosse, Pascal. “What Does German Colonialism Have to Do with National Socialism?” *Germany’s Colonial Pasts*. Ed. Eric Ames, Marcia Klotz, & Lora Wildenthal. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005. Print.

- Guest, Harriet. Introduction. "Looking at Women: Forster's Observations in the South Pacific." *Observations made during a Voyage round the World*. By Johann Reinhold Forster. Ed. Nicholas Thomas, Harriet Guest, Michael Dettelbach. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1996. xli-liv. Print.
- Hahn, J. Hans. *German Thought and Culture. From the Holy Roman Empire to the present Day*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995. Print.
- Hammerstein, Katharina von. „Reiseberichte von Frieda Freiin von Bülow. Einführung.“ *Kolonialer Alltag in Deutsch-Ostafrika in Dokumenten*. Ed. Ulrich van der Heyden. Berlin: Verlagsgruppe Dr. Wolfgang Weist, 2009. Print.
- Harris, Gil Jonathan. "The New New Historicism's Wunderkammer of Objects." *European Journal of English Studies* 4.2 (2000): 111-123. Print.
- Hertz, Frederick. *The German Public Mind in the Nineteenth Century*. Totowa: Rowman and Littlefield, 1974. Print.
- Hillgruber, Andreas. *Bismarcks Außenpolitik*. Freiburg: Verlag Rombach, 1972. Print.
- Hobson, A. John. *Imperialism: a Study*. New York: James Pott and Co., 1902. Print.
- *Imperialism*. 1902. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1972. Print.
- Hochstetter, Sophie. *Frieda Freiin von Bülow: Ein Lebensbild*. Dresden: Carl Reißner, 1910. Print.
- Holub, Robert. "Nietzsche's Colonialist Imagination: Nueva Germania, Good Europeanism, and Great Politics." *The Imperialist Imagination*. Ed. Sara Friedrichsmeyer, Sara Lennox, and Suzanne Zantop. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998. 33-49. Print.
- Honold, Alexander. "Raum ohne Volk. Zur Imaginationsgeschichte der kolonialen Geographie." *Kolonialismus. Kolonialdiskurs und Genozid*. Ed. Mihram Dabag, Gründer Horst and Uwe-K. Ketelsen. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2003. 95-110. Print.
- Honold, Alexander and Oliver Simons, eds. *Kolonialismus als Kultur. Literatur, Medien, Wissenschaft in der deutschen Gründerzeit des Fremden*. Tübingen: A. Franke Verlag, 2002. Print.
- Howards, E. Jean. "The New Historicism in Renaissance Studies." *Renaissance Historicism: Selections from English Literary Renaissance*. Ed. Kinney, Arthur F. and Dan S. Collins. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press (1987): 3-33. Print.

- Hull, V. Isabel. *Absolute Destruction. Military Culture and the Practices of War in Imperial Germany*. Ithaca: Cornell University, 2005. Print.
- "Military Culture and the Production of 'Final Solution' in the Colonies: The Example of Wilhelminian Germany." *The Specter of GENOCIDE: Mass Murder in Historical Perspective*. Ed. Gellately Robert & Ben Kiernan Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. 141-62. Print.
- Humboldt, von Alexander. *Ansichten der Natur mit wissenschaftlichen Erläuterungen*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Cotta, 1860. Print.
- Joeden-Forgey, von Elisa. "Race Power in Postcolonial Germany. The German Africa Show and the National Socialist State, 1935-40." *Germany's Colonial Pasts*. Eds. Eric Ames, Marcia Klotz & Lora Wildenthal. Lincoln & London: University of Nebraska Press, (2005):167-88. Print.
- Jusdanis, Gregory. "Enlightenment Postcolonialism." *Research in African Literatures* 36.3 (2005): 137-50. Print.
- King James Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. Print.
- Kacandes, Irene. "German Cultural Studies: What Is at Stake?" *A User's Guide to German Cultural Studies*. Eds. Scott Denham, Irene Kacandes, and Jonathan Petropoulos. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1997. 3-28. Print.
- Klotz, Marcia. "The Weimar Republic. A Postcolonial State in a Still-Colonial World." *Germany's Colonial Pasts*. Eds. Eric Ames, Marcia Klotz & Lora Wildenthal. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press (2005): 135-47. Print.
- Knellwolf, Christa. "The Exotic Frontiers of the Imperial Imagination." *Eighteenth Century Life* 26.3 (2002): 10-30. Print.
- Knoll, J. Arthur. "German Africa and the German Pacific. Continuity and Contrast." *Studien zur Geschichte des deutschen Kolonialismus in Africa*. Eds. Peter Heine and Ulrich van der Heyden. Pfaffenweiler: Centaurus-Verlagsgesellschaft, 1995. 341-49. Print.
- Knoll, J. Arthur & Hermann J. Hiery, eds. *The German Colonial Experience*. Lanham: University Press of America, Inc., 2010. Print.
- Koponen, Juhani. "Colonialism and Development: The Case of Mainland Tanzania During the German Period." *Proceedings of the Thirty-Seventh Annual Meeting of the African Studies Association, November 3-6, 1994*. N.p. Print.

- Kopp, Kristin. "Constructing Racial Difference in Colonial Poland." *Germany's Colonial Pasts*. Eds. Eric Ames, Marcia Klotz & Lora Wildenthal. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005. Print.
- "Reinventing Poland as Germany Colonial Territory in the Nineteenth Century: Gustav Freytag's *Soll und Haben* as Colonial Novel." *Germans, Poland, and Colonial Expansion to the East*. Ed. Robert L. Nelson. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2009. Print.
- Lange, Helene. *Lebenserinnerungen*. Berlin: F. H. Herbig GmbH, 1925. Print.
- Lemkin, Raphael. "Empire, Colony, Genocide. Keywords and the Philosophy of History." Qtd. in *Empire, Colony, Genocide. Conquest, Occupation, and Subaltern Resistance in World History*. Ed. Dirk A. Moses. New York: Berghahn Books, 2008. 3-54. Print.
- Lenk, Carsten. „Kultur als Text. Überlegungen zu einer Interpretationsfigur.“ *Literaturwissenschaft-Kulturwissenschaft: Positionen, Themen, Perspektiven*. (Hrsg.) Glaser, Renate und Matthias Luserke. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1996. Print.
- Levine, Caroline. "Strategic Formalism: Towards a New Method in Cultural Studies." *Victorian Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Social, Political and Cultural Studies* 48.4 (2006): 625-57. Print.
- Lichtheim, George. *Imperialism*. New York: Praeger, 1971. Print.
- Lowe, John. *The Great Powers, Imperialism and the German Problem, 1865-1925*. London: Routledge, 1994. Print.
- Lowood, Henry Ernest. *Patriotism, Profit, and the Promotion of Science in the German Enlightenment: The economic and scientific Societies, 1750-1815*. Diss. U. of California, Berkeley, 1987. Print.
- Lüthy, Herbert. *Nach dem Untergang des Abendlandes*. Köln: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 1964/65. 362-86. Print.
- Lützel, Michael Paul. "Der Postmoderne Neohistorismus in den amerikanischen Humanities." *Geschichte als Literatur: Formen und Grenzen der Repräsentation von Vergangenheit*. Eds. Eberhard Lämmert, Hartmut Eggert, Ulrich Profitlich, Klaus R. Scherpe. Stuttgart: Metzler (1990): 67-76. Print.
- "Einleitung: Postkolonialer Diskurs und deutsche Literatur." *Schriftsteller und "Dritte Welt". Studien zum postkolonialen Blick*. Ed. Paul Michael Lützel. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag, 1998. 7-30. Print.

- *Schriftsteller und „Dritten Welt.“ Studien zum postkolonialen Blick.* Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag, 1998. Print.
- “Die kulturalistische Wende in den Geisteswissenschaften.” *Akademie Journal. Magazin der Union der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaft.* 1/2000. 17. Print.
- *Postmoderne und postkoloniale deutschsprachige Literatur.* Diskurs – Analyse – Kritik. Bielefeld: Aisthesis Verlag, 2005. Print.
- Mah, Harold. *Enlightenment Phantasies. Cultural Identity in France and Germany, 1750-1914.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003. Print.
- Michaels, Ben Walter. “The Victims of New Historicism.” *Modern Language Quarterly: A Journal of Literary History* 54.1 (1993): 111-20. Print.
- Mishra, Vijay and Bob Hodge. “What was Postcolonialism?” *New Literary History* 36.3 (2005): 375-402. Print.
- Mommsen, J. Wolfgang. *Theories of Imperialism.* New York: Random House Inc., 1980. Print.
- “The End of Empire and the Continuity of Imperialism.” *Imperialism and After: Continuities and Discontinuities.* Ed. Jürgen Osterhammel & Wolfgang J. Mommsen. London: Allen & Unwin, 1985. 333-358. Print.
- Montrose, A. Louis. “Professing the Renaissance: the Poetics and Politics of Culture.” *The New Historicism.* Ed. H. Aram Veeser. New York: Routledge, 1989. 15-36. Print.
- “The Work of Gender in the Discourse of Discovery.” *Representations.* 33 (1991): 1-41. Print.
- Mosse L. George. *Toward the Final Solution: A History of European Racism.* New York: H. Fertig, 1978. Print.
- Naranch, D. Bradley. “Inventing the Auslandsdeutsche: Emigration, Colonial Fantasy and German National Identity.” *Germany’s Colonial Pasts.* Eds. Eric Ames, Marcia Klotz & Lora Wildenthal. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005. 21-40. Print.
- Myers, David Gershom. “The New Historicism in Literary Study.” *Academic Questions* 2 (1988-89): 27-36. Print.
- Nelson, L. Robert. “*The Archive for Inner Colonization, The German East, and World War I.*” *Germans, Poland, and Colonial Expansion to the East.* Ed. Rober L. Nelson. Palgrave: Macmillan, 2009. 65-93. Print.

- Nolden, Thomas. "On Colonial Spaces and Bodies: Hans Grimm's *Geschichten aus Südwestafrika*." *The Imperialist Imagination. German Colonialism and its Legacy*. Eds. Sara Friedrichsmeyer, Sara Lennox and Susanne Zantop. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998. 125-38. Print.
- Noyes, K. John. "National Identity, Nomadism, and Narration in Gustav Frenssen's *Peter Moor's Journey to Southwest Africa*." *The Imperialist Imagination*. Ed. Sara Friedrichsmeyer, Sara Lennox, and Susanne Zantop. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998. 87-105. Print.
- Nünning Ansgar and Vera Nünning, eds. *Konzepte der Kulturwissenschaften*. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler Verlag, 2003. Print.
- Okafor, Onyedi Uche. "Anti-Kolonialismus Literatur Afrikas als afrikanische Aufklärung: Eine Komparatistische Analyse der deutschen literarischen Epoche der Aufklärung und der literarischen Anti-Kolonialismus-Epoche in Afrika." *Foreign Languages Studies in West Africa: Nigeria and Benin*. Ed. Adeleke, Joseph Ajibola, Festus Ayodeji Soyoye and Flavian Gbeto. Benin: Presses Scolaires et Universitaire du Benin, 2004. 110-142. Print.
- Okafor, Uche Onyedi "Aggressivity and Oppressiveness in Germany's Colonial Enterprise in Africa: An Action or a Reaction." 2007. Typescript. Department of Germanic Studies, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Perras, Arne. "Colonial Agitation and the Bismarckian State. The Case of Carl Peters." *Wilhelminism and Its Legacies. German Modernities, Imperialism and the Meaning of Reform, 1890-1930*. Eds. Eley Geoff and James Retallack. New York: Berghahn Books, 2003. 154-70. Print.
- Pesek, Michael. *Koloniale Herrschaft in Deutsch-Ostafrika. Expedition, Militär und Verwaltung seit 1880*. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 2005. Print.
- Pflanze, Otto. *Bismarck and the Development of Germany: The Period of Unification, 1815-1871*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990. Print.
- Redekop, W. Benjamin. *Enlightenment and Community. Lessing, Abbt, Herder, and the Quest for a German Public*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000. Print.
- Renker, K. Cindy. "Imperial Motherhood: The German Civilizing Mission in Bülow's *Im Lande der Verheißung*." <http://sophieold.byu.edu/sophiejournal/thesis/renker0.pdf>. The Sophie Journal, 2004. Web. 24 Dec. 2011.

- Reusch, J. K. Johann. "Germans as Noble Savages and Castaway: Alter Egos and Alterity in German collective Consciousness during the long Eighteenth Century." *Eighteenth Century Studies* 42.1 (2008): 91-129. Print.
- Robertson, Ritchie. *The Jewish Question in German Literature 1749-1939*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. Print.
- Rohrbach, Paul. „Deutsche Kolonialwirtschaft.“ *Sudwest-Afrika*. Vol.1. Berlin: 1907. 285-288. Print.
- Rosenberg, Brian, "Historicising the New Historicism: Understanding the Past in Criticism and Fiction." *Modern Language Quarterly: A Journal of Literary History* 50.4 (1989): 375-92. Print.
- Rousseau, George Sabastian and Roy Porter, eds. *Exoticism in the Enlightenment*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990. Print.
- Sagarra, Eda. *Germany in the nineteenth Century: History and Literature*. New York: Peter Lang, 2001. Print.
- Said, W. Edward. *Orientalism*. 1979. New York: Vintage Books, 1978. Print.
- *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1994. xiii. Print.
- Schaller, J. Dominik. "From Conquest to Genocide. Colonial Rule in German Southwest Africa and German East Africa." *Empire, Colony Genocide. Conquest, Occupation, and Subaltern Resistance in World History*. Ed. Dirk A. Moses. New York: Berghahn Books 297-324. Print.
- Schmockel, W. Wolfe. *Dream of Empire: German Colonialism, 1919-1945*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964. 161. Print.
- Schneider, Daniel. *Identität und Ordnung. Entwürfe des »Eigenen« und »Fremde« in deutschen Kolonial- und Afrikaromanen von 1889 bis 1952*. Bielefeld: Aisthesis Verlag, 2011. Print.
- Schwarz, Thomas. "Die Kultivierung des kolonialen Begehrens." *Kolonialismus als Kultur: Literatur, Medien, Wissenschaft in der deutschen Gründerzeit des Fremden*. Eds. Alexander Honold und Oliver Simons. Tübingen: A. Francke Verlag, 2002. Print.
- Seligmann, S. Matthew and Roderick R. McLean. *Germany from Reich to Republic 1871-1918*. New York: Saint Martin's Press, 2000. Print.

- Shumannfang, Barbara Ann. *Envisioning Empire: Jewishness, Blackness and Gender in German colonial Discourse from Frieda von Bülow to the Nazi Kolonie und Heimat*. Diss. University of Michigan, 1998. Print.
- Simo, David. "Colonization and Modernization. The Legal Foundation of the Colonial Enterprise; A Case Study of German Colonization in Cameroon." *Germany's Colonial Pasts*. Eds. Eric Ames, Marcia Klotz & Lora Wildenthal. Lincoln & London: University of Nebraska Press, (2005): 97-112. Print.
- Sippel, Harald. „Recht und Herrschaft in kolonialer Frühzeit: Die Rechtsverhältnisse in den Schutzgebieten der Deutsch-Ostafrikanischen Gesellschaft. (1885-1890).“ *Studien zur Geschichte des deutschen Kolonialismus in Afrika*. Eds. Peter Heine & Ulrich van der Heyden. Pfaffenweiler: Centaurus-Verlagsgesellschaft, 1995. 466-94. Print.
- Smith, D. Woodruff. "Colonialism and the Culture of Respectability." *Germany's Colonial Pasts*. Eds. Eric Ames, Marcia Klotz & Lora Wildenthal. Lincoln & London: University of Nebraska Press, 2005. 3-20. Print.
- Smith, Helmut Walser. "The Talk of Genocide, the Rhetoric of Miscegenation: Notes on Debates in the German Reichstag Concerning Southwest Africa, 1904-14." *The Imperialist Imagination*. Eds. Sara Friedrichsmeyer, Sara Lennox, and Suzanne Zantop. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998. 107-123. Print.
- Sösemann, Bernd. „Die sogenannte ‚Hunnenrede‘ Wilhelms II; Textkritische und interpretatorische Bemerkungen zur Ansprache des Kaisers vom 27 Juli 1900 in Bremerhaven.“ *Historische Zeitschrift* 222.2 (1976): 342-58. Print.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Towards a History of the vanishing Present*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999. Print.
- Stephan, Inge. "Aufklärung." *Deutsche Literaturgeschichte: von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*. 6th ed. Eds. Beutin Wolfgang, Klaus Ehlert, Wolfgang Emmerich, Christine Kanz, Bernd Lutz, Volker Meid, Michael Opitz, Carola Opitz-Wiemers, Ralf Schnell, Peter Stein and Inge Stephan. Stuttgart: Metzlersche Verlagslexikon, 2001. 148-230. Print.
- Steinmetz, George and Julia Hell. "The Visual Archive of Colonialism: Germany and Namibia." *Public Culture* 18.1 [48] (2006): 147-183. Print.
- Stig, Förster, Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Ronald Robinson, eds. *Bismarck, Europe, and Africa. The Berlin Africa Conference 1884 – 1885 and the Onset of Partition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988. Print.
- Stoyanov, Yuri. *The Other God. Dualist Religions from Antiquity to the Cathar Heresy*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000. Print.

- Streese, Konstanze. „Cric?“ – „Crac!“ Bern: Peter Lang, 1991. 3. Print.
- Tambila, I. Kapepwa. “The German Invasion and Occupation of East Africa: Policies, Processes and Tactics.” *Studien zur Geschichte des deutschen Kolonialismus in Africa*. Eds. Peter Heine & Ulrich van der Heyden. Pfaffenweiler: Centaurus-Verlagsgesellschaft, 1995. 501-520. Print.
- Taylor, Alan John Percivale. *Germany's First Bid for Colonies*. Connecticut: Archon Books, 1967. Print.
- Taylor, Roland. *Literature and Society in Germany 1918-1945*. Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1980. Print.
- Thomas, Nicholas. Introduction. “Johann Reinhold Forster and his Observations.” *Observations made during a Voyage round the World. 1778*. By Johann Reinhold Forster. Eds. Nicholas Thomas, Harriet Guest, Michael Dettelbach. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1996. xv-xi. Print.
- Thornton, Paton Archibald. *The imperial idea and its enemies*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1966. Print.
- Tifflin, Chris and Alan Lawson. *De-Scribing Empire: Post-Colonialism and Textuality*. New York: Routledge, 1994. Print.
- Tipton, B. Frank. *A History of Modern Germany since 1815*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003. Print.
- Townsend, Mary Evelyn. *Origin of Modern German Colonialism 1875 - 1885*. New York: Howard Fertig, 1974. Print.
- Treitschke, von Heinrich. *Politics*. Qtd. in *Bedarf Deutschland der Colonien?/Does Germany need Colonies?* By Friedrich Fabri. Eds. Eleanor C. Breuning and M.E. Chamberlain. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1998. 13. Print.
- Trotha, von Trutz. „‘One for the Kaiser.’ Beobachtungen zur politischen Soziologie der Prugelstrafe am Beispiel des ‚Schutzgebietes Togo.‘“ *Studien zur Geschichte des deutschen Kolonialismus in Afrika*. Ed. Peter Heine & Ulrich van der Heyden. Pfaffenweiler: Centaurus-Verlagsgesellschaft, 1995. Print.
- Walther J. Daniel. “Racializing sex: same-sex relations, German colonial authority, and Deutschtum.” *Journal of the History of Sexuality*. 17.1 (2008): 11-24. Print.
Merriam Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary. 1988. Print.
- Wehler, Hans Ulrich. *Bismarck und der Imperialismus*. Köln: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 1969. Print.

- Weißenburg, von Otfried. „Gospel Harmonie: Das Evangelienbuch.“ *Anthology of Medieval German Literature*. By Albert K. Wimmer 3rd Rev. Edition 1998. Print.
- Wildenthal, Lora. “Race, Gender and Citizenship in the German Colonial Empire.” *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*. Eds. Frederick Cooper and Ann Stoler. Berkley: University of California Press, 1997. 263-283. Print.
- “‘When Men Are Weak’: The Imperial Feminism of Frieda von Bülow.” *Gender and History* 10.1 (1998): 53-77. Print.
- *German Women for Empire, 1884-1945*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2001. Print.
- Williams, Patrick and Laura Chrisman, eds. *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory. A Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994. Print.
- Young, J.C. Robert. *Postcolonialism. A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. Print.
- Zantop, Susanne. *Colonial Fantasies: Conquest, Family, and Nation in Precolonial Germany, 1770-1870*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1997. Print.
- “Colonial Legends, Postcolonial Legacies.” *A User’s Guide to German Cultural Studies*. Eds. Scott Denham, Irene Kacandes, and Jonathan Petropoulos. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997. 189-205. Print.
- Zimmerman, Andrew. *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001. Print.