

## CONVERGING SPECTRES OF AN OTHER WITHIN Race and Gender in Prewar Afro-German History

by Tina M. Campt

In his early, seminal volume on the figure of the Black in German culture, *On Blackness Without Blacks*, Sander Gilman argued that the uniqueness of the German conception of blackness lay in its paradoxical development in the virtual absence of a black presence. Gilman maintained that in Germany, the image of blackness developed independently of an "external reality," composed rather of "elements taken from external traditions and altered to fit certain needs of a radically different culture." He described this image as "an accretion of borrowings which were altered and shaped to create patterns into which these projections were cast." According to Gilman, this "mirage of blackness" defined German responses to Blacks when the latter were eventually confronted "in reality" (*On Blackness* xi).<sup>1</sup> Yet as more recent analyses of German colonial history and the history of Blacks in Germany have demonstrated, German conceptions of blackness and Black Germans in particular have been shaped in profound ways by a series of encounters with Blacks both domestically and in its former colonial territories.<sup>2</sup> As part of this emerging body of literature, this essay attempts to add an important historical dimension to our understanding of contemporary articulations of Black German identity and subjectivity through an examination of some of the early discourses of blackness enunciated in Germany society. These discourses would have a lingering influence on later attempts by the Black German community to construct the terms of their identification as Black people as the implicit and explicit negation against which they were often forced to define themselves.

In the early 20th century, the status of Germany's mixed-race Black citizens was contested and constructed in public and political discourse as a threat to the survival of the German nation. By extension, the imagined danger posed by this spectre was expressed in Germany as a sense of racial endangerment seen to have dire consequences for the future of the white race. Like many nationalist discourses, it too invoked the need for a defensive mobilization and unification against an internal enemy constituted along complexly gendered lines of racial difference. My analysis explores how Germany's response to its Afro-German population in the last quarter of the 19th century constituted this group as a dangerous spectre. Focusing on two of the most important historical events in the formation of the public discourse on Afro-Germans, it engages how the threat posed by this spectre was mobilized with particularly volatile effects. I examine how the threat of miscegenation was articulated through a discourse of racial endangerment in the German colonies in the debates

on the status of racially mixed marriages and the Afro-German progeny of these relationships. I then link this discourse with its later resonances in the 1919–22 campaign protesting the use of French African troops in the occupation of the Rhineland. The following pages unpack the ways in which racialized discourses of purity and pollution constructed Black Germans as a threat to the German body politic, and trace the trajectory of what I term, “echoing spectres of racial mixture”—for the spectre of racial mixture associated with the Afro-German population can be seen to have “echoed” or recurred repeatedly in German history.<sup>3</sup>

As one of the key events in the history of the Black German community, the use of African colonial troops by the French in the occupation of the Rhineland between 1917 and 1919 was important not only as a site of confrontation between myth and reality or what Gilman describes as “the first major confrontation between the German image of blackness and the reality of the Black” (*On Blackness* xii). It is also both a historiographical and discursive location that witnessed the emergence of a “figure” of the Black which synthesized and rearticulated many of the images of Blacks and blackness that had developed in the preceding centuries. The “Rhineland Bastard,” a term coined during the 1919–1922 newspaper campaign against the occupation, is a trope that came to embody the children fathered by French African colonial soldiers. These mixed race children were seen as a complex representation of the manifold tensions of the occupation. The Rhineland campaign plays a pivotal role in the history of the Black German community because it articulated the central elements of a spectre of imagined danger of racial mixture that can be found in German public discourse both before and after the First World War. Indeed, the discourse on Blacks and Black Germans enunciated during this campaign represents an important turning point, when public discussions of the implications of Blacks and Black Germans shifted from a focus on external concerns (i.e., issues of social administration and the regulation of contact among Germans and Blacks abroad) to internal ones (specifically, the presence of and confrontation with a black population on German soil).

Unlike the stereotypes that preceded it, the Rhineland Bastard is the first representation of a *domestic*, German-born black “native.” Contrary to Gilman’s “mirage of blackness,” this trope emerged simultaneously with the people it represented and eventually would eclipse as a particularly imposing threat posed from *within* the boundaries of the German nation. Notwithstanding the ideological shift initiated by this newer incarnation of the German image of the Black, the significance of the discursive link between the Rhineland Bastard and the pre-war constructions of race, blackness, and racial mixture that historically preceded it should not be underestimated. It is these discourses that in many ways enabled this figure’s emergence. The trope of the Rhineland Bastard resonates and at the same time rearticulates both essential scientific constructions of race and racial mixture and colonial conceptions of the social and political consequences of racial mixture that were historically seen to pose such a dire threat. Reading the discourse of this campaign in relation to its historical antecedent, the 1912 Reichstag debates on mixed marriages in the German colonies, reveals important resonances between these two events, as sites where the danger posed by racial mixture became the focus of political agitation.

Examining the ways in which these early discourses constituted Afro-Germans as a threat to the German nation helps us to understand how and why these discursive constructions provided fertile soil for the actions and ideologies of subsequent regimes. When National Socialism overturned the young Weimar Republic, the public discourse that had constituted the Black children of the Rhineland as a racialized threat to the purity of the German national body made them an available target for persecution in the Third Reich. Indeed much of the groundwork had been laid as early as 1927, when the first official calls were made for the sterilization of the Black children of the occupation.<sup>4</sup> Because of their illegitimate status, their existence had been documented through their registration with social welfare organizations which legally served as guardians for children born out of wedlock. The registration of these children later proved both convenient and invaluable to the Gestapo in their secret program to sterilize the Black children of the Rhineland. In the end, 385 of an estimated 600–800 mixed race children were sterilized (Bock 354).<sup>5</sup>

Rather than structuring this essay as a linear, chronological narrative, my analysis takes the form of a backward glance at the historical events it presents. It takes this approach in order to emphasize that despite the importance of the connections between these discourses, the links between the historical periods examined here should not be viewed as cumulative or inevitable in their relation. Nor should the developments documented with regard to the public discourse and response to Black Germans be read as necessarily culminating in the sterilization of Black Germans by the Nazis. On the contrary, my aim is to paint a far more complex picture. Resisting a convenient or predictable teleology of Nazi persecution, I focus instead on a more nuanced notion of historical “echoes” and “spectres.” For what is most remarkable about the relationship between discussions about and discourse on Black Germans in the colonies, following the First World War, and in the Third Reich are the discursive “echoes” that recurred in each context. These echoes of a dangerous spectre posed by a Black German population link the very different historical events of each of these periods and demonstrate the resilience of the perceived threat of racial mixture throughout. At the same time, it shows how the discourse of nation was and remains an inherently gendered and racialized discourse that relies on gender and race to incite and sustain its efficacy. Overdetermining the links between these events and epochs would be a mistake that denies and occludes the complicated ways that race and gender have worked together historically with powerful social and political effects. This article attempts to move in a different direction by connecting and historicizing the discourses that incited and enabled these historical events, not necessarily the events themselves. In this way, placing the history of Black Germans in the Third Reich in the context of Germany’s colonial legacy and the scientific discourses of race that played such a significant role therein underlines continuities in how Black Germans were constituted as particular kinds of raced subjects. More importantly, this analytic structure highlights important continuities in the stakes and salience of a conception of national purity as racial purity.

In the campaign protesting the use of Black occupation troops, at least four powerful discourses converged to create this early and perhaps most enduring image of a Black German population. The first of these was a scientific discourse of race as

a biologically immutable category of human difference. The authority of this essential notion of race lies in its value as a means of differentiating among individuals and the social and political implications these distinctions were imputed to have. It was what was seen as the significant genetic consequences of racial mixture postulated in the work of geneticists and eugenicists at the turn of the century that constitutes a second, particularly potent discourse in these debates. The threat racial mixture was seen to pose within these essential discourses of race was articulated as a form of endangerment and violation of the boundaries that constituted German national identity. In Imperial Germany, these discourses came together with a third, equally compelling colonial discourse on racial mixture, specifically the legacy of prewar debates on mixed marriage in the German colonies. Together, they had a significant impact in shaping German responses to the presence of a Black population in their midst before, during and after the First World War. Finally, a discourse of German victimhood combined with these discourses of race in the Rhineland protest campaign to transform German defeat into a larger narrative of German victimhood. In this narrative, Germany was only the first and most innocent victim of a racial conspiracy/pollution that would ultimately unite it in victimhood with its former enemies—in the process, recasting defeat as heroic martyrdom. It was through these discourses that German responses to Blacks and Afro-Germans were articulated, and in their terms that Black Germans came to take on meaning.

In each of these discourses we find historical echoes and resonances of a recurring “spectre” which in each context figured racial mixture as an imagined threat to the German nation, German identity and by implication, to the purity and survival of the white race. In the first case, the spectre was a genetic one that transmitted the negative traits of an “inferior race” to contaminate and degrade the genetic pool of the pure and thus superior white race. In the second case, it was the spectre of a mixed race colonial citizen who, through his claim to the rights of legitimate political subjecthood, posed a threat to the German body politic through the prospect of racial parity symbolized by a mixed race, Black German citizen. In the post-WWI occupation, this spectre returned in the form of the Rhineland Bastard as a threat to both the purity of the German nation and its post-colonial balance of power in the former colonies—a threat posed from within the boundaries of the Reich itself. Eventually, in the Third Reich the echoes of this imagined danger would come together with the vision of a National Socialist racial state. The sterilization of members of this group of Afro-German children ultimately became the most concrete response to their embodiment of the fantastic threat to the purity of the Aryan race.

### **Resonances of Discourses Past . . . : Essential Discourses of Racial Mixture**

On April 23, 1920, responding to an article by Edmund Dene Morel in the *Daily Herald*, six Reichstag delegates petitioned the German government for an inquiry into the rapes and assaults allegedly committed by Black soldiers on civilians in the occupied territory. The language of their charges linked alleged rape incidents to the

trampling (*zertreten*) of German national honor and dignity and further to the purity of the white race. In this way, what were initially formulated as racial objections to a black military presence in the Rhineland were refounded on the basis of the purported sexual misconduct perpetrated by these soldiers, in addition to the most serious consequence associated with this uncontained sexual menace: miscegenation. This coupling of Black sexuality with the threat of interracial sex and miscegenation was a primary element around which the discourse of the campaign against the post-WWI Black occupation troops was structured.

Yet the images of Blacks and Africans used in this period to represent the threat posed by Black occupation troops in the Rhineland campaign and out of which the trope of the Rhineland Bastard would eventually emerge cannot be said to have originated in the Weimar Republic. In fact, they had a much longer history that considerably predates the contentious debates and diplomatic rhetoric of the post-World War I period. These representations are, first and foremost, products of a post-Enlightenment, scientific discourse on race which defined race as essence, locating its origins and meaning in nature and biology. Indeed, the notion of race as a biological human trait has been the focus of scientific research for centuries. Yet the aim of this research has never been limited to the strictly “scientific” goal of understanding the biological basis of race. More often, and perhaps more importantly, it has also sought to explain the meaning of race for society as a whole, and its implications for human interaction in particular.

Racial mixture played an important role in late-19th- and early 20th-century scientific efforts to define and interpret the significance of race and racial difference. For the innate or inherited differences thought to exist between the races did not in and of themselves necessarily present any problems that could not be remedied through the legislation of interracial social contact. More significantly, racial mixture represented the most problematic outcome of the genetic implications of racial difference, in that it posed the question of what “racial traits” would be passed on to mixed race children, and what long-term implications these individuals and their offspring would have for the future of the race. Hence, at the turn of the century, racial mixture became an important site for scientific inquiries into racial difference, for it was here that scientific laws of heredity (specifically, the applied and adapted theories of Mendel and Darwin, and concrete proof of the pessimistic prognoses of the racial theories of Gobineau)<sup>6</sup> could be put to the test. Paradoxically, people of mixed racial heritage came to be seen as both absolute proof of the untenability of racial theories of heredity, as well as their absolute truth.

Although racial mixture had popularly been seen as a social problem for some time, scientific studies of individuals of mixed racial heritage began shortly before the war to formulate a somewhat different objective. These investigations of racial mixture explicitly aimed at clarifying how physical, psychological and intellectual traits were transmitted genetically among humans. At the same time, their explorations were also intended as scientific investigations of social problems.<sup>7</sup> Most of these studies were conducted in the European colonial territories. The question they sought to answer was to what extent human social and cultural development would be influenced by the resulting biological or genetic effects of racial mixture believed to

accompany modern colonialism, migration and acculturation. The argument explored by these studies was that racial intermixture had not only *physical effects* but more important, had an impact on both the *intellectual capacity* and *psychological constitution* of racial groups. In spite of the fact that these studies did not necessarily assume that racial mixture negatively affected the larger population, many posited social and psychological deficits among mixed race people to be the result of the genetic inadequacy of racial mixture. Echoing the arguments of Gobineau, the predominant view among geneticists at the turn of the century and shortly thereafter was that in the majority of cases racial interbreeding resulted in the "pauperization" of the genetic traits of the "superior" white race.

The earliest, and by all accounts, most influential study of racial mixture was conducted in 1908 by the German scientist Eugen Fischer in what was at that time the German colony of Southwest Africa (currently Namibia) in a town called Rehobot. Fischer studied a population of mixed race people then known as the "Rehoboth Bastards." These were the descendants of white European Boors of Dutch descent and Black women who migrated from the Cape in the late 19th century. Fischer proclaimed his study to be a groundbreaking scientific investigation. He asserted that prior to his own research, anthropologists had focused primarily on the "purest" strains of racial groups, whereas little was known about racially mixed groups. Yet it was from these groups that Fischer claimed science could learn the most as it was here that effects of the genetic transmission of racial differences appeared most dramatically and could best be traced.

Fischer's study of Rehoboth made use of the dominant methodological approach to investigating racial difference of the time, interpreting a series of anthropological measurements and categorizations of their physical attributes and reconstructing family genealogies. His conclusions were that Mendelian rules of heredity were in fact applicable to humans and that in this population, there was no evidence of the dominance of one race over the other. He rejected the assertion of sterility or reduced fertility, or a higher incidence of illness among this population, thus also rejecting the assertion of "biological inferiority" of mixed race people. Yet in a chapter on "the psychology of the Rehoboth" (a chapter that lacked any empirical basis), Fischer also remarked on the mental aptitude of the group. Relying on no scientific data whatever, Fischer asserted that the intelligence of many of these individuals is equal to that of their white counterparts among the Boors. Nevertheless, he made the dubious assertion that "culturally" the psychological and intellectual aptitude of these individuals was inferior to that of "pure whites," and for this reason declared any evidence of the equality of whites and mixed race people based on individual cases to be irrelevant. Fisher went on to argue that these German colonial "bastards," like all others, were inferior to whites and because of this, they were in need of "constant supervision."<sup>8</sup>

In both the racial discourse of the Rhineland newspaper campaign and in scientific studies of the genetic implications of race, individuals of mixed race have a special status, for the issue of racial mixture is of particular significance in this context. Here it is important to emphasize that as a marker of difference between individuals, racial difference only becomes an issue of contention with regard to the interaction between

individuals of different races. In this logic (as scientists like Eugen Fischer and Charles Davenport attempted to prove), racial mixture was the ultimate test of racial difference in that it is here that the consequences of racial distinctions would supposedly become apparent. It is for this reason that racial mixture is often constructed as a threat, as the site of the inherent conflict of difference that underlies racial distinctions. Hence, racial mixture has often functioned as a driving force (either implicit or explicit) in discussions of racial difference. As a vehicle with the potential to catalyze such discussions in volatile ways, the combination of essential conceptions of racial mixture with a discourse of racial endangerment offers a powerful tool of political mobilization with often unpredictable results.

### Nation Time/Body Politics—Racing The German National Body

One of the first important sites of public articulation for Germany's response to its Black German population were the public debates in Imperial Germany on the status of Black individuals born of unions between Germans and Africans in Germany's colonial territories. It was in relation to this and the larger issue of interracial marriage in the colonies that scientific notions of race as essence converged with a colonial discourse on racial mixture. In the course of these debates we see the formulation of some of the key features of what became a recurring public discourse on Afro-Germans. Scientific conceptions of the negative genetic consequences of racial mixture were already an element of 19th-century German colonial policies on the issue of "*Rassenmischehe*" or racially mixed marriages between white colonial settlers and indigenous colonial peoples. Only six years before the Rhineland occupation, the Reichstag debates on racially mixed marriages prefigured many of the same arguments and fears voiced later in the newspaper protest campaign.<sup>9</sup>

Although interracial marriage was not illegal under German Imperial law, colonial officials began refusing to register interracial unions in the colonies in 1890. In 1905 Governor von Lindequist issued the first such measure in the form of a decree banning interracial marriages in German South West Africa. His explicit rationale cited what he saw as the dangerous effect of racial mixture on the purity of the white race. As he stated, "Such unions do not preserve, but rather diminish (deteriorate) the race. As a rule the offspring are physically and emotionally weak and unite in themselves the negative traits of both parents." Lindequist's administrative order was followed by similar decrees banning mixed marriages in the German colonies of East Africa in 1906 and Samoa in 1912. The bans were not officially codified as laws sanctioned by the Reichstag, but only decrees issued by colonial governors and a colonial secretary. It was in response to the 1912 Samoan decree that a protest ensued in the Reichstag, prompting delegates to debate the legality of these colonial decrees in light of their conflict with imperial law. But the objections raised in protest of the bans did not focus in any fundamental way on juridical arguments on the question of the precedence of imperial over colonial legislation. Rather, numerous explicitly moral arguments were made both for and against the bans which presented marriages between German

colonists and non-white colonial natives as a threat to sexual morality and existing racial hierarchies of difference.

Despite the virulence of this debate, most historians and even those involved in the debates at the time concede that the bans themselves could never effectively have been enforced. Individuals wishing to marry in contravention to these colonial restrictions needed only to travel to any of the neighboring colonial territories or return to Europe (or for that matter, Germany) to wed, after which their marital status must legally be honored upon their return. But as Lora Wildenthal astutely argues, by restricting the rights of German men to marry and pass on the rights of German citizenship to their wives and children on racial grounds, the bans were an attempt to assert race as a legal category in defining citizenship.<sup>10</sup> Clearly the central issue behind the decrees was that of the citizenship of both indigenous colonial spouses and more importantly, the mixed race children of these unions. What was thought to hang in the balance of the legality of mixed marriages was the status of Blacks as German citizens and a future Black German population with a legitimate claim as German political subjects. Two deputies to colonial governors in Southwest Africa gave the following justification for the bans. The prospect of a racially-mixed, Black German minority with equal status to a white, "racially-pure" German populace was certainly a cause for concern that motivated this change in colonial policy and culminated in the Reichstag debates of 1912.

The native woman, the mixed-blood children produced by both [her and her German husband] and their offspring [become] German citizens and are thereby subject to the laws valid for the Germans here. The male mixed-bloods will be liable for military service, capable of holding public offices, and will partake of the right to vote to be established sometime in the future, as well as other rights tied to citizenship. These consequences are of a high degree of seriousness.[ . . . ] Not only is the preservation of the purity of the German race and of German civilization here very substantially impaired because of them, but also the white man's position of power is altogether endangered. (Wildenthal, "Race" 267)

This group of mixed race Germans became a source of alarm in that their presence triggered expressions of racial endangerment that tapped into both scientific discourses on the hereditary consequences of racial mixture and popular beliefs in their negative impact on the race, and thus raised the question of the implications for the future of the German (and/or white) race. The legalization of unions between white German colonists and non-white indigenous colonials was deemed problematic in that it undermined racial assumptions of purity with regard to citizenship, which until then had served as one of the clearest and most fundamental boundaries delineating German national identity. Granting non-white colonial spouses and their mixed race children the status of German citizenship symbolically represented an entry into the German national body which threatened to dissolve the boundaries of racial difference around and in relation to which Germanness was intrinsically



constituted. Through the invocation of an imagined spectre of racial contamination associated with the negative consequences of racial mixture, the issue of mixed marriages evolved into an even more volatile issue. More than a “problem” it was seen as a *threat* both to the fragile colonial balance of power and to domestic politics within the Reich.

The official Reichstag discussion of colonial mixed marriages began in May 1912, when Colonial Secretary Solf was one of the first speakers arguing in favor of parliamentary support of the colonial bans. Using the violent backlash against emancipated Blacks in the United States as a cautionary example of racial parity gone awry (American anti-miscegenation laws had served as a model in the conception of the mixed marriage bans), Solf appealed to the emotions of the representatives, urging them to allow themselves to be led by their “instincts.” As a strategic attempt to mobilize and exploit the emotional potential of this issue, Solf repeatedly invoked the figure of a racially mixed child as a spectre which threatened the purity and sanctity of any German family: “You send your sons to the colonies: do you want them to return with wooly-haired [black] grandchildren?” He continued to raise the stakes on this issue, emphasizing the particular danger racial mixture posed to (white) German women. Here the German national body is a raced body made vulnerable through the female body as the conduit of racial pollution:

Do you want these girls [those sent by the Colonial Society (deutschen Kolonialgesellschaft)] to return with Herreros, Hot-tentots and bastards? [. . .] Consider these facts, consider them according to your instincts as Germans and as white men! The entire German nation will thank you, if you consider nothing else than this: we are Germans, we are white and we want to stay white.[. . .] Do you want our race to be bastardized? (Essner 509)

The combination of scientific and colonial discourses of racial purity which converged on the issue of mixed marriages was also constructed around a gendered and sexualized discourse which, as Wildenthal contends, “counterposed men’s rights to German racial purity.” Foreshadowing what would later recur in the protest campaign against the Black occupation troops, racial mixture was an imagined danger that mobilized racial and sexual fears in the form of *racial parity*—a spectre whose power lay in the threat it posed to white men’s position of power. Here gender played an integral role on both sides of the debate, where women were engaged as both primary and secondary victims of this threat. On the one hand, opponents and supporters of the bans relied on gendered arguments for the protection of native women. Whereas Representative Ledebour, for example, argued that the bans allowed for the protection of indigenous women from the exploitation of white settler men in search of cheap housekeepers, cooks and concubines, the colonial secretary, Solf, also argued that because of the shortage of native women, they should be protected from white male colonists’ attempts to take them away from their men. On the other hand, opponents of the ban offered a complexly gendered argument that combined a defense of male marital and sexual privilege with a vision of the civilizing

mission of a (superior) white German colonialist as a *Kulturträger* ["bearers of culture"] among black inferiors. For example, Liberal Representative Richthofen emphasized that the objective of German colonial politics was to bring a "higher culture" to the natives "[i]n order to educate ['civilize'] them to a higher sensibility" [(um) sie zu einer höheren Lebensauffassung erziehen zu können]. Toward this end, both "appropriate bearers of culture" [geeignete Kulturträger] and the proper distance between him and his "civilizing object" [Erziehungsobjekt] were necessary. Here German women were constructed as a necessary bulwark ensuring this distance and the maintenance of this important cultural—read racial—boundary.

Furthermore, German women saw themselves as important protectors of the purity of the German nation/ "race."<sup>11</sup> Their self-proclaimed mission in the colonies was based in part on a notion of white female bodies as barriers to the potential pollution of the German race via miscegenation. Indeed, the availability of white female bodies offered what was seen as an important alternative to the dangerous temptations of non-white, indigenous female sexuality. Indigenous women's bodies were figured as vessels and conduits for transporting pollution and contamination into the German national body. It was the sexual lures they presented to German male colonists that were seen to produce the mixed race progeny which destabilized the equation of Germanness with whiteness and violated the imaginary boundary separating the German national body—a body constituted as pure and white—from the Others from which it attempted to distinguish itself.

Contrary to the vehement opposition and reservations voiced against the ban on both sides of the discussion, the result of these heated debates was the passage of a resolution affirming the legality of colonial mixed marriages, along with a second resolution aimed at strengthening the influence of the Reichstag in colonial legislative affairs. In spite of the fact that the legality of mixed marriages was upheld, racial mixture continued to be viewed with ambivalence and foreboding. Indeed, when confronted with the consequences of mixed marriages in the flesh, the response of German colonial officials was an equally ambivalent reaction to the threat of racial parity these individuals were seen to embody. As Wildenthal's study has shown, the cases of disputed citizenship in the colonies pursued during and after this debate demonstrate that this debate was not resolved with the parliamentary resolutions taken in 1912.<sup>12</sup> Rather, they emphasize the resilience of the gendered and sexualized threat racial mixture was seen to pose to the German body politic—a spectre which would recur shortly thereafter in an even more virulent form. The fears of racial parity articulated in these discussions did indeed return with a vengeance following the war, and in many ways even came to be realized in the scenario presented by African occupation troops and their Black German children.

Throughout these discussions essential, biological notions of racial difference, superiority and hierarchy enunciate a scientific discourse of race that pervades these debates. Though often articulated in the language of "culture" and "civilization," the discussion nevertheless belies the logic of racial purity that was used as a compelling political tool. Here references to "culture" and "civilization" referred to what were viewed as essential differences and immutable traits attributed to skin-color. This elision marks an important tension in these discourses of race and racial difference—

one that dissolves the boundaries between groups of individuals and raises the question of which distinctions between them are considered learned or innate. Yet regardless of what these distinctions are attributed to, they are purported to *matter* nonetheless, with extremely serious implications for those seen to trespass the boundaries of such differentiation, as in the case of racial mixture.

**Imagined Danger Realized:  
Racial Parity, Victimhood and Racialized Body Politics**

In spite of the fact that the legality of mixed marriages was upheld, racial mixture continued to be viewed with ambivalence and foreboding. The fears of racial parity articulated in these discussions return with a vengeance following the First World War, and in many ways even came to be realized in the scenario presented by African occupation troops and their Black German children:

What offends European sensibility in the use of black troops, is not their blackness, but rather the fact that savages are being used to oversee a cultured people. Whether these savages are totally black or dark brown or yellow makes no difference. The prestige of the European culture is in danger. That is what is at stake. And precisely those peoples, those such as England and France who are dependent upon the dominance they exercise over colored peoples, should consider that with the degradation of Germany in the eyes of the colored, they degrade the white race and with this, endanger their own prestige. [ . . . ] Thus the fact remains unchanged, that a cultured people like the French allow another cultured European people to be overseen by savages. Whether these savages are slightly more black or brown or yellow is of no matter. They must feel themselves to be policing a people of the white race. This is what outrages the German people. At the same time, it is the dangerous thing for the white race in general. ("Die Farbigen Truppen im Rheinland," *Die Leibziger T.*, {title unreadable in original} 26 May 1921)<sup>13</sup>

The language of this quotation echoes resoundingly with the fears expressed in the Reichstag debates of the threat posed by Blacks and their mixed race offspring. Taking up the issue of the racial/cultural hierarchies raised in these debates, the above article refers to the *Demütigung* or the humiliation Germany was seen to face through the imposition of primitives on a *Kulturvolk*. The dichotomy implicitly set up within this discourse opposed Germans as a white, civilized *Kulturvolk* to Blacks as an uncivilized or primitive *Naturvolk* characterized by savagery, unbridled passions, appetites and instincts. As earlier, what was seen to be at stake in the interracial contact that transpired through the use of Black troops in the postwar occupation was the violation of the boundary which implicitly divides the *Kulturträger* [bearer of culture]

from his *Erziehungsobjekt* (his so-called “civilizing object”)—a boundary which forms one of the ideological cornerstones of the colonial hierarchy. The use of Black troops as a force of occupation in Germany in this way both reversed this relation and transgressed this sacred boundary, while at the same time, the language used to articulate this threat naturalized “culture” as an essential attribute, access to which is necessarily mediated by race.

The significance of the presence of these “primitives” in Europe was that this contact would have *essential, genetic* implications for the white race; Germans could not simply “unlearn” civility and culture. Rather, the prospect of miscegenation was tantamount to the ruin of the race, for the consequence of miscegenation was the pollution of white German genetic stock. Here the German nation is constructed as a body vulnerable to contamination through the introduction of black troops within its national boundaries. This violation of its boundaries posed a fundamental danger to its existence, for the German body seems only able to exist in a pure form. Violation/contamination by the Black thus represents its essential negation. In this way, the humiliation decried in this and numerous other articles in the campaign articulates an injury inflicted upon a wounded German national body. It is an injury that stands at the beginning of a larger continuum. As a racial injury inflicted by the victorious powers on a vanquished German state, it is only the first step in a process of postwar victimization.

The article cited above is one example of the accusation frequently leveled against the victorious powers of their participation in the *Schändung* or desecration of the white race. This charge aimed not only at compromising France and Britain’s position as victorious powers, but also at discrediting their status as colonial powers inasmuch as this status is predicated on the racial hierarchy that such *Rassenschande* (racial desecration) would destroy. The discrediting of France and Britain as colonial powers in turn legitimated Germany’s own status through its defense of the racial hierarchy on which it was based—this time and most dangerously, within Europe itself. The language of this excerpt is a typical example of a strategic deployment of skin color as essentialized “culture” that occurs frequently in the articles of the campaign. In this article, as in numerous others published during this campaign, skin-color is rhetorically rejected as playing a role in the protests against the Black troops, while at the same time, race/racial inferiority (Blacks as a savage race) is emphasized as the primary danger presented by the use of these troops in the occupation. Skin-color is equated with culture, thus eliding racial difference and level of “civilization.”

The articles in the newspaper campaign against the Black troops illustrate that Germany’s defeat in WWI was experienced not only with a sense of loss and humiliation; it was also articulated as a threat. Here, as was the case less than a decade earlier in the mixed marriage debates, the threat which served as the implicit and explicit subtext of this campaign was the perceived threat of racial parity. Racial parity was the danger perceived to result from Germany’s loss of the war, and with which Germans were confronted in several areas including the military and, to a certain extent, German society itself. In the military, the use of Black colonial troops by other European countries ostensibly set Blacks on an equal level with whites. Although Germany did not use colonial troops during the First World War, it had in

fact considered this as an option. France's use of Blacks alongside white troops in the occupation forces presented Germany with a superficial form of racial parity which it had never before encountered, neither in the colonies, nor in the military, nor in German society as a whole:

The main danger in the use of colored troops in the heart of Europe lies far more in the systematic awakening and cultivation of their sense of power over the white race. . . . The French have provided amply for the military training of the Blacks through their use of them in the war and as occupation forces. But, drunk with their victory, the French military still refuse to see the terrible danger. Not long ago Senegalese negroes were exuberantly celebrated shortly before their transfer to Paris as the 'Heroes of Dirmuiden, the Marne, the Dardanelles and other places where one [had to hang on] {word unreadable in the original} at all costs' . . . It is in this way that the feeling of power of the colored race against the whites is only strengthened by the French military. ("Die Geister, die ich rief . . .': Die Gefahr der farbigen Besatzungstruppen für Europa," *Die Weser Zeitung*, 23 July 1921)

Perhaps more significantly, racial parity was also perceived as a threat to German society itself. Again, the threat of racial parity was articulated as a gendered, sexual threat to the German body politic. Unlike in the mixed marriage debate where white women figured as necessary barriers to interracial sexual pollution/contamination, in the Rhineland campaign, the white female body became a dangerously porous conduit of the violation of this boundary. In several articles the white German woman was presented as the channel of this threat, portrayed as both a whore and a victim and, as such, as both an active and passive conduit of Black male sexuality. The latter, in turn, was demonized as, among other things, infectious, instinctual, uncivilized and most notably, insatiable and uncontrollable. At the same time, Black men were also seen as irresistible seducers of white women, who were supposedly unable to resist their exotic colonial desire for Black male sexuality. The access of Blacks to white female bodies via the use of Black troops in the occupation represented another form of racial parity; that is, a sexual equality between Black and white men in relation to (or, perhaps, in the possession of) white women. This, in turn, was articulated in the campaign against the Black troops as a threat to the German man:

The white woman has always had a visibly privileged position among Europeans. For this reason the negro has also shown her for the most part, absolute respect and submissive obedience. But the white woman was also something different to him; something beyond the term 'Weib'. She was something unreachable to him; something he certainly only seldom consciously desired. [ . . . ] Now the negro, who inhabits Africa and parts of the rest of the world in countless millions and generally stands on a lower rung of the evolutionary ladder, is not only being brought to Europe, not only being used in battle in a white

country; he is also systematically being trained to desire that which was formerly unreachable for him—the white woman! He is being urged and driven to besmirch defenseless women and girls with his tuberculous and syphilitic stench, wrench them into his stinking apish arms and abuse them in the most unthinkable ways! He is being taught that [ . . . ] he can do anything his animal instincts even remotely demand, without the slightest restraint, he even finds support for this from the ‘victors’. (“Die Schwarze Schmach,” *Hamburger Nachrichten*, 30 July 1921)

In this excerpt, the white female body again forms the conduit of the racial pollution that endangers the German body politic. It is unbridled Black male sexuality—essential in its insatiability, and yet socially malleable in its ability to discern between appropriate and inappropriate objects of desire—that is the perpetrator of this act of national pollution. The violation of this most fundamental of boundaries presented this sexualized form of racial parity as perhaps the most intolerable threat to the German nation, that was seen as a rallying point for the German people and eventually other whites. Ultimately racial parity posed the most significant danger to white German men in the threat it posed to their masculinity. This is also true of the military, where *Wehrhaftigkeit*, the ability to perform military service and protect one’s country and property, has long been regarded as a primary masculine attribute. Here the threat posed by racial parity was the emasculation of the white German male. In the logic of national body politics, it appears that this masculine potency could only be maintained through inequality:

But the ‘Black Horror is—how long must one scream it into the ears of a deaf world’—not only a disgrace for Germany. It is much more. It represents the desecration of white culture in general. At the same time, it means the beginning of the end of the supremacy of the white man. (“Völker Europas . . . !” *Grenzland Korrespondent*, 24 April 1922)

The discourse on the Black troops in the 1919–1923 newspaper campaign can in many ways be read as an attempt to recover Germany’s pre-war “Great Power” status. This involved the displacement and/or projection of the fears aroused by the changes occurring in post-war German society onto another surface. The Black occupation troops were one such surface, and the threat of racial parity served as a catalyst in this process. However, the ultimate result of the displacement of German national anxieties onto the Black troops was the *racialization* of the post-war situation: German society attempted to regain its pre-war status by affirming its racial superiority to Blacks and specifically the Black troops. This was achieved through the extension or generalization of the problem of a Black presence in Germany, and the exaggeration of the perceived threat of racial parity into a crisis which threatened all Europeans and the white race in general. This process of racialization is also part of a dynamic that strategically transformed the presence of a Black force of occupation in Germany into

the fiction of an all-encompassing racial threat to civilization. Here, the merging of fiction and reality was intended to have strategic political consequences—namely, the potential and much hoped for revision of the post-war settlement along racial lines. The most dubious effect of this process was the way in which this racialized discourse succeeded in presenting the Black troops as a common “enemy” of all white nations, against whom they should unite and overcome their differences. The extension of the threat posed by the Black troops to this more encompassing formulation created a point of identification between Germany and its former European adversaries via the threat to racial purity, i.e., “whiteness.” This, in turn, led to a defensive closing of ranks among whites against an alleged threat to the white race:

Only too late will they realize that they have conjured up a catastrophe for the whole of Europe through the use of colored troops in the Rhineland. All hope rests on the remaining European states and America. Hopefully the feeling of solidarity among the white race will break out in time to effectively meet the rising African threat. (“Völker Europas . . . !” *Grenzland Korrespondent*, 24 April 1922)

In addition to creating a racially inferior “Black enemy,” the discourse of the newspaper campaign simultaneously constructed a position of racial superiority for the white German counterpart to this figure, a scenario which might be described as follows: The racially inferior Black enemy poses a threat which must be controlled and contained. The racially superior white German champions this moral campaign of containment. The effect of this is the re-establishment of the old colonial hierarchy at the ideological level. Through a racialized discourse in which the use of Black troops in the postwar occupation was constructed as a dangerous attack on the established racial order, Germany is constituted as the victim of a racial conspiracy. Its defense of the racial hierarchy in the discourse of the campaign effectively makes it the last protector of the white race. In this way, its victimization is recast as a heroic sacrifice (or martyrdom) for the race.

In this trajectory, the Afro-German children of the Black occupation troops were the realization of the fears expressed in the propaganda campaign, the concrete embodiment of racial parity and post-war German defeat and humiliation. Similarly as in the *Mischehe* debates, these children were used provocatively as a shock tactic aimed at evoking outrage and repulsion and creating a sense of endangerment caused by deploying Black troops in Europe. The message behind this strategy was that the use of Black troops would have long-term repercussions for Germany, or more explicitly, for the “German race.” Here the public statements of one of the most prominent speakers involved in the campaign, Ray Beveridge, are of particular significance.

One highly publicized example of Beveridge’s rhetoric is her much-publicized speech given at a protest rally in Munich on 22 February 1921. At the rally, Beveridge presented two “little martyrs” of the occupation to the audience: an undernourished and underdeveloped white German child, said to be the victim of the Allied “hunger

blockade," and a Black German child described as a "living and unfortunate witnesses to the black disgrace and white shame" [*lebendigen und unglücklichen Zeugen Schwarzer Schmach und weißer Schande*]. Beveridge's speech, which was published repeatedly in newspapers throughout Germany, quite literally cast these "little Bastards" as symbols of German defeat and the impending threat to the purity of the German race, in that the former (the white child) was a symbol of defeat, whereas the latter (the Black German child) was a symbol of both defeat and the imagined threat to racial purity. As part of the deployment of the Rhineland Bastard, the children of Black soldiers were also depicted as the carriers of the infectious diseases of their fathers, in particular sexually transmitted diseases. Sexuality played a crucial role in the campaign against the Black troops as it was the representation of the Black soldiers as a *sexual* threat which provoked the most vehement popular reaction. Interracial sex was seen as a mode of contamination that represented the ultimate rape of the German body—a body both raced as white, and gendered as a virginal female whose purity is lost through the violation of the Black. Here, racial discourses were permeated by and combined with discourses of gender and sexuality. Whenever the issue of race was raised, it was immediately and invariably posed in relation to a sexual threat; for example, essential notions of biological difference and stereotyped ideas of the exaggerated sexual passions of Blacks were combined with the threat of the sexual transmission of infectious diseases. This in turn was exacerbated by the excessive sexual appetites of Blacks and their supposed lack of capacity to control them, as well as the powerful allure they were also thought to have for white women.

The Black German children of these soldiers were seen as a lasting legacy of the occupation, while their mixed racial heritage and illegitimate birth posed both a moral and biological threat to the chastity and purity of the German "race." The danger they posed surpassed that of the Black troops, for as German citizens whose presence in the country was in no way temporary, the children presented a more far-reaching threat. In the articles written in this period, this danger is formulated as *Mulattisierung* or the "mulattoization" of the German race—a foreboding warning that, should this situation be allowed to continue, "one need not wonder if, in a few years, there are more half-breeds than whites walking around; if sacred German motherhood has become a myth and the German woman, a black whore."

The above passage offers a vivid example of how scientific discourses on race permeated the 1919–1922 newspaper campaign. Read together with the article excerpts cited above, the Rhineland protest campaign demonstrates a powerful convergence of scientific and colonial discourses on race and racial mixture with a postwar discourse of German victimhood. Ray Beveridge's comments in particular synthesize some of the most important resonances between the discourse of the campaign and the earlier debates of racial mixture and mixed marriages: among others, the deployment of gender (via the threat to women of Black sexuality and women's supposed role in the campaign against the use of the Black occupation troops); the deployment of race and sexuality (through the construction of Black men as uncivilized savages, infectious and sexually depraved); and, in the case of the postwar protests, the deployment of the figure of the Rhineland Bastard as a threat to the purity of the "German race."



## Conclusion

As a recurring spectre of racial mixture, the images of Blacks and Afro-Germans constructed in the post-WWI campaign against the Black troops resonate and at the same time rearticulate both essential scientific discourses of race and racial mixture and colonial conceptions of the social and political consequences that racial mixture was seen to pose to the German nation. The concept of the nation that structured and sustained each of these discourses was one that, in many ways, took the body as its model—a model in which bodily boundaries and their defense against violation and contamination functioned as the bedrock of social order and cohesion.

In the early discourses that interpolated Black Germans in German society, the raced bodies of these individuals were viewed as having dire consequences for the German nation through the threat they were thought to pose to German identity and who was entitled to lay claim to this category. This essay has sought to examine some of the implications of the repeated instances in Germany during the first part of this century, of race being conceived as essence and German national and cultural identity were also articulated as having an essential racial substance. In the discourses of race that came together in each of these historical contexts, both Black people and the German nation were naturalized as bodies whose substance was articulated to have very specific forms of meaning that were seen as one basis for regulating social interaction in German society. On the one hand, Germanness was equated with purity and superiority, while racial mixture represented dangerous forms of impurity, pollution and inferiority. The mixed-marriage debates in the colonies and the discussions of how to deal with the Black German children of the post-WWI occupation were concrete attempts to legislate and negotiate this assumed substance and the implications its meaning was perceived to have for the German nation. On the other hand, this racialized national discourse was simultaneously a gendered one whose mobilizing effect were catalyzed by its invocation of a sexualized danger to the purity of the nation. The threat of racial endangerment inherently (en)gendered the German nation as a vulnerable female body open to the seduction of violation by the Black and thus in dire need of protection.

In the discourse that emerged from the 1912 *Mischehe* debate and in the post-WWI protests against Black occupation troops, Black Germans represented a deeply threatening spectre of racial mixture—one that endangered German national identity through the perils of racial parity. Unlike in the debates preceding the First World War, in the discourse of the newspaper protest campaign this spectre was portrayed as a racial injury inflicted on Germany by the victorious allies. This injury functioned as both the source of Germany's victimization and, at the same time, elevated its status as such through a heroic glorification of victimhood as racial martyrdom. Similar to other equally compelling discursive configurations of enemies and victims in German history, it is important to recognize the strategic dimensions of the post-World War I discourse of victimhood, and the ways in which it too functioned as what Omer Bartov has described as a "national adhesive."<sup>14</sup> The presence of a Black German population was similarly used with strategic intent in opposition to the Versailles settlement. Here too metaphors of victimhood and endangerment also served as a

form of national adhesive that offered a source of unity and identification in this period of postwar national crisis.

#### NOTES

This essay is based in part on research funded by grants from the American Association of University Women, the Social Science Research Council, the Volkswagen Foundation and the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD). It builds on and greatly expands arguments presented in one section of my article, "Blacks, Germans and the Politics of Imperialist Imagination, 1920–1960," co-authored with Pascal Grosse and Yara-Colette Lemke Muniz de Faria and published in *The Imperialist Imagination: German Colonialism and Its Legacy*. I am indebted to the Resident Fellows Program of the Center for German and European Studies at Georgetown University, in particular Roger Chickering and Jeffery Peck, whose generous support and intellectual exchange allowed me the opportunity to undertake the substantial revisions that resulted in the production of this essay. For a more extensive discussion of the issues raised in this article, see my forthcoming book, *Other Germans: Race, Gender and Memory in Afro-Germans Narratives of the Third Reich*.

1. See also Gilman's later writings on Blacks in German culture in *Difference and Pathology* and "Black Bodies, White Bodies: Toward an Iconography of Female Sexuality in Late Nineteenth-Century Art."
2. See most notably the essays published in *The Imperialist Imagination: German Colonialism and Its Legacy*.
3. My discussion of spectres of racial danger in this essay in some ways might be read as a (somewhat oblique) historical counterpoint to the fascinating arguments of Avery Gordon in her highly acclaimed monograph, *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination*. However, the specificity of my own analytic project and disciplinary vantage point precludes direct comparison with or an extensive discussion of her extremely compelling points in this article.
4. In 1927, a local official in the Pfalz, Hans Jolas, wrote to the Bavarian Minister of Health Sperr regarding what he described as the growing concern in the province about the danger posed by the presence of these Black German children who would soon be coming of age. He asked the minister to investigate what measures might be taken to secure and protect the purity of the race in the region from this emerging threat. Jolas suggested sterilization as a possible solution to this problem, though he acknowledged that such measures were illegal according to existing law. Jolas' request was denied by the Bavarian ministry. In his response, Sperr emphasized the fact that the ministry recognized the "serious racial danger" presented by the procreative potential of these Black German children. Yet he affirmed that there was to date no legal basis on which to carry out such sterilizations. As German citizens (German citizenship followed along maternal lines of parentage) the children could also not be deported—a consideration also discussed within the ministry. Moreover, such an undertaking would be hindered by the fact that few mothers would agree to it. A further consideration was its potentially negative effects on domestic and foreign policy. Yet what is most salient about these discussions is the fact that, as was also the case earlier in the colonies as well as later in the Third Reich, these discussions revolved around the protection of the purity of the race from the dangers of "colored blood." See Reiner Pommerin's "Sterilisierung der Rheinlandbastarde": *Das Schicksal einer farbigen deutschen Minderheit, 1918–1937* (30).
5. See also Pommerin and Georg Lilienthal's "'Rheinlandbastarde', Rassenhygiene und das Problem der rassenideologischen Kontinuität."
6. Here I must acknowledge a cogent point suggested to me by my co-editor, Michelle Maria Wright. Although Gobineau's *Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines* ("Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races," the first secular argument for racial hierarchization) became a popular reference for a wide variety of late 19th-century and 20th-century white supremacist movements, the *Essai* is far from consistent in its argument. While Gobineau's thesis asserts, on the one hand, that civilizations collapse because of miscegenation when inferior blood pollutes that of the superior race, elsewhere in the "Essay" he argues that a civilization cannot become a great artistic culture, nor its people adequately vigorous *without* intermixture, specifically mixing with Blacks. This is less surprising if one considers, as Michael Biddiss has noted, that the ultimate goal of the *Essai* was to prove that French civilization would collapse if power were

not returned to the aristocracy whom, he maintained, were racially distinct from the middle class and peasant class. At one point in the *Essai*, Gobineau angrily reminds his readers that he is well aware that an African chieftain is easily superior to the French peasant or even the French bourgeoisie. See Arthur comte de Gobineau's *Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines* and Michael Biddiss's *Father of Racist Ideology: The Social and Political Thought of Count Gobineau*.

7. For a more extensive discussion of these and other studies of racial mixture, see Tina Campt and Pascal Grosse's "Mischlingskinder in Nachkriegsdeutschland: Zum Verhältnis von Psychologie, Anthropologie und Gesellschaftspolitik nach 1945" and Grosse's "Kolonialismus und das Problem der 'Rassenmischung' in Deutschland: Zur Geschichte der anthropologischen Psychologie 1920–1940."
8. On the other side of the Atlantic, a second study of racial mixture was conducted during the First World War by one of the United States' leading eugenic scientists Charles Benedict Davenport. Davenport's primary concern was in the potentially negative results of racial mixture. Concurring with Fischer's study, Davenport asserted that the most important effect of these "mixtures" was not physical, but rather *psychological*. Published in 1917, the study used the same methodology as Fischer's: anthropometric measurements and family genealogies. Davenport's study provided scientifically sophisticated arguments for much older claims about the psyche of the mulatto. He argued that mulattoes combined "an ambition and push . . . with intellectual inadequacy which makes the unhappy hybrid dissatisfied with his lot and a nuisance to others." Ambition was an attribute assumed to have come from the white parent and inadequacy from the black. Davenport concluded that miscegenation necessarily meant disharmony and that a "hybridized" people were inevitably badly put together, dissatisfied, and ineffective. See William Tucker's *The Science and Politics of Racial Research*. At least nine subsequent studies on racial mixture were conducted between 1921 and 1927 by German, American, Norwegian, Dutch and Chinese scientists. See also Campt and Grosse (51–58) and Annegret Ehmänn's "From Colonial Racism to Nazi Population Policy: The Role of the So-Called Mischlinge."
9. For an extensive discussion of the racial and gendered politics of the mixed marriages debates, see Pascal Grosse's *Kolonialismus, Eugenik und bürgerliche Gesellschaft in Deutschland 1850–1918* and Lora Wildenthal's *German Women for Empire, 1884–1945*.
10. Wildenthal emphasizes that each of these bans was unique among the existing European colonial regimes. More importantly, as she demonstrates, the bans mark the first attempt to introduce explicitly racial definitions into German citizenship law. As she convincingly demonstrates in her article, the National Socialists were the first to successfully codify race formally into law, for until that time, neither the 1913 law, nor its predecessor, the Reich citizenship law of 1870, contained any explicit formulation of racial categories in their interpretation. See Wildenthal's "Race, Gender and Citizenship in the German Colonial Empire" (267) and *German Women for Empire, 1884–1945* (85).
11. Wildenthal's 2001 study *German Women for Empire, 1884–1945* offers a comprehensive and detailed analysis of the manifold forms through which German women utilized and engaged the discourse of womanhood in strategic ways to achieve a number of different feminist and political ends.
12. See Wildenthal's "Race, Gender and Citizenship in the German Colonial Empire" and *German Women for Empire, 1884–1945*.
13. All of the newspaper articles cited in this article were taken from the Bundesarchiv, Potsdam, Germany, Records of the Reichskommissar für die besetzten rheinischen Gebiete, Abteilung I/1755, signature no. 1602. These files contain clippings from 1920–1922 from German newspapers on the Black occupation troops.
14. See Omer Bartov's masterful interpretation of the power of the discourse of victims and enemies in the constitution of German national identity in "Defining Enemies, Making Victims: Germans, Jews, and the Holocaust." Although his analysis focuses specifically on anti-Semitism and the role of Jews as scapegoats in Germany, Bartov's explications of how the construction and glorification of victimhood and its inextricable link to locating enemies both from without and within have functioned as a "national adhesive" in the history of Germany since the First World War is illuminating in the broader context of understanding how these constructions function similarly with regard to the concept of race more generally.

WORKS CITED

- Bartov, Omer. "Defining Enemies, Making Victims: Germans, Jews, and the Holocaust." *The American Historical Review* 103.3 (1998): 771–816.
- Biddiss, Michael. *Father of Racist Ideology: The Social and Political Thought of Count Gobineau*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1970.
- Bock, Gisela. *Zwangsterilisation im Nationalsozialismus*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1986.
- Campt, Tina. *Other Germans: Race, Gender and Memory in Afro-Germans Narratives of the Third Reich*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, forthcoming 2003.
- , and Pascal Grosse. "Mischlingskinder in Nachkriegsdeutschland: Zum Verhältnis von Psychologie, Anthropologie und Gesellschaftspolitik nach 1945." *Psychologie und Geschichte* 6.1–2 Leverkusen: Leske and Budrich, 1994. 48–78.
- , Pascal Grosse, and Yara-Colette Lemke Muniz de Faria. "Blacks, Germans and the Politics of Imperialist Imagination, 1920–1960." *The Imperialist Imagination: German Colonialism and Its Legacy*. Ed. Sara Lennox, Sara Friedrichsmeyer and Susanne Zantop. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998. 205–29.
- Ehmann, Annegret. "From Colonial Racism to Nazi Population Policy: The Role of the So-Called Mischlinge." *The Holocaust and History: The Known, the Unknown, the Disputed and the Reexamined*. Ed. Michael Berenbaum and Abraham J. Peck. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press (published in association with the US Holocaust Memorial Museum), 1998. 188–212.
- Essner, Cornelia. "Zwischen Vernunft und Gefühl. Die Reichstagsdebatten von 1912 um koloniale 'Rassenmischehe' und 'Sexualität.'" *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 6. Berlin: Metropol Verlag, 1997.
- Gilman, Sander. "Black Bodies, White Bodies: Toward an Iconography of Female Sexuality in Late Nineteenth-Century Art." *Race Writing and Difference*. Ed. Henry Louis Gates, Jr. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986. 223–61.
- . *Difference and Pathology*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985.
- . *On Blackness Without Blacks*. Boston: G.K. Hall Publishers, 1982.
- Gobineau, Arthur comte de. *Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines*. 2. Ed. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1884.
- Gordon, Avery. *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.
- Grosse, Pascal. "Kolonialismus und das Problem der 'Rassenmischung' in Deutschland: Zur Geschichte der anthropologischen Psychologie 1920–1940." *Psychologie im soziokulturellen Wandel—Kontinuitäten und Diskontinuitäten*. Ed. Jäger, Siegfried, et al. Frankfurt, 1995. 75–85.
- . *Kolonialismus, Eugenik und bürgerliche Gesellschaft in Deutschland 1850–1918*. Frankfurt and New York: Campus, 2000.
- Lennox, Sara, Sara Friedrichsmeyer, and Susanne Zantop, eds. *The Imperialist Imagination: German Colonialism and Its Legacy*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998.
- Lilienthal, Georg. "'Rheinlandbastarde', Rassenhygiene und das Problem der rassenideologischen Kontinuität." *Medizinhistorisches Journal* 15 (1980): 426–36.
- Pommerin, Reiner. "Sterilisierung der Rheinlandbastarde": *Das Schicksal einer farbigen deutschen Minderheit, 1918–1937*. Düsseldorf: Droste Verlag, 1979.
- Records of the Reichskommissar für die besetzten rheinischen Gebiete, Bundesarchiv Berlin, (RBRG) Abteilung I/1755, signature no. 1602, Bundesarchiv Potsdam, Germany.
- Tucker, William. *The Science and Politics of Racial Research*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1994.
- Wildenthal, Lora. *German Women for Empire, 1884–1945*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2001. 79–130.
- . "Race, Gender and Citizenship in the German Colonial Empire." *Tensions of Empire. Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*. Ed. Frederick Cooper and Ann Laura Stoler. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press, 1997.

---

---

## CONTRIBUTORS

**AKHIM Y. CABEY** is originally from the Bronx, New York, and currently lives in Columbus, Ohio, and teaches at the Ohio State University. He is the 2003 recipient of the Ohio Arts Council grant and is working on *No Black Boy Here*, a memoir.

**TINA M. CAMPT** is Associate Professor of Women's Studies at Duke University. Her work theorizes processes of racialization, gendering, and subjecthood in the history of Black Germans during the Third Reich. *Other Germans: Black Germans and the Politics of Race, Gender and Memory in the Third Reich*, her forthcoming book on Black German narratives, will be published in Fall 2003 by the University of Michigan Press.

**KYLE DARGAN**, who recently graduated from the University of Virginia, is currently enrolled in Indiana University's MFA program, where he also serves as a poetry editor for the *Indiana Review*. His work has also appeared in the *Denver Quarterly* and the *Carnegie-Mellon Poetry Review*. He is currently working on a manuscript of Hip Hop inspired poems entitled *T.H.U.G.: A Truncated History of Urban Griots*.

**YARA-COLETTE LEMKE MUNIZ DE FARIA** earned her doctorate in history at the Institute for Research on Anti-Semitism at the Technical University of Berlin. Since 1999, she has worked as a researcher on the history of clinical photography at the Institute for the History of Medicine of the Free University of Berlin. She is the author of *Zwischen Fürsorge und Ausgrenzung. Afrodeutsche: "Besatzungskinder" in Nachkriegsdeutschland*, published in 2001 by Metropol Verlag.

**CARMEN FAYMONVILLE** is Assistant Professor of Comparative Literature and the Director of the Women's Studies Program at the University of Wisconsin-Platteville. She has published on postcolonial narratives, immigrant women's writing and modernist writers. Her most recent work concerns transnationalism in Europe and the U.S., as well as feminist pedagogy and theory.

**JOHANNA X. K. GARVEY** is Chair of the English Department at Fairfield University and founding co-director of both its Women's Studies Program and the Program in Black Studies: Africa and the Diaspora. She has published numerous articles on 20th-century writers such as James Joyce, Virginia Woolf, Ann Petry, Michelle Cliff, Paule Marshall, Caryl Phillips, Merle Collins, and others. She is completing a book manuscript on Caribbean women writers.

**THOMAS GLAVE** is the author of *Whose Song? and Other Stories* (City Lights, 2000). A *Callaloo* book review editor, he is an assistant professor of English and Africana Studies at SUNY-Binghamton. He has work forthcoming in *The Kenyon Review*, *The Massachusetts Review*, and *Black Renaissance*.

**KAREIN K. GOERTZ** teaches German and Comparative Literature in the Residential College at the University of Michigan. Her primary fields of research are Holocaust literature and film, cultural and literary studies of the city, and literature by ethnic minorities in Germany, France, and the U.S.A. She has published essays on Holocaust testimonies and second-generation narratives, Turkish and Afro-German