



## Chapter 4: Colonialism, National-Socialism and the Holocaust: On modern ways of dealing with deviance

Wiebke Keim

### ► To cite this version:

Wiebke Keim. Chapter 4: Colonialism, National-Socialism and the Holocaust: On modern ways of dealing with deviance. Gauging and Engaging Deviance, 1600-2000, 2014, 978-93-82381-31-0. halshs-01091133

**HAL Id: halshs-01091133**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01091133>**

Submitted on 4 Dec 2014

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

## **Chapter 4: Colonialism, National-Socialism and the Holocaust: An essay on modern ways of dealing with deviance**

Wiebke Keim<sup>1</sup>

– Manuscript –

In: Sitas, Ari; Keim, Wiebke; Damodaran, Sumangala; Trimikliniotis, Nicos; Garba, Faisal (2014): Gauging and engaging deviance. 1600-2000. Delhi: Tulika Press: 109-188

The central question of this chapter is about socio-historical implications of colonialism for ways of dealing with deviance in the metropolises. Postcolonial studies metaphorically talk about the colonies as “laboratories” of modern societies (Conrad 2008: 90). Indeed, a series of political reforms and interventions aiming at society as a whole or, to put it more strongly, at creating the “ideal society”, have been experimented with in the colonies. The historical development of the European metropole was heavily affected by the colonial experience (either simultaneously or with some time-delay), an insight that leads to rejecting any assumption of a uni-directional “modernisation”-flow.

We will see that there are obvious continuities in terms of social thought. Concrete connections between organizational, institutional and juridical forms of dealing with deviance are more difficult to describe in clear-cut terms, if we do not want to fall into simplistic accounts of a complex story. In the conclusion, we will have to reconsider Baumann’s claim that the Holocaust has to be understood as the product of modern society and of a highly developed civilization (Bauman 1994: 10)<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank Ari Sitas for encouraging me to invest my sociological craft into the depths of the history of my country; Sumangala Damodaran and Nicos Trimikliniotis for the fruitful and always challenging collaboration in the deviance project; my father Eris J. Keim (†) for his comments to earlier versions of this paper and for his contribution to the paragraphs on the burning of books; Christian Möller for comments and additions to a recent version of the paper; Ulrich Herbert for giving me orientation in the ongoing debates by historians; the colleagues and guests in the research project “Universality and acceptance potential of social knowledge” at University of Freiburg – Sakhela Buhlungu, Ercüment Çelik, Christian Ersche, José Jimenez, Barbara Riedel, Ksenia Robbe and Veronika Wöhrer; as well as the Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) for funding this project; Sebastian Volkmann and Maximilian Vogelmann for their comments, assistance in research and editing of the text.

<sup>2</sup> The history of colonialism as well as the history of national-socialism are topics that fill libraries. As a sociologist and certainly a non-expert in terms of detailed historical facts, my use of the existing literature might appear eclectic. The idea was to search for those elements in the debate that could feed into the overall topic of the book, i.e. the history of deviance. Drawing on various fields of research enabled me to productively use the insights generated by post-colonial approaches, but also to be aware of their limitations. Ultimately, this essay points to the need to develop a post-fascist perspective.

## Introduction: the thesis of continuity between colonialism and National Socialism

Millions of people died as a result of German National Socialism (NS) in Europe. Most prominently, it aimed at the total extermination of European Jews, which was systematically organized from 1941 onwards, but planned earlier. Around six million Jews were killed by the NS machinery. As opposed to the usual focus on extermination of Jews, we will broaden the perspective. Studying the history of deviance under modernity requires a broader perspective on National Socialist policy and ideology, in order to understand the process that marked so many people as deviant. Similarly to the Jews, the Sinti and Roma were the target of a total extermination project (Roma Holocaust or Porajmos). Apart from the war deaths, there were acts of mass murder in which several million Polish and Soviet citizens were killed. Many died as a result of forced labour or of starvation under German occupation. Between 1941 and 1945, 27 Million Soviet citizens died (Jahn 14.6.2007). 200,000 sick, mentally disabled people and individuals with psychological problems were killed as a consequence of the “euthanasia” programme (Urbahn, 2009). We have to add around 7,000 homosexuals. All of these can be regarded as existential deviants. In addition to these victims, there were articulatory deviants: around 20,000 communists and social democrats, as well as around 1,200 Jehova’s Witnesses. The behavioural deviants, i.e. the “usual criminals”, “lazy people”, “anti-social” elements and, importantly, many of the agents of the opposition and resistance movements murdered under Hitler remain countless. And extermination was only the last step in a complex and at times contradictory experimentation of dealing with all types of deviance that had been defined, including social and economic exclusion, exclusion from citizenship status and rights, public stigmatization, confinement, forced labour, mass deportations, as well as regulation of relationships to the extent of intervening on the most intimate level, i.e. in love relationships, sexuality and reproduction through legal frameworks and eugenic practice.

Daring minds have put forward the thesis that National Socialism and the Shoa are in continuity with colonialism. The argument may start with Fanon who declared that “The colonist makes history and he knows it. (...) The history he writes is therefore not the history of the country he is despoiling, but the history of his own nation’s looting, raping, and starving to death” (Fanon 2004: 15). The political system corresponding to overseas’ colonialism within the metropolis is fascism, said Memmi:

“Now one can carry this a step further; every colonial nation carries the seeds of fascist temptation in its bosom (...) There is no doubt in the minds of those who have lived through it that colonialism is one variety of fascism. (...) It is no more surprising that colonial fascism is not easily limited to the colony. (...) The colonialist can only support oppressive and reactionary or, at least, conservative governments. He tends toward that which will maintain the current status of his homeland, or rather that which will more positively assure the framework of oppression (...) Even if he should never move, the very fact of his living in a colonial system gives rise to uncertainties at home; an alluring example of a political pattern whose difficulties are resolved by the complete servitude of the governed. It is no exaggeration to say that, just as the colonial situation corrupts the European in the colonies, *the colonialist is the seed of corruption in the mother country*” (Memmi [1957] 1990: 128-130).

Colonial exploitation, oppression and violence have their repercussions within Europe, where this can lead to the degeneration of culture and society, a fascist potential inherent to colonialism. Césaire has analysed in great detail how in his view the colonial experience has provoked the rise of National Socialism in Europe:

“First we must study how colonization works to *decivilize* the colonizer, to *brutalize* him in the true sense of the word, to degrade him, to awaken him to buried instincts, to covetousness, violence, race hatred, and moral relativism; and we must show that each time a head is cut off or an eye put out in Vietnam and in France they accept the fact, each time a little girl is raped and in France they accept the fact, each time a Madagascan is tortured and in France they accept the fact, civilization acquires another dead weight, a universal regression takes place, a gangrene sets in, a centre of infection begins to spread; and that at the end of all these treaties that have been violated, all these lies that have been propagated, all these punitive expeditions that have been tolerated, all these prisoners who have been tied up and ‘interrogated’, all these patriots who have been tortured, at the end of all the racial pride that has been encouraged, all the boastfulness that has been displayed, a poison has been distilled into the veins of Europe and, slowly but surely, the continent proceeds toward *savagery*. And then one fine day the bourgeoisie is awakened by a terrific boomerang effect: the gestapos are busy, the prisons fill up, the torturers standing around the racks invent, refine, discuss.

People are surprised, they become indignant. They say: ‘How strange! But never mind – it’s Nazism, it will pass!’ And they wait, and they hope; and they hide the truth from themselves, that it is barbarism, the supreme barbarism, the crowning barbarism that sums up all the daily barbarisms; that it is Nazism, yes, but that before they were its victims, they were its accomplices; that they tolerated that Nazism before it was inflicted on them, that they absolved it, shut their eyes to it, legitimized it, because, until then, it had been applied only to non-European peoples; that they have cultivated that Nazism, that they are responsible for it, and that before engulfing the whole edifice of Western, Christian civilization in its reddened waters, it oozes, seeps, and trickles from every crack”. (Césaire, [1955] 2000, pp. 35–36).

Césaire thus talks of the “boomerang effect” of colonization, its striking back in the metropolis<sup>3</sup>. Interestingly, he does not refer to any sort of “barbarian” being created in the colonies, but of the “modern barbarian” (Césaire, [1955] 2000, p. 76). If we follow this argument, the Holocaust does not appear as an accidental aberration of modernity. If not necessarily a foreseeable outcome of European history in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the potential for the Holocaust appears to have been inherent in modern European development. The foregoing chapters have analyzed colonialism and its ways of dealing with deviance as the dark side of modernity. The intention of this chapter is to

---

<sup>3</sup> “For my part, if I have recalled a few details of these hideous butcheries, it is by no means because I take a morbid delight in them, but because I think that these heads of men, these collections of ears, these burned houses, these Gothic invasions, this steaming blood, these cities that evaporate at the edge of the sword, are not to be so easily disposed of. They prove that colonization, I repeat, dehumanizes even the most civilized man; that colonial activity, colonial enterprise, colonial conquest, which is based on contempt for the native and justified by that contempt, inevitably tends to change him who undertakes it; that the colonizer, who in order to ease his conscience gets into the habit of seeing the other man as *an animal*, accustoms himself to treating him like an animal, and tends objectively to transform *himself* into an animal. It is this result, this boomerang effect of colonization that I wanted to point out”. Césaire [1955] 2000, p. 41.

find out more about continuities between colonialism and administrating deviance in the metropolis, especially with regard to National Socialist ideology and practice, and to the question in how far the latter was a genuinely modern phenomenon<sup>4</sup>. The intention here is to test, specify and differentiate the current post-colonial temptation: Through a current conjuncture in social theorizing and debate, colonialism seems to have replaced the Holocaust as the number one historical object of moral indignation. Hence attempts to rescue attention in pointing out direct connections and continuities between the two. The following will show that there are indeed connections and continuities – but that they alone do not provide a fully comprehensive account of the story.

### **The legacies of German colonialism**

The experience of German colonization is usually understated when compared to Spanish, British and French colonialism<sup>5</sup>. If we imagine a line of continuity, it should be clearest if we remain historically within the German-dominated sphere. However, German colonialism cannot be regarded in isolation from the global period of high imperialism towards the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The global historical framework, the colonial visions, ambitions and practices, the existence of a shared “colonial archive” are probably more important for understanding the particular German experience and its effects on later developments in Germany than a more limited focus on inner-German affairs (Conrad, 2008).

We do not start this investigation from scratch. Recent German historiography has highlighted various aspects which serve to strengthen the continuity thesis. First, continuity can be seen from the perspective of a history of violence. The most prominent example is the war against the Herero and Nama, which has been interpreted as the first breach of the ultimate taboo of the mass murdering of children, women, non-warriors and elderly people on the basis of ethnic

---

<sup>4</sup> This paper focuses on National Socialist extermination as a singular, exemplarily violent event, in which extermination based on racial categorization of deviants was the main aim of the regime and was realized with scientific and industrial means. Obviously, the Holocaust shares certain characteristics with Stalinist extermination policy, for instance its modern, scientifically and bureaucratically organized approach – the main difference being that Stalinism focused on class distinction, NS on racism; and that for NS, extermination was an overtly declared main objective in view of the creation of the “ideal society” – not merely an ugly “side effect”. It would also be interesting to investigate whether there are any connections and continuities between the Russian experience and European colonialism or not (for an attempt to “colonize” Russian history, cf. Etkind (2011)). However, for reasons of time and space, we cannot provide any details regarding Soviet treatment of deviance here.

<sup>5</sup> German colonization started in 1884/85 with first possessions in Africa, extending in 1897 to North East China and in 1899 to the Pacific. German South West Africa (today: Namibia) was the first colony, the only German settler colony, where the government confiscated 70% of the land. This led to the war against the Herero and the Nama (1904-07). Cameroon was a plantation colony, based on forced labour and expropriation of land, Togo a trade colony. In German East Africa (today: Tanzania, Burundi, Rwanda), colonial rule was particularly violent (the Maji-Maji-war and the following famine resulted in 300.000 deaths). New Guinea and Samoa represented “prestigious projects” without further military or economic importance. Kiautschou in North East China (occupied since 1897) was a trade colony, but also important for its urban planning experience. The Boxer Rebellion in 1900 marked the history of this colony. (Conrad 2008, pp. 28 ff.). However, we can also look at projects of internal colonization: the exclusion of ethnic minorities, for instance the Sorbs under the German Empire.

characteristics. It was the first German extermination war, a genocide. Zimmerer interpreted it as “hinting towards what was to follow”, “a prelude for a century of total wars, the unleashing of hitherto unimaginable violence of armies against one another and against the civil society”, as “an important step towards the National-Socialist extermination war” (Zimmerer, [2003b] 2004, p. 45)<sup>6</sup>. While this teleological argument goes far in its interpretation, we can easily agree with Zimmerer in saying that, as the Herero war happened only 40 years before the Holocaust, the “non-existence of a connection between the two would be more surprising than its existence”. Zimmerer concludes: “The German war against the Herero and Nama is, thus, neither a local event in Namibian or German history, nor an isolated event in colonial history. Rather, it is an event that stands out in a global history of the unleashing of violence, which culminated in the two world wars” (Zimmerer, [2003b] 2004, p. 63). This interpretation is in line with Césaire’s assumed boomerang effect: in the colonies the Europeans learned the skills for extermination that were to lead to the human disasters of the 20<sup>th</sup> century inside Europe (Zimmerer & Zeller, [2003] 2004, p. 9).

Second, Hannah Arendt’s (1963: 222ff.) distinction between “continental” and “overseas” imperialism implies that German expansionism towards Central and Eastern Europe in the course of the Second World War was a form of continental imperialism. Discourses and concrete measures involving “Germanizing the soil”, claiming more *Lebensraum* [living space], and the practice of racial segregation in the occupied territories support such a hypothesis.

Furber sets a different focus, declaring that the Nazi occupation of Poland was “colonialism that can be analyzed as such without ‘equating’ it with the more familiar cases” (Furber, 2003, p. 1). Distancing himself from Arendt as well as from Césaire’s positions and the “emblematic superficiality” of these and other “colonial comparisons”, he does not “purport to explain any direct connection or continuity between Europeans overseas and Nazi approaches to the European east” but argues that “German colonialism in the east evolved distinctly and separately from the overseas variant, albeit with some interchange between the two different colonial spheres. A formal continuity thesis is not required to see that Nazi ideology was deeply imprinted by biological racism and Social Darwinism. Divorced from the context of minority rule by expatriates when applied within Nazi Germany, these institutions did not resemble colonial rule again until the Nazis erected occupation regimes in Eastern Europe” (Furber, 2003, p. 6). He concludes: „If fascism brought colonialist institutions and ideologies, policies and practices to Germany, these did not really become colonialism again until they were extended to the east. The basic elements were inherent to Nazism”. (Furber, 2003, p. 36). Despite the highly controversial character of the debate, all authors do agree upon a certain set of ideological features and of political and administrative practices, however differently weighed, that were inherent to overseas colonialism and were again mobilized under National Socialism.

---

<sup>6</sup> Concretely, Zimmerer refers to parallels such as the lack of individual guilt and the targeting of an entire racially defined group of people; the official terminology of an “extermination war” or of a “racial war”; the destruction of livelihoods; summary executions; murdering by neglect; the fact that the Officer who led the war, von Trotha (who had experience in German-East-Africa 1894-1897 and in China 1900) acted on direct order of the Emperor; the extermination in the Omaheke desert; the concentration camps. Eckert complements this view indicating the generalized high potential for violence inherent in settler colonies: Eckert [2003] 2004, p. 236.

Thus, the literature seems to agree that parallels do exist. And if we take the argument about the relationship between the colonial experience and historical developments in the metropolis seriously, we have to move beyond metaphorical “parallels” and search for tangible relationships and continuities between discourses and institutions. We will see that certain continuities can be traced in terms of a history of social thought and that NS ideology could partly build upon them. Continuities in terms of institutional arrangements and practice would require historiographic research. We will rely on several examples highlighted in the literature to illustrate the point that remains more ambiguous, however, than the question of continuities at the discourse-level.

No matter how far we follow the continuity thesis, we do not accept envisaging it as a singular, unilinear and monocausal form of continuity. National Socialism was complex and often contradictory in its discourse as well as in its practice, and there were obviously many influences other than colonialism that added up to this period of German and European history and led to the “final solution”. In order to complete our account of dealing with deviance under National Socialism, two further topics impose themselves, namely the industrialization of extermination on the one hand, and the ways of dealing with articulatory deviance on the other.

## I. Lines of continuity in social thought

It makes sense to study the ideological aspects of German imperialism in order to further analyze the question of continuity<sup>7</sup>. Ideas underlying National Socialism related to colonialism, but certainly not exclusively. National Socialist ideology built on a synthesis of various strands of social thought such as racial and social Darwinism or *Lebensraum*, that were in direct line with justifications of colonial expansionism and exploitation. Furthermore, however, it combined a long tradition of anti-Semitism, a tradition of anti-modern [read: anti-western European] and anti-democratic attitudes in German social thinking throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century (and before). To understand how the fusion of these diverse traditions into NS ideology and practice could happen at that point of time in Germany, we must first of all summarize the historical context.

### 1. Historical contextualization of the German experience

The German region underwent a paradoxical development. On the one hand, there was the Age of Enlightenment in Prussia (Kant, 1721-1804). Prussia was actively involved in the international circulation of this current of ideas, and of advances in natural science and philosophy. At the same time, however, the social, economic and political development lagged behind in comparison with, for instance, France and Great Britain (Plessner, [1935] 1959).

Let us take the revolution of 1848/49 as an entry point. While the *Vormärz*-period had given way to critical thinking on society, the failure of the 1848/49 revolution and the subsequent political restoration and creation of the nation state encouraged reactionary, conservative thought. In

---

<sup>7</sup> "The evidence for continuity that is most often cited - the repetition in one period of imperialist formulas from a previous one is essentially ideological evidence." Smith (1986, p. 10).

comparison with its western neighbours, Germany was a latecomer in terms of the formation of the nation state. Its territories were divided among several independent states until the formation of the *Reich* in 1871. According to Lukács, the territorial and political segmentation of the German speaking region led to ideological particularities: “Firstly, there was the incredible pettiness, narrowness and short-sightedness of life in the small German duchies compared to England or France. Secondly and closely connected with this, there was the far greater and more tangible dependence of the subjects on the monarch and his bureaucratic machinery, the far more restricted scope for an ideologically hostile or merely critical attitude than elsewhere. A further point is that Lutheranism (and later on Pietism, etc.) limited this scope in the subjective sense also, converting external subjection into an inner submissiveness and thus breeding that underdog mentality which Engels termed ‘servile’.” (Lukács [1962] 1981: 41.) This psychology of the German subject is beautifully portrayed in Heinrich Mann’s *Der Untertan* [The patrioter] (Mann [1918] 2004).

The creation of the nation state followed the victory over France in 1871. The relationship with France was conceived as one of German superiority, symbolically mirrored in the crowning of the Emperor in Versailles<sup>8</sup>. Accordingly, the German philosophical traditions of cultural pessimism and idealism gained impetus against the more rationalistic approaches regarded as French heritage. The fact that the foundation of the nation state was not achieved through a revolutionary movement but ordered from above did not help the development of critical and emancipatory thinking. Instead of empowering the popular masses, this favoured the understanding that “Great men make history”. In addition, various inner political events between 1890 and the outbreak of the First World War were interpreted as defeats and, in turn, promoted an intellectual, political and social history of cultural pessimism, perception of permanent crisis, ultra-nationalism, racism and social Darwinism, leading to phantasies of Germany becoming a world power – which would mean it needed colonies. These ideas were also taken up by leading military and political elites (Bley, 2003, p. 68).

Things became more complicated towards the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, as Germany had overtaken Britain as the leading industrial nation. The rapid industrialization was also the main reason for Germany’s late entry into colonialism: external expansion was meant to enhance investment, thus German businesses turned to the government with various expansion plans. The challenge though was to achieve an elite consensus, i.e. also to include the interests of the aristocratic great land owners or *junkers*. Therefore, the official reading was that African and central European expansion was a means of procuring land for industry and mining. Germany could not achieve those plans in the First World War, and they were taken up again by Hitler (Smith, 1986).

Paradoxically, despite its industrial and technical progress, large parts of German society, its intellectual and political elites, remained backward and reactionary<sup>9</sup>. While highly industrialized, Germany maintained characteristics of an agrarian society, as is illustrated by the enormous social and political weight of the *junkers*. Politics and economy developed in contradictory directions – “Prussian capitalism”. The contradiction was ideologically backed up, interpreted as a higher level of development in comparison with the West. Related to this is the anti-progress attitude in German

---

<sup>8</sup> This is important in order to understand the humiliation of Germany by the outcome of the First World War, where Versailles again played a central role.

<sup>9</sup> Thus, the anti-western, anti-modern thinking outlined below refers to social and cultural thought, not to scientific, industrially relevant ideas.



history that builds on an idealization of German *Kultur* [culture] (however backward) (Lukács [1962] 1981: 62) as opposed to Western *Zivilisation* [civilization]<sup>10</sup>. From the first victory of the Social Democratic Party in 1903 onwards, right-wing extremism started to exert serious pressure on the German government (Bley, 2003, pp. 56 ff.).

The broad public, including renowned scholars, supported the First World War with strong nationalist propaganda on the basis of a cultural representation of France as an enemy. The German ideological justification of the war explicitly opposed the ideals of the French Revolution, as expressed in the famous slogan “The ideas of 1914 against the ideas of 1789” (Troeltsch & Baron, 1925). The assumption of German superiority included not only the military, but also the cultural and political domains. Scholars in the humanities and social sciences fully supported this strategy, as the volume “Germany and the World War” (Otto Hintze, Friedrich Meinecke, Hermann Oncken, & Hermann Schumacher, 1916), in which a series of renowned scholars ideologically justified the war, documents.

Dissatisfaction with the outcome of the First World War proved to have disastrous long-term effects. The Weimar Republic was not the result of a democratization movement, but mainly of a military defeat. The November Revolution, initiated by the Kiel and Wilhelmshaven mutiny of sailors who, in the face of defeat, refused to follow orders of the Naval Command to engage in a useless last battle against the British Royal Navy, had led the emperor to abdicate. But Ebert’s SPD refused to work with the revolutionaries who were inspired by communist ideas (the Spartacists), fearing the outbreak of civil war. And instead of stripping the old imperial elites, they integrated them into the new social democratic system, in alliance with the *Obere Heeresleitung* [Supreme Command]. The army and militias oppressed the Spartacists and murdered its leaders, Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. The ensuing opposition between SPD and KPD was a major source of weakness of the left against the rising NSDAP.

The “Republic by accident” (Tucholsky [1922] 1985) was disliked by many from the outset. The Treaty of Versailles, one of the most influential treatises of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, put an end to the First World War. It regulated the territorial order of Europe and of various regions outside Europe and was the basis for the creation of the League of Nations (Kolb, 2005). Signing the treaty was experienced as a moment of great national humiliation, and a broad range of German minds rejected what was perceived as the *Diktat von Versailles* [Dictate of Versailles] or *Knebelvertrag* [adhesion contract] as well as the idea that Germany alone carried the guilt for the outbreak of the First World War. They asked for the revision of the new borders, especially in the east, wanted the colonies back, and believed Germany should be among the first European powers. This consensus regarding the non-acceptance of the outcome of the First World War in terms of foreign policy could even be found in communist circles. Perspectives differed in terms of domestic policy, but apart from the Social Democrats, there was in fact also a consensus that the Weimar Constitution needed to be revised, i.e. there was a strong rejection of the Weimar democracy. Thus, Weimar “was essentially a republic without republicans, a democracy without democrats [...]” (Lukács [1962] 1981: 75). The high ranks of the military, the old bureaucracy and the *junkers* remained powerful. There was no agrarian

---

<sup>10</sup> For instance, the maintenance of old forms of rule helped resolve “modern problems” such as socialism. People with anti-democratic attitudes argued that German bureaucracy was much more expert-led, competent and neutral than western politics and parliaments (Lukács [1962] 1981: 71f.).

reform. The newly emerging capitalist class exerted its power in rather hidden ways, in alliance with Prussian *junkers* and the military and civil bureaucracy. Therefore, the broad masses, lacking any democratic experience, tradition or education were quickly deceived by the Republic. The fact that Weimar had to execute the Treaty of Versailles reinforced this rejection.

The political crisis was accompanied by massive economic difficulties. Apart from the given economic cycle, the structural problem was one of reorganizing the former war-economy with mass production of armaments for times of peace in the face of an economically weak population as well as the social reintegration of soldiers into civil society.

Graph 1: about here

The first coup of Hitler in November 1923 coincided with the peak of the inflation and ensuing insecurity. Following the world economic crisis of 1929, unemployment rose from 1.8 to 6 million in only three years. There was a broadly shared hope that Hitler and the Nazis would revise Versailles and bring about more prosperous times (Archiv der sozialen Demokratie der Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, 1983, pp. 8, 9).

In his influential work *The Myth of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century*, the leading NS thinker Rosenberg summarized his view on this part of history and helps us understand the intensity of anti-democratic thought and of adherence to the *Führer*-principle: "We have known since 1933 which powers will help to replace this deformed state ['Unstaat'] of November 1918 by a German Reich. We have known this man for years, the man who will put up a new banner on the towers of German cities. Finally, we know and experience the powers of the race's soul, which, today, awakens from deep sleep, the powers which had to support this man (...) The people can only seldom directly see a great man today. Disasters must happen beforehand, as a result of which one man can struggle to emerge for everyone to see. For this reason in everyday life, a presidential or imperial election, directly carried out by 70 million people, is just a matter of money. (...) Therefore, this dishonest demand for democracy must be abandoned for good in the coming German nation state. From this it follows that a parliament, which will advise the government alongside a leading council of the nobility, cannot be the result of mass deception, as under the rule of the immoral democratic parliamentary system. Beyond the parochial realm, beyond the mid-sized town, the average person loses his standards of judgment." He concludes: "Bismarck already characterized the secret ballot as un-Germanic. And it is indeed so. As it bears no name, the cowardice of the individual becomes one mentality among others. The feeling of responsibility is deliberately undermined. If applied to a whole people, it means breeding mental decay" (Rosenberg, [1931] 1934, pp. 546–548).

If we mentioned the experience of violence in the colonies as a predecessor to NS violence in Europe, this argument needs to be complemented by a further consideration of the history of violence inside Europe. Apparently, Lemkin, who invented the term "genocide" and is most knowledgeable on the study of genocides in global history, does not need to refer to colonialism when analyzing the history of German militarism: "German militarism has been very stubborn. Germany has attacked her neighbours five times since 1864, and in every one of these five wars the methods of occupation and spoliation increased in thoroughness inversely as the ethical level of the aggressors sank lower and lower. Other nations in recent and past times have had cycles of militarism in their history (the Spaniards, Swedes, Danes, French, and many others). However, German militarism is the most virulent because it is based upon a highly developed national and

racial emotionalism which by means of modern technology can be released upon the world in a much more efficient and destructive way than any of the pedestrian methods of earlier wars". (Lemkin, 1944, pp. xiv). He adds: "Indeed it appears obvious that the occupant does not respect the limitations imposed by the Hague Convention. He has adopted a unilaterally utilitarian conception of law – law is that which is useful to the German nation; and in this respect the present rulers of Germany are using essentially the same conception of law which was used by Bethmann-Hollweg in 1914, when he declared that necessity knows no law". (Lemkin, 1944, pp. x)<sup>11</sup>

While the Nazi attack on Poland and France and the annexation of Austria were still thinkable and acceptable (except for leftist pacifists who were either in emigration or in concentration camps), it was only after the attack on the Soviet Union that this broad anti-democratic consensus started to crumble in the light of realities of the war. Many Jewish intellectuals shared the same perspective and did not foresee the outcome of National Socialism.

Finally, we need to say something about the colonial administration and the colonialist lobby after the official end of German overseas colonization, as various organizations will be mentioned here and there throughout the following sections. Colonialists and colonial experts had organized their interests through the "colonial societies" – the most important ones being the *Deutscher Kolonialverein* [German Colonial Association], founded in 1882, later transformed into the *Deutsche Kolonialgesellschaft* [German Colonial Society] (1887), the *Alldeutscher Verband* [Pan German League] (1894) and the *Deutschnationaler Kolonialverein* [German National Colonial Association] (1904). These organizations pursued the lobbying of colonialist ideas, such as the economic exploitation of existing and the acquisition of new colonies. They had also been in charge of humanitarian aid in the colonial territories (Deutsches Historisches Museum - Lebendiges Virtuelles Museum Online, 2012). While the outcome of the First World War had put an end to German colonialism as *Realgeschichte* [real history], there were palpable continuities in the form of these organizations – and through several individual biographies of the Wilhelmine generation of imperialists and conservatives who survived within these organizations. This was also true for the official colonial administration. In 1919, the reorganization of the colonial apparatus started and the former *Reichskolonialamt* [Reich Colonial Office] became the *Reichskolonialministerium* [Reich Colonial Ministry], mainly in charge of phasing out the former German colonies. Dissolved in 1920, its tasks were passed on to the *Reichsministerium für Wiederaufbau* [Reich Ministry of Reconstruction] that was also in charge of further developing the colonial question and of plans to recover and expand the colonies. This was a major field of activity for former colonial officials, i.e. for a small interest group whose careers had been cut short after the war and who organized themselves after 1918 into various veteran associations (van Laak, 2003, p. 75).

The colonies continued to be a topic of public interest – mainly as an important argument in the revisionist circles during the Weimar Republic who fought against the "Dictate of Versailles". The German Colonial Society acted as the centre of concrete patterns of organizational and ideological continuity. It had accommodated economic colonialists (the *Weltpolitik* [World Politics] fraction), as well as settlement enthusiasts according to the *Lebensraum*-ideology (this distinction is discussed below). Financial and political support from a broad majority of all sorts of political pressure groups

---

<sup>11</sup> Bethmann-Hollweg had been *Reichskanzler* during most of the First World War.

and parties, except the Communists, kept the Colonial Society alive and growing in membership, – in the absence of a colonial empire – throughout the Weimar Republic (Smith, 1986, pp. 213 ff.). The Society was mainly composed of industrialists, bankers, nobility and politicians. Its most representative positions were occupied by retired colonial officials. The Society's main (and, in fact, only) political leverage was the continued symbolic value of overseas colonies for revisionism.

However, the return of colonies was not a political priority for any of the bigger parties. Apparently, the realization that their political power was weak was "one of the factors that led the Society after 1928 to investigate the possibility of cooperation with the Nazis – a party that had shown little more than the obligatory interest in colonies up until that time. If properly 'educated' on colonial matters, Hitler might provide the popular backing that the colonial movement needed and a means of exerting effective pressure on policy" (Smith, 1986, p. 215). After 1928, the Society made an effort to integrate both the *Weltpolitik* and the *Lebensraum* fractions into one single ideological pattern, which provoked internal discussions around priorities, staging and timeframes with regard to overseas, internal or eastern expansion and colonization.

The colonial plans of the NS regime, then supported by the colonialists and their organizations in question, foresaw first of all the assault and conquest of Eastern Europe, but went beyond this goal and ultimately aimed at world hegemony. These plans were astonishingly concrete, at least from 1938 onwards. The corresponding administrative authorities had planned for a colonial currency; the ministries of post, mailing and of transport had finalized drafts for their practical activities in the overseas colonies that were to be conquered. Legislation for colonial civil servants and police were fully planned, as was the colonial *Blutschutzgesetz* [Law for the Protection of German blood, see below]. One could seriously ask "whether ever in history a non-existing Empire had been administrated so well!" (Wolfe W. Schmokel, quoted in: van Laak, 2003, p. 83).

We need to trace the various ingredients of NS ideology that made it so powerful for the masses. Conservative ideology since the Wilhelminian era was largely incoherent and, as already obvious from our own account, was variously described (*völkisch*, anti-modern, irrationalist etc.). We might assume that its incoherence and frequent inconsistency was due to this ideology's function, namely to act as a basis for consensus and political support. Continuities between 19th century conservative social thought – not only in Germany but throughout Europe and beyond, which cannot be fully covered here – and NS ideology are obvious. (Smith, 1986, pp. 84–85). National Socialist ideologists, in order to create a "philosophy of despair" (Lukács [1962] 1981: 84ff), could build on a long-standing philosophical tradition of anti-modern and anti-democratic thinking and combined it, in eclectic ways, with the crudest forms of racism and social Darwinism, anti-Semitism, anti-socialism and anti-capitalism alike. This ideology greatly reverberated among a population that was disillusioned by the war and by an unwanted democracy, as well as being existentially threatened by the economic crisis.

## 2. Developments in German social thought

German academia was heavily affected by the traumatic post-World War One experience that was to shape the works of a whole generation of intellectuals, of which Heidegger remains emblematic:

“Although he adopts a prophetic posture (...), Heidegger is right to affirm that his thinking reflects a critical moment, or what he also calls an *Umsturzsituation*, a 'revolutionary situation'. In his own way, he never ceased to reflect on the profound crisis of which Germany was the focus; or rather, to be more precise, the crisis of Germany and the German university system never ceased to be reflected and expressed through him. The crisis comprised the First World War and the (incomplete) revolution of November 1918, which spelled out the possibility of a Bolshevik revolution and struck lasting fear into the hearts of the conservatives, at the same time as profoundly disappointing the writers and artists (Rilke and Brecht, for instance) once their moment of enthusiasm had passed; the political assassinations (whose perpetrators often went unpunished); Kapp's putsch and other attempts at subversion; the defeat; the Treaty of Versailles; the occupation of the Ruhr by the French and the territorial amputations which exacerbated people's awareness of *Deutschtum* as a community of language and blood; the galloping inflation of 1919-24, which affected above all the *Mittelstand* [the middle classes]; the brief period of *Prosperität* [prosperity], which introduced an obsession with technology and the rationalization of labour; and finally the great depression of 1929. All these events helped to create a traumatic experience, which was bound to have a permanent impact, albeit to different degrees and with different effects, on the vision of the social world held by a whole generation of intellectuals” (Bourdieu, [1988] 1991, pp. 7–8).

In order to reconstruct the structures of the academic environment of the time, we also need to acknowledge material difficulties following the economic and political crisis: increasing student numbers, uncertain career opportunities for academic staff, the decline in social and economic status of the professors and the emergence of an academic “precariat”, the reversal of hierarchies between disciplines with the growing prestige of natural and social sciences as opposed to the humanities. State- und industry-driven demands for more practically relevant knowledge and education played a role, as did criticisms of the current university systems and its norms through educational reform programs by the political parties after 1919, targeting the “spiritually aristocratic tradition” of the university (Bourdieu, [1988] 1991, pp. 12–13). The response from the professoral body was a conservative, nationalist and often anti-semitic one. The loss of status of professors, especially in the domain of the humanities, made them adopt and reinforce the historical tradition of lamenting the *Untergang des Abendlandes* [decline of the Occident].

Lukács presented a detailed account of what he calls the “irrationalist” tradition of thinking in German philosophy (underlying most of its humanistic and social science ideas) as the “most significant and influential kind of reactionary answer to the great typical problems of the past century and a half” (Lukács [1962] 1981: 3) i.e., “modern irrationalism”. He finds in it “Germany's path to Hitler in the sphere of philosophy” (Lukács [1962] 1981: 4). By irrationalist thinking he means the depreciation of critical reason, the apotheosis of feeling, intuition and will, of *Kultur* as opposed to *Zivilisation*, the rejection of social and historical progress, anti-socialism as well as the creation of myths. These are found, for instance, in the broad range of approaches under the overarching tendency which he quite simplistically calls *Lebensphilosophie* [vitalism]. Bourdieu rather speaks of a collective *völkisch* [populist] philosophical mood, on the basis of a shared ideological structure of fundamental oppositions that organizes the commonly held worldview: “These are, to mention only the most important, the oppositions between culture and civilization, between Germany and France (or, in another context, England), as a paradigm of cosmopolitanism; between the 'community' (Tönnies's *Gemeinschaft*), and the 'people' (*Volk*) or the incoherent masses; between the *Führer* or

the *Reich* and liberalism, parliamentarianism, or pacifism; between the country or the forest and the town or the factory; between the peasant or the hero and the worker or the shopkeeper; between life or the organism (*Organismus*) and technology or the dehumanizing machine; between the total and the partial or the disconnected; between integration and fragmentation; between ontology and science, or godless rationalism, etc. These choices, and the debates they occasion, are not the sole prerogative of the conservative ideologues. They are written into the very structure of the field of ideological production, where the problematic shared by all the thinkers of the age is engendered in and through the antagonistic positions which go to make up the structure" (Bourdieu, [1988] 1991, p. 21)<sup>12</sup>. Conservative thought is thus mainly self-defined in the negative, as an opposition to its enemies – "the francophiles, Jews, progressives, democrats, rationalists, socialists, cosmopolitans, and left-wing intellectuals (epitomized by Heine), seem to cry out for negation in a nationalist ideology which aimed at 'the revival of a mythical *Deutschtum* and the creation of political institutions that would embody and preserve this peculiar character of the Germans'" (Bourdieu, [1988] 1991, pp. 22–23, quotes from F. Stern, *The Politics of Cultural Despair*, Berkeley and L.A., Univ. of California Press, 1961 p. xvi/xiii.). We shall reencounter nearly the same enumeration among the articulatory deviants as defined by National Socialism (see below).

Germany had been one of the centres of development of the humanities and of humanism throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century. We can assume that, as elsewhere in the European metropolises, the concepts of subject and self in German humanism emerged simultaneously as the colonial "other"<sup>13</sup>. Major thinkers in the German humanities – e.g. Herder, Kant, Hegel – had explicitly disqualified the majority of humans from their study because of their supposed lack of history, literacy and overall culture (Zimmerman, 2001, p. 39)<sup>14</sup>.

Precisely at that time, anthropology emerged as a new discipline and challenged the humanities' position in academic institutions and in social thought. The conditions for its emergence were, on the one hand, the realities of imperialism and, on the other, the strong standing and increasing influence of the natural sciences, under which anthropology placed its study of human beings (as opposed to the humanities). Anthropology could apply concepts from natural science to the study of human beings only after colonial explorations gave access to the necessary "raw materials" to be brought back to the metropolis and studied comparatively. The legitimizing claim

---

<sup>12</sup> One important concept present in German social thought that was relevant for the emergence of NS ideology, but that will not be discussed in more detail in the following sections, was that of society as an organism. The metaphor of the *Volkskörper* [body of the people/nation] was useful in order to overcome all sorts of social conflicts – except for the racial divides, as we shall see below.

<sup>13</sup> "Already in the late eighteenth century, the German humanities (or *Geisteswissenschaften*) had been engaged with, and informed by, imperialism (...) Humanist notions of the self were both defined and profoundly threatened by the existence of humans whom Europeans regarded as inferior. A number of scholars have recently shown how this notion of a European self was worked out in the colonies or that the 'self' of humanism and the 'other' of imperialism were twin births. For all its provincialism, German humanism was, from the very beginning, a global discourse that made sense of the colonial encounter by defining a European self unaffected by it" Zimmerman (2001, pp. 2–3), cf. also Dussel (1993).

<sup>14</sup> Kant, for instance, in his *Anthropologie in pragmatischer Hinsicht* (1800) [Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View], assumed that most nations could never achieve a *Volkscharakter* [national character]. This was the privilege of the French, British, Spanish, Italians, and Germans. On the other hand, it remained unclear what the requirements for a *Volkscharakter* would be (Zimmerman, 2001, p. 40).

was that the new discipline would answer the requirements of the modern era, i.e. natural science knowledge of all human peoples, not focused exclusively on European societies and their history (Zimmerman, 2001, p. 6).

In Germany, as opposed to other European countries, where anthropology was founded simultaneously, its role was above all an anti-humanist one. While the humanities had excluded the colonized “peoples without history”, anthropology pursued their inclusion into an overall study of the human being, with a special focus on the so-called *Naturvölker* [natural people] that were radically different from the so-called (European) *Kulturvölker* [cultural people] (Zimmerman, 2001, p. 3). The passage from the dominant humanities to anthropological social thought thus had ambiguous potentials. On the one hand, all humans and societies are included under a single discipline. Simultaneously however, this rendered the science of humans “inhuman”, and consequently allowed it to become a major constituent of NS ideology: “Anthropology challenged the elitism of an academic humanism that consisted of professors interpreting an ethnocentric canon in the name of humanity. It also provided a series of practices, theories, and ideologies for some of the greatest evils of human history: colonialist and Nazi genocide. While anthropology’s expansion of the scope of humanist studies represents a democratization of the human sciences, its displacement of hermeneutic notions of understanding and interpretive empathy with models of objective observation borrowed from the natural sciences devalued the human both as an inquirer and as a subject of inquiry” (Zimmerman, 2001, pp. 10–11).

Anthropology’s disciplinary position between history and the natural sciences proved to be precarious, as it quickly came into conflict with the rise of evolutionism. Early anthropology started from the idea of a static, ever true “nature”, as opposed to the contingent and evolving history of the humanities. After the turn of the century, however, the spread of Darwin’s ideas and of evolutionism caused anthropologists to abandon this idea (Zimmerman, 2001, p. 7) and to consider the strongly disliked conception of continuity between humans and monkeys<sup>15</sup>.

Besides the overall *völkisch* mood in German academia and the rise of anthropology, triggering the emergence of NS thought, there are various other major sources of influence that combine in Rosenberg’s writing: race thinking, social Darwinism and anti-Semitism. All of them have had a long tradition of their own. At least for the history of racial thinking and social Darwinism, colonialism played an important role. While Bourdieu, in his endeavour to reconstruct the academic field that enabled Heidegger’s philosophy, neglects the search for intellectual sources, we argue that we can trace and intersect these various strands of social thought, central elements of which were taken up by NS ideology, for instance, in Rosenberg’s *The Myth of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century* (1931) or Hitler’s *Mein Kampf* (1933), both of which can be seen as two attempts to make the formerly abstract cultural pessimism practical: “Everything that had been said on irrational pessimism from Nietzsche and Dilthey to Heidegger and Jaspers on lecture platforms and in intellectuals’ salons and cafés, Hitler and Rosenberg transferred to the streets” (Lukács [1962] 1981: 85).

---

<sup>15</sup> “Darwinism was diametrically opposed to the conception of nature fundamental to anthropology, for it replaced the absolute, static differences among natural types with narrative continuity. Particularly threatening to anthropology was the implication that the human could not be understood as a single idea, but rather was part of a continuity that also included animals. For this reasons, anthropologists often referred to Darwinism derisively as the ‘monkey doctrine’ (Affenlehre)”. Zimmerman (2001, p. 68).

### 3. Race thinking, social Darwinism and eugenics

NS ideology provided a fusion of various strands of social thought prevalent in the fields of race thinking, social Darwinism and eugenics, which all had had a history well before the rise of National Socialism. In each of them, we find connections to colonialism, but not exclusively. This can be illustrated, for example, through the history of the discipline of anthropology in the German understanding as opposed to Anglophone “Social or Cultural Anthropology”. Reconfiguring social antagonisms and building national identities in terms of biologicistic social thought (e.g. Schallmayer’s *National Biology* [1905]) was a typically modern phenomenon, based on and legitimized by scientific advance. Race thinking also affected the nationalist ideals that were debated within Germany. From the 1890s onwards, nationalism in Germany was increasingly dominated by ethnic categories, i.e. race thinking permeated nationalist ideas. For a long time, this reformulation of nationalist self-representation through racial concepts has been interpreted as an effect of growing anti-Semitism. However, Conrad shows that thinking in terms of race as well as related political measures had prevailed in the colonies before that date (Conrad, 2008, pp. 94–95). For instance, the idea of the “nigger” as the most inferior race, “born for slave labour”, as presented by Chamberlain and Gobineau, scientifically legitimized colonial exploitation and racial segregation measures. Eckart goes as far as to speak of a “paradigmatic exceptionalism of German colonial racism” (Eckart, 1997, p. 63), constitutive of political practice. While racism and social-Darwinism in general have received a lot of attention in research, this exceptionalism has not been studied in depth.

However, from the outset, racial anthropology was applied to European peoples as well. We must not assume that race thinking was a coherent body of social thought. Schallmayer, in his “prize-winning study”, stated that European peoples were an “intimate”, “inextricable” “mixture of various races” and that Gobineau’s idea that only the “Nordic race” is competent for culture is naïve, as it is impossible to trace the “Nordic” inheritance (Schallmayer, 1910, p. 377). Aspects of anthropology, such as the search for phenotypical racial criteria, were applied to the German population in an important statistical study, the *Schulstatistik* [school statistics], by the German Anthropological Society, which contributed to popularizing race thinking as well as the formation of German national identity on the grounds of racial criteria as early as the 1870s. Over 6 million schoolchildren were screened with regard to the colour of their hair, eyes and skin, in order to “determine the fate of the fair-skinned, blond, blue-eyed ‘classic Teutons’ described by Tacitus and the origins of the brown-skinned, brown-haired, brown-eyed individuals who had become preponderant in Germany”. This study fostered the public perception amongst the concerned children and their teachers who assisted in data collection that Germanness was related to specific physical traits different from those of the darker “races”. Race thinking that had emerged in the study of non-Europeans in the colonies was, thus, also made relevant to German identity (Zimmerman, 2001, p. 135). It is true as well, however, that the Jewish played a crucial role in the racial self-perception of Germans fostered by the study. The use of anthropology for anti-Semitic arguments, for racial groundings of citizenship or later on the formation of NS ideology was not intended by most anthropologists themselves, who did not participate in these currents. It was in the more specific current of eugenics (see below) that the idea of the breeding of the original “Aryan race” had prevailed since the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century



(Schmuhl, 2011a, p. 31). Nevertheless, there was clearly a potential in the concepts of anthropology that could then be instrumentalized by ideologists and politicians to promote the phantasm of the Nazi “racial state”.

The step towards combining race thinking with different shades of social Darwinist concepts was close at hand. For an understanding of the links between former race thinking, social Darwinism and National Socialism, Chamberlain is a key figure, a philosophical “classic” source of National Socialist ideas, who combined race theory with social Darwinist elements. In 1927, Rosenberg had written a whole book on Chamberlain, who was a friend of the Kaiser and who had met Hitler in 1923. In addition, he was awarded the “Iron Cross” for his writings in favour of the First World War.

The field of eugenics (or, in German, *Rassenhygiene* [racial hygiene]) bordered on that of anthropology as a scientific discipline and contained fusions with social Darwinism. Schallmayer declared the motto of eugenics on his book cover: “For nations as well as for the individual, the highest good is their genetic material” (Schallmayer, 1910). Eugenics was a crucial influence in NS ideology. It could look back on a history that started around 1880, growing stronger towards the First World War, and was an international current of social thought with representatives in Europe and North America as well as in Latin America, Asia and Australia (Schmuhl, 2011a, pp. 25 ff.). The concern of eugenics was to intentionally improve given “races” by “breeding” those with favourable physical and phenotypical characteristics while preventing “degenerate” individuals from reproduction. Apparently, the concern for racial “improvement” was strongly motivated by accounts of overseas travellers and adventurers who reported on particularly strong “natural peoples” in the colonized territories, which meant that Europeans were “degenerate races” (Schallmayer, 1910, pp. 188 ff.).

Eugenics in Germany was in exchange with the international community – the International Federation of Eugenic Organizations (IFEEO) as well as the International Union for the Scientific Investigation of Population Problems (IUSIPP) –, but it also fed into a broader social reformist movement. It was first institutionalized through the foundations of the *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie* [Archive for Racial and Social Biology] in 1904 and of the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Rassenhygiene* [German Society for Eugenics] in 1910. It achieved broad recognition by the time of the First World War and continued to grow throughout the Weimar period. Initially, eugenics was planned to be associated with sociology, but from the 1920s onwards, it was established in all German universities as a sub-discipline of medicine, and later on related to psychiatry (Schmuhl, 2011a, pp. 26 ff.). Eckart underlines the role of medical doctors in the colonies for discourses on avoiding the “threatening degradation” of the German race in the colonies (Eckart, 1997, p. 65)<sup>16</sup>.

As with anthropology, we should acknowledge that eugenics was not a coherent body of knowledge that was directly translatable into NS ideology. Schallmayer, for instance, distances his “scientifically grounded research” from *Rassedünkel* [racial bumptiousness] by “propagandists of the gospels of Aryans and Germans” (Schallmayer, 1910, p. 474). He sees the main difference in the fact that, according to scientific eugenics, any *Volkskörper* [body of the people/nation] (not only the

---

<sup>16</sup> Interestingly, references to contagious diseases such as syphilis and tuberculosis, but also alcoholism are mentioned at this early stage as particular threats to racial “improvement”. See below their role in subsequent debates.

“Nordic” one) as well as any “racial mixture” are equally valid and accessible for racial “improvement” or “degeneration” (Schallmayer, 1910, p. 475). In the end, eugenics would aim at the generalized *Aufartung* [racial improvement], whereas racial anthropology would aim at *Aufnordnung*, i.e. the increase of “Nordic blood” in order to improve the German “race”.

In translating and synthesizing these various strands of thought into NS ideology (with Chamberlain as a key reference) the National Socialists legitimized their expansionist ideas in a very modern way that was based on scientific arguments. This was true for both the external fight for a “world empire” on the one hand (parallels and borrowings from colonial discourses with regard to the Eastern European “inferior” Slavs are manifest, see Lower, 2005, pp. 3 ff.), and the internal fight against the spread and negative potential of existential deviances on the other. While colonial oppression and exploitation had been justified by declaring the colonized subjects sub-humans, thus, consequently, justifying their exploitation and enslavement, Hitler escalated this ideology on a principle level: “For the establishment of superior types of civilization the members of inferior races formed one of the most essential pre-requisites [...] It is certain that the first stages of human civilization were not based so much on the use of tame animals as on the employment of human beings who were members of an inferior race.” (Hitler [1933] 2009: 230).

Eugen Fischer, who had founded the *Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut für Anthropologie, menschliche Erblehre und Eugenik* [Emperor Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Genetics and Eugenics] in 1927, is often referred to as a key figure in terms of continuities between colonialism and NS racism. He promoted the step from static accounts of anthropology and the “measuring of skulls” towards evolutionary, genetic accounts of race. However, there was a discrepancy between what was merely state of the art science and its political application. NS racial politics lagged behind scientific advances in the field in many respects, for instance in the discussion of “Jewish mixed blood” (Schmuhl, 2011a, p. 32).

The difference between the use of race thinking during National Socialism and earlier periods in German history is that eugenics and racial policy were declared the basis of the “bio-political dictatorship of development” (Schmuhl, 2011a), which was supposed to inform all other fields of politics. National Socialism was more consistent than any other regime in applying racial and eugenic ideas to any population that was under its rule: the breeding of the German “race” was declared the top responsibility of the NS state: “The most important consequence of the demand for the protection of the people’s honour is the indiscriminate implementation of the protection of the people and of the race” (Rosenberg, (1931) 1934, p. 575). The “indiscriminate” was prominently directed against the Church (and other potential sources of ethical objections to this programme) and drew on images of degeneration due to idiocy, alcoholism and syphilis, which had become the favourite forms of deviance in the spotlight of NS discourse. Rosenberg even goes as far as to argue for procreation outside marriage for the purpose of breeding the German “race” more effectively – quantitatively as well as qualitatively. According to him, monogamy should be maintained if possible. However, procreation outside marriage could become necessary in the face of an excess of women in the German population. Let’s quote him at length: “In a couple of decades, all those that are now middle-aged will have become old aged, and then there will be a great deal of dying. If we take into account that the peoples in the east are continually increasing in number (...) then the German people has to ask itself simply, whether it is willing to win in the coming battles or to perish. If, therefore, in view of the existence of many deliberately childless marriages alongside a great surplus

of women, healthy unmarried women give birth to children, this is to be interpreted as a growth in the strength of the German collectivity. We are, then, facing the greatest battles for *the essence*. When, however, we establish this fact and draw the conclusions from it, then all the sexually saturated moralists come and all those presidents of various women's organizations, who are knitting wristlets for Negroes and Hottentots, and who are eagerly donating money for the 'mission' of the Zulu-Kaffers, and they all start agitating against this 'immorality', when indeed someone simply says that the highest priority is the preservation of the essence, which is threatened by extinction – something that takes precedence over *everything* else: and this requires the breeding of *healthy* German blood" (Rosenberg, (1931) 1934, pp. 594–595).

Furthermore, eugenics, as a supposedly scientific discipline, was able to profit from NS-policy in its own right. While the level of the genomes had not yet been discovered, eugenicists planned to develop a test of blood proteins that would determine the exact "race" of a given individual, i.e. a "serological race test". They experimented with blood testing methods on colonial war prisoners from 1940 onwards and with humans of various "races" in Auschwitz. In turn, NS racial thought directly informed the genocide of the Jews as well as that of the Sinti and Roma and the programme of ethnic cleansing in Eastern Europe (Schmuhl, 2011a, pp. 30 ff.)

There was a difference, however, in the way colonialism dealt with "deviant races" and the NS solution. Part of the ideological core of the colonial project (in Germany just as elsewhere) was the civilizing mission. It found broad acceptance among the German public, based on the commonly shared assumption that Germany (or, more broadly, Europe) represented the peak of human development. Interestingly, Conrad points out that the civilizing mission did not exclusively aim at the colonial world but also at "peasants and urban underclasses" within the *Reich* (Conrad, 2008, p. 70). We will see below that similar measures were taken in relation to civilizing the colonial subject as well as the inner-German deviants. That colonial definitions of race were not as static then as later during National Socialism could be related to the fact that the humanist tradition was still stronger under Wilhelminian imperialism, whereas the biologicistic notions had grown stronger and stronger in the following decades (Zimmerman, 2001, p. 146). Thus, while former colonialism could formulate the idea of spreading German culture through cultural assimilation, Hitler could only think of the "final solution" in the sense of either expulsion or extermination. He threatened that "'he who talks about cherishing the native and civilizing him, goes straight off to the concentration camp!'" and asserted that "'The former German colonial policy, like everything else we did, was a half measure'" (quoted in: Furber, 2003, p. 65). In the end, Nazi thought pushed the issue to the limit: Walter Groß, director of the NSDAP *Rassenpolitisches Amt* [Office of Racial Policy], wrote in 1936 that the human as such did not exist – there were only humans of this or that race (Mazower & Richter, 2009, p. 23).

We should point out again that the discourses dealt with in this section did not represent a coherent body of ideas without internal contradictions. If we consider that the Japanese were subsumed under the same race as the Germans, as "Prussians of the east", when it came to declaring an axis between Berlin, Rome and Tokyo, we would tend to agree with Lukács who assumes that race thinking was a mere propaganda instrument, which was quite cynically used by NS ideologists (Lukács [1962] 1981). Similarly, racial arguments clearly served to legitimate economic exploitation in the colonies (Eckart, 1997, p. 66). The inherent contradictions can, thus, at least partly be explained by interpreting these discourses as political propaganda – related to but not totally in line with the

“scientific” basis of related disciplines. In how far major National Socialists really believed what was told in their own political propaganda cannot be dealt with here.

While the scientifically based study of human “races” was related to colonialism, the social thought that led to the development of NS ideology also drew on anti-Semitism. Both forms of racism suggest a racial hierarchy and relate to biological categories. However, the perspective was a fundamentally different one: Jews had always been referred to as “strangers inside”, as a particularly strong threat to the *Volkskörper*, in which they had lived for centuries. Black Africans, on the contrary, were easier to identify through the colour of their skin and were perceived as remaining outside society in the colonies. Metaphors such as parasitism or the scenario of a world conspiracy were, thus, not used with regard to blacks (Kundrus, 2003, p. 111).

#### 4. The ideologies of “*Lebensraum*”, “*Blut und Boden*”: legitimating imperialism

NS ideology coined the conceptual pair termed *Blut und Boden* [blood and soil]. It represents a unique fusion of racial and territorial concepts, which took centre stage in the preparation and realization of the Second World War. It built on imperialist territorial ideas that we need to understand first.

Defendants of the continuity thesis mainly point to the uniformity of discourses and vocabulary in German imperialism, overseas as well as continental: “If there was continuity in German imperialism between Bismarck’s time and Hitler’s time, it consisted mainly of a line of ideological developments commencing before the middle of the nineteenth century and extending down to the collapse of 1945. (...) Each era did not, however, construct its own imperialism from new materials. Each was presented with ideological aggregations from the previous period, aggregations that already possessed meaning in terms of different interest groups” (Smith, 1986, p. 256).

Until the First World War, there was no coherent idea of a German *Reich*, but eclectic phantasies that formed around the ambition to become a world power prevailed in the broad public of the Kaiserreich and informed German colonial expansionism (Bley, 2003, pp. 63 ff.). There were two diverging ideological bases for imperialism: *Weltpolitik* [world politics] on the one hand and *Lebensraum* [living space] on the other hand. *Weltpolitik* related mainly to a modern form of economic imperialism and prevailed in government and business circles. It was a strong influence on politics prior to World War I and during the war effort. *Lebensraum* ideologically backed settler colonialism and prevailed amongst the conservative groupings who favoured an anti-modernist, nostalgic, agrarianist project of protecting the pre-industrial German culture (symbolized by the free and virtuous peasant) through migration to the colonies either overseas or in Eastern Europe (Smith, 1986, pp. 18–19). It had been present at the same time as and in opposition to the more liberalist *Weltpolitik*-discourse and it became more dominant towards the end of the First World War. Geographer Friedrich Ratzel, who was an advocate of *Lebensraum*-imperialism, had invented and popularized the term “*Lebensraum*”, which from the start drew on biologicistic social thought. It continued to be largely used in imperialist literature after World War I (Smith, 1986, p. 83) and had combined elements that were *völkisch* from the outset, such as the promotion of culturally superior

*Deutschtum* [Germanness]. Racial thinking served to legitimize the occupation of space formerly populated by “racially inferior” people (Smith, 1986, pp. 85 ff.).

Despite defeat in the war, both ideologies remained present throughout the Weimar Republic and their main elements were fused in NS ideology (Smith, 1986, p. 20). *Lebensraum* was particularly influential in rallying the conservative right-wing circles. Hans Grimm, an author and journalist who was active in the export business with South Africa and closely associated with the DNVP (*Deutschnationale Volkspartei* – German National Peoples Party), *Stahlhelm* (Steel Helmet) and the Colonial Society, contributed to a massive popularization of the idea in the broad public through his novel *Volk ohne Raum* [A People without Space]: “Maybe this idea can be expressed this way: Never again, will someone be able to become a farmer like his ancestors, even if his heart and that of his children would cry out for space and air and his own bread. Because all of Germany is small and already brimful of people crowded together, and one has to take the bread wherever it can be found, and one has to exert oneself for some butter to put on it (...) What if those grandsons of farmers were Britons and if they knew they had the vastness of Canada and of Australia, of New Zealand and South Africa behind them, if they had, in other words, an alternative to marching into the factories and cities!” (Grimm, [1926] 1931, p. 19). Up until the 1880s, there had indeed been massive migration from Germany towards overseas colonies but also to North America. Despite the fact that the newly industrializing and increasingly urbanizing German Reich became much more an immigration country in the following period, the hope for space to settle peasantry remained vigorous, as a conservative opposition to industrialism.

In order to back National Socialism ideologically, the German tradition ended up producing a highly rationalized, supposedly “scientific” combination of territorial, biological and racial approaches, which were fused to produce an organic relation between or even an identity of the concepts of *Volk*, culture, nation and state on the one hand and territory on the other. This served to include those Germans outside of the borders of the nation state, i.e. “German territory” under foreign rule, as well as the potential to create *Volks- und Kulturboden* [soil and culture for the German people] wherever Germans worked, including overseas territories (Smith, 1986, p. 243).

Walther Darré was an agricultural advisor for the NS regime. He had obtained a diploma as a *Diplomkolonialwirt* [colonial economist] in 1920 and had focused on race breeding not only with regard to cattle but also to humans. Darré wrote publications such as *Das Schwein als Kriterium für nordische Völker und Semiten* [The pig as a criterion for Nordic peoples and Semites] (Darré, 1933). Darré was a crucial figure in theorizing German expansionism towards Eastern Europe for which he adapted *Blut und Boden* – the assumption that a “necessary affinity existed between the optimal exploitation of a certain type of natural environment and a certain pure racial type” (Smith, 1986, p. 243). He thus managed to combine the anti-modern, environmental and territorial aspects of *Lebensraum* with modern biological racial thinking. And not only that, he also found a way of “uniquely incorporating anti-Semitism into the imperial ideology” (Furber, 2003, pp. xiv) (see below).

The two options to gain more space for the German *Volk* were either to have colonies overseas or in Eastern Europe. During the Second World War, the concrete geographic focus was even extended to the Caucasus (Bley, 2003, p. 59) and the phantasmatic ideal was no less than world domination. Interestingly, central actors as well as various institutions ensured a certain circulation

of discourses and practices from overseas colonial expansionism towards eastern settlements (Bley, 2003, p. 59) (see below).

For Hitler, overseas colonies had no priority, but colonialism (for him as for many others) was a means of opposing the Versailles Treaty (Smith, 1986, p. 242)<sup>17</sup>. Nevertheless, his ideology had the potential to integrate both lines of argument, because it overcame major contradictions between them by chronologically staging the plans for expansionism and, ultimately, world domination. In the longer run, an overseas empire would be necessary for the status of a world power, and, in the very long run, world hegemony had to be achieved (Smith, 1986, pp. 249 ff.). Imperialist ideology was the Nazi's major means of creating this consensus: "Imperial expansion was in some ways the linchpin of their [the Nazi's, wk] whole ideological universe, an action that appeared to reconcile the numerous contradictions in the program they put before the public and in which they themselves believed. Thus the Nazi period saw the culmination of the development of German imperialism in a grand scheme of aggression that encompassed no less than the intended subjugation of the entire world. Because Nazi imperialism contained, as a legacy of its history, a multitude of logical and empirical weaknesses, it could not help but be a formula for disaster." (Smith, 1986, p. 20).

The geographic, spatial and territorial thinking inherent in *Boden* [soil], which called for expansion and, thus, for the acquisition of living space, was to a certain extent in contradiction to the racial concept of *Blut* [blood] which called for racial homogenization through eugenic practice. The two came together, however, in the conception of an "organic order" of economy and society. J. C. Scott suggested that attempts to synthesize such diverse factors, which are partly "natural" but are taken under human control through social engineering, are inherently authoritarian and have totalitarian potentials as part of an "authoritarian high modernism" (Scott, 1998). They enabled the conceptualization of scientifically and technically backed "final solutions". Furthermore, Germany took the superstructure of social Darwinist and race-theory that had informed and legitimated much of Europe's overseas colonialism so far a step further: "When Germany at last 'awoke' to the prospect of imperial expansion, its policy-makers simply took the new rationale to the next level. Annexation and colonization were deemed to be racial imperatives" (Weinstein & Stehr, 1999, p. 9). Being the racially superior people the Germans had to conquer territories in order to allow their race to multiply and ultimately to lead the whole world.

## 5. Anti-Semitism in perspective

Another crucial influence in NS ideology was anti-Semitism, which had a long tradition throughout Europe. The assumption that the Jews had killed Jesus (forgetting, by the way, that Jesus himself was a Jew), had led to Judaism being regarded as an arch-deviant creed, and, thus, all those adhering to it as deviants by implication and inheritance. However, the German self-consciousness, which drew on the "Aryan" myth, was based on roots that were even older than Christianity (Conrad, 2008, p. 22).

---

<sup>17</sup> However, the Nazi establishment and the Colonial Society moved closer together between 1928 and 1933. The NSDAP's "call for Middle Africa", i.e. for the expansion of former German colonies in Africa, mainly sought to rally the support of the "*Weltpolitik*"-fraction, i.e. to secure German markets, sources of raw materials and investment areas against competing powers.

Pollock has argued that orientalism in Germany did not so much focus on overseas alterities, but on populations within German territories. The corresponding scholarly discipline, Indology, supported the difference between „Indo-Germans“ (= Aryans) on the one hand and “Semites” on the other. This includes a racial, but, more importantly, a cultural, especially linguistic aspect. What is new under National Socialism is the designation of Jews as existential deviants, as opposed to their being regarded as articulatory deviants in the tradition of Christian anti-Semitism, which is perhaps more appropriately described as anti-Judaism. The question of whether combining anti-Semitism with racial categorization included concepts learned from the colonial experience of racial stereotyping and segregation is being debated in the literature. We thus have to understand how and why the conceptual change in anti-Semitism from articulatory deviance (being a member of the deviant religious community) to existential deviance occurred. This might also help elucidate the question why anti-Semitism, as a tradition of many centuries, had never before led to such radical extermination policies as during the Holocaust. In fact, anti-Semitism appears to be a necessary but insufficient precondition for the extermination of European Jews under National Socialism (Bauman, 1994, pp. 45ff).

What characterizes anti-Semitism as opposed to other social antagonisms is the minority status of Jews in European society, in contrast to conflict between numerically equal or territorially based groups. The Jews themselves had maintained this status of strangers within over the centuries. Anti-Semitism, thus, corresponds to the endeavour to maintain demarcation lines with this population group within the boundaries of a given country or nation. Furthermore, the Jews were in themselves a people without a homeland. Interestingly, they shared these two characteristics with the Sinti and Roma, the second of just two groups marked by the NS ideology for total extermination. During former periods, in the Middle Ages for instance, the Jews lived as one (spatially) separated group among many other different and hierarchically ordered status groups – social classes or *Stände*. The established social order foresaw rules and regulations to avoid intermingling of different status groups. Apart from this, the religious factor came into play. Jews were not lost souls accessible for mission and conversion, but knowingly and willingly resisted Christianity. They thus represented a permanently present and visible challenge to Christianity, a continuous “alter ego of the Christian Church”, which co-defined Christian identity, since Christianity originated in its opposition to Judaism (Bauman, 1994, p. 52).

With the emergence of modernity, this ambiguous standing in society had to be redefined. Jews became increasingly emancipated in terms of their citizenship rights and grew economically influential as they could profit from social change and the restructuring of the economy and society (whereas other classes were paralyzed by the prevailing agrarian order and its value system). The increasing assimilation of Jews blurred the intended sharp dividing lines between them and the “normal” population. While social segregation seemed to be a “natural” aspect of medieval society, it became a practical, social and political problem with modernity. Simultaneously, the ancient figure of the German, this German superiority will be fully evident after hostilities have ceased and for or many years to follow, when, due to the present disastrous state of nourishment and heatant problems in modern history and society. Until the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, anti-Semitism combined with an anti-modernist attitude in the sense of a critique of social change in the direction of modernization. Since it became obvious that social change was irreversible and that there could be no return to petty-bourgeois, conservative, romantic community life, anti-Semitism became an

element of many socialist theories as well. Society needed to overcome capitalism and to be emancipated from the Jews (Bauman, 1994, p. 62).

Modernity needed to find a new way of defining, rationally explaining, politically legitimating, administrating and controlling the Jewish “others”, a way that was adapted to modern society. There needed to be a construction of natural difference between those Jews who became increasingly invisible and assimilated and the rest of the population, who could freely choose marriages and profession. Modern anti-Semitism is, thus, a product of the homogenizing tendencies of modern nation states, and the problem was not a high level of segregation, but precisely the loss of such dividing lines. The solution to this dilemma lay in transforming cultural, historical and religious anti-Semitism into an issue of race. Thus, any attempt at assimilation, integration and education of the arch deviant could be declared an endeavour in vein. This is what Arendt summed up in her statement that Judaism was replaced by being Jewish, i.e. deviance became existential: “Jews have been able to escape from Judaism into conversion; from Jewishness there was no escape” (Arendt 1963: 87). In a world in which better education and more individual chances for social upward mobility were more widespread and visible than before, racial thinking was the solution that made it possible to proclaim whole groups of people as resistant to educational reform, who, thus, had to be eliminated – deported and expelled from the territory or killed – in order to ensure the improvement of the dominant race. The elimination of other forms of degenerate life and of other deviant groups under National Socialism followed the same logic.

What needs to be added to this section on race thinking and anti-Semitism, however, is a glance at the material aspects of the persecution of Jews. Throughout history, it is obvious that those persecuting Jews had usually also sought material advantages and enriched themselves through dispossessing and persecuting their victims. The National Socialists even thought out a pseudo-theoretical underpinning of their practice, differentiating between productive capital and *raffendes* [exploitive] capital (see below).

The anti-Semitic tradition is certainly an important factor in differentiating the experience of mass extermination under National Socialism from the colonial experience and its potential impact inside Europe. Furber believes that the “murder of six million Jews on Polish and Soviet territory is the inescapable fact of this historical epoch, and also the greatest hindrance towards seeing Nazi rule as colonialism” (Furber, 2003, p. 3). With regard to the other elements mentioned, the anti-Semitic aspect should not be overstated to the point that makes the Holocaust a singular problem of Jewish history, the culminating point of anti-Semitic long-term tendencies, as this would veil the other components of the disaster and its relationship to (colonial) modernity (Bauman, 1994).

## **6. *Schaffendes and raffendes Kapital*, anti-communism and anti-Bolshevism**

Anti-Semitism, combined with right-wing discourses on organic order, anti-socialism and supposed anti-(financial)capitalism alike, was a means of projecting the broadly spread social fears onto the Jewish arch deviants and of gaining broad mass support in times of economic crisis. The trick was to separate the “good sides” of capitalism, *schaffendes Kapital* [productive capital], i.e. national, purely German, creative, industrial and agrarian, from its bad side, *raffendes Kapital* [exploitive capital] i.e.



international, Jewish, trade and finance<sup>18</sup>. Rosenberg declared that socialist or Marxist anti-capitalism worked in favour of the Jews. Instead, the question was one of ownership of capital by race:

“In the same way that democratic pseudo-thinkers fought for ‘the law’, the staunch social democrat fought against ‘capital’. Again, an anaemic term or, more correctly, a mere word became the object of contention for millions. However, it was clear that there were *essential* differences between capital and capital. It is indisputable that capital is necessary for *every* enterprise. The only questions are: who owns this capital and what are the principles by which it is governed, directed and supervised. *This* is the crucial point and the hue and cry against ‘capital’ has turned out to be a deliberate deception of demagogues, who used the idea that capital is hostile to the people in order to refer to means of production and natural recourses so that ‘capital’ in the sense of liquid international loans was lost from sight. Had the staunch German social democrat been aware that, since this liquid financial capital can easily be transferred from one state to another, it is crucial to bind it to the state and to the people through an act of power, then the whole fight against the dominance of the money, i.e. the fight against the *de facto* devastating capitalism, would have been led in the right direction. As it was, however, he was dazed by all the empty phrases and tagged along behind the Jewish demagogues, allowing himself to be turned into a pioneer of the international financial capital, which is destructive for the people” (Rosenberg, [1931] 1934, pp. 581–582).

Gottfried Feder, in his book *Der Deutsche Staat auf nationaler und sozialer Grundlage* [National and Social Bases of the German State] theorized this critique of (Jewish) financial capital. It served as a main reference for Hitler’s *Mein Kampf*, i.e. Feder was the leading ideologist for what the NS took for a critique of capitalism (Feder, 1933, pp. 7 ff.). His simple recipe was *Brechung der Zinsknechtschaft* [Breaking with interest farmhand shank], which was intended to help avoid high capitalism and described a “truly social form of economy”, a “state of work and merit [*Leistung*] without falling into communism (Feder, 1933, p. 112). The abolition of interest farmhand shank specifically meant, firstly, the reduction of the expenses for war reparations and, secondly, the fight against Jewish loans in accordance with the biblical principle of non-usury.

This unique combination of anti-Semitism and NS views on (financial) capitalism and on communism alike also included an opposition between the “international” Jews and their world conspiracy as opposed to down-to-earth German peasants, who were almost thought of as part of the piece of earth they cultivate. Differentiation between communism, bolshevism and Marxism was totally lacking. Bolshevism, in particular, was seen as an invention of the Jews: “The 19<sup>th</sup> century gave birth to the ripest fruit of Bolshevism, the most devastating pestilential trait of oriental thought that has sent its venomous fumes to Europe since the Inquisition” (Rosenberg, [1931] 1934, p. 559). This allowed for the combination of imperialist ideas towards Eastern Europe with anti-Semitism. Obviously, this attack on the “Jewish-Bolshevik” Soviet Union included anti-Slavic racial ideas as well (Smith, 1986, p. 4). The hatred against the threatening “Jewish Bolshevism” must have been particularly strong amongst the conservative elites that provided much of the higher army ranks, due to the experience of the November revolution of 1918 in Germany, an event that had been

---

<sup>18</sup> There is no English translation that would grasp the particular meaning of “*raffend*”. The term is still used today as an antisemitic metaphor in Nazi-discourse.

attributed to Jewish and Russian Bolsheviks and that had been made responsible for the loss of the First World War<sup>19</sup>.

Marxism as such was guilty of “three major devastations”, namely internationalism, class struggle and pacifism and, in addition to these, also of the destruction of the concept of property<sup>20</sup>. The degree of anti-Semitism inherent in these economic ideas is astonishing: It combined the images of contamination, parasitism and conspiracy, all of which were characteristic of the specific racism against Jews. According to Rosenberg, such a situation called for a “hard honourable man” to put end to the existence of the Jews: “The jurisdiction of the coming *Reich* will sweep there with an iron broom. It will have to embrace the idea of Lagarde about the Jews that you cannot educate a trichina, but have to render it harmless as quickly as possible. Millions are groaning today under a terrible injustice and they long for a raise in salary, revaluation, etc. They forget that their misery is conditioned by the common premise that the economy is the highest good. But they will realize immediately what happened in the last century when the hangman’s noose and gallows start to carry out the necessary cleansing. Someday, they will marvel at the speed with which this whole nightmare will be over, when the forceful iron fist of a hard man of honour will grab all of this riffraff dressed in silken tailcoats which is strutting around in banks and in the stock exchange by the scruff of the neck and have them legally hanged under a new kind of justice” (Rosenberg, [1931] 1934, p. 591). The NS ideology of Jewish *raffendes* capital thus contributed to fostering the image of the arch deviant of the Jew, combined with that of the Slav and that of the Bolshevik. It also defined the communist as one of the major targets of the NS policy against articulatory deviance.

## Conclusion

As shown at various stages of the argument, NS ideology was “heterogeneous and highly self-contradictory in logic and in empirical referents, but the elements of which it was composed had almost all been thoroughly legitimated in the course of their political employment during the previous two or three generations (...). One of the reasons that the Nazi ideology was so successful in eliciting support for the party and consensus behind its program was that its structure was built around central concepts that, in the political environment of interwar Germany, appeared to integrate the disparate individual elements of the party’s program in a convincing fashion. Imperialism played an extremely important role in this regard” (Smith, 1986, p. 234).

Ultimately, the Nazi ideologists dreamed of a “new type of human” (Rosenberg, [1931] 1934, pp. 1–2) and their narrative and practice aimed at progressing towards this ideal human in an ideal

---

<sup>19</sup> It is noteworthy that the *Kaiserreich*, in order to weaken the Tsar, had secretly provided massive support to the Bolsheviks, financially and logistically, during the First World War. See Wiegrefe et al. (2007).

<sup>20</sup> “Besides three major devastations of Marxism, i.e. the doctrine of internationalism (which corrodes the foundations of all *völkisch* thinking and feeling), class struggle (which is meant to destroy the nation, i.e. the living organism, by inflaming one part to revolt against the other), and pacifism (which is meant to finish this work of destruction by unmaning the foreign policy), the fourth and maybe strongest erosion materializes in the destruction of the concept of property, which is most deeply connected with the German ideal of personality as such [...] And so the inevitable happened: *When the Marxists came into power in 1918, it was not so much the case that having property was declared to be theft, but – quite the opposite – the greatest acts of theft were declared to be legal property*” Rosenberg [1931] 1934, p. 587.

society. The *Reich* they dreamed of was meant to be the space for this new human type. This ideal conception included controlling and managing not only deviance, but the totality of life as such: birth and death, sexuality and reproduction, purification of racial types as well as evolution towards the ideal human type. This has been termed by Foucault “bio-politics” at state level. Agamben assumes that it is the “state of exception” that empowers bio-politics, i.e. a politics dealing with bare life as opposed to dealing with juridically defined persons (Schmuhl, 2011a, p. 24). Eugenics, racially based policies and imperialism thus combined in unique ways and were put into practice more consistently than under any other regime. The specific form of anti-Semitism and critique of financial capitalism helped broaden the support for that programme. The supposed progress towards the ideal human and ideal society required exclusion and extermination of anyone designated as deviant with regard to the programme. The focus had to be on existential deviance in the first place, as this was at the heart of the NS-project. However, as a direct consequence of the totalitarian ambitions and of the programme and the supposed almightiness of the NS-regime, more and more individuals had to be defined and persecuted as a threat to the very defining power of the same programme, i.e. mainly as articulatory deviants (see section 4 below).

## II. Lines of continuity? Examples of political and institutional practice

While continuities between colonialism and National Socialism are rather obvious in certain domains of social thought, it is more complicated to show such continuities at the level of the political, institutional and administrative practice of dealing with the deviance these discourses propagated. Unfortunately, it is not possible here to go into all the details of historiographic accounts that have been fuelling the debate on the continuity thesis to this date. Instead, I am going to give two examples in which astonishing continuities are documented: first, the moral panic around the *Schwarze Schmach* [Black Horror]<sup>21</sup> and the fate of the so-called “Rhineland bastards” under National Socialism – an episode that started during democracy and linked into National Socialism; second, certain aspects of the Nazis’ assault on Eastern Europe. These are just two examples out of a complex and heterogeneous period in German history. They diverge greatly with regard to their scale and dimensions. Both are particularly interesting, however, regarding definition of deviance and related practices. However, we cannot limit the story to those examples in which continuities from colonialism are most obvious. Briefly characterizing the industrial and bureaucratic character of the NS extermination machinery will help us understand in how far the Holocaust was a highly modern undertaking that was unprecedented in some of its most crucial aspects. Finally, we have to understand in how far articulatory deviance represented a major threat to the totalitarian ambitions of the regime and how this was dealt with.

---

<sup>21</sup> In the literature, *Schwarze Schmach* is most often translated as “Black Horror”. This does not capture the various layers of meaning of the German term, however, which is actually closer to “disgrace” in English, but also includes the aspects of “humiliation” and “dishonour”.

## 1. *Schwarze Schmach* and the fate of the “Rhineland bastards”

The Treaty of Versailles, which put an end to the state of war in 1920, foresaw the occupation of the Rhineland in Southwest Germany and of the bridgeheads at Cologne, Koblenz and Mainz by the Allied Powers for 15 years. Among the French occupying troops (around 85.000 soldiers) were a total of 30,000-40,000 African soldiers recruited in the colonies – Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, Madagascar, Senegal, among others<sup>22</sup>. The moral panic of the *Schwarze Schmach* [Black Horror, see footnote 21], which arose in Germany when the population was faced with these occupying colonial troops, represents an exemplary case of a combination of the various lines of thought outlined above. In this particular historical setting of post-war Germany, the different strands of thought crystallized into forms of policy practice to deal with deviance that clearly showed continuities from colonial times right into National Socialism.

The moral panic that arose from 1920 onwards revolved around supposedly massive violence inflicted by the colonial soldiers, especially sexual violence against German women. Historiographical research reveals very few documented cases of rape (less than among the French troops on average), whereas common criminality amongst the colonial soldiers concerned unauthorized cycling or football, damage to property, affray, and four cases of homicide. The history of the *Schwarze Schmach* is, thus, essentially a history of a moral panic and the accompanying propaganda (Wigger, 2007, pp. 9 ff.).

The prelude to this outrage had already occurred during the First World War. In an analysis of the situation in Russia in April 1917, in which he meant to convince German social democracy to continue support for the war against potential Russian anti-war influences, Max Weber warned that “[...] an army of negroes, ghurkas and all the barbarian rabble in the world [is] standing at our borders, half crazed with rage, lust for vengeance, and the craving to devastate our country [...]” (Weber [1912] 1995: 255)<sup>23</sup>. The German government, following advice from the Colonial Society in 1917, had argued against the presence of black soldiers amongst the occupation forces from 1918 onwards. President Friedrich Ebert argued: “It should be called out to the world again that it is a provocative violation of the laws of European civilization to use coloured troops of the lowest culture as wardens for a population of such high mental and economic distinction as the Rhinelanders” (quoted in: Kolb, 2005, pp. 97–98).

The campaign was supported by the vast majority of the German public, including almost all political parties of the German *Reichstag* (excluding the USPD and KPD), the Department of Foreign Affairs, the *Reichsheimatdienst* [Reich Homeland Service], *Rheinische Volkspflege* [Rhineland Social Welfare], the liberal *Heidelberger Vereinigung* [Heidelberg Union, of which Max Weber was a member], the *Deutsche Ärzteschaft* [German Medical Fraternity], the trade unions, the *Rheinische*

---

<sup>22</sup> Apparently a total of about 190.000 African soldiers were recruited before and during World War I. We cannot deal here with the complex question regarding the reasons for the recruitment of colonial troops by the French army, the realities and consequences of this decision and its implementation. See Campt (2004, pp. 31 ff.). For an overview on the “Third World in the Second World war”, see the volume under the same title (Morgenrath and Rössel, 2005).

<sup>23</sup> For a decolonizing perspective on German social theory, cf. Steinmetz (2006), for M. Weber in particular, cf. Zimmerman (2006); Naber (2007).

*Frauenliga* [Rhineland Womens' League, initiated by public authorities and thus semi-official], and various other women's organizations, the Protestant and Catholic Churches as well as some newly founded associations such as the *Deutscher Notbund* [German Emergency Union] or *Volksbund 'Rettet die Ehre'* [National Association: Rescue our Honour], that partly received public funding and support (Wigger, 2007, pp. 11 ff.). The propaganda was distributed via all sorts of media including newspapers and the radio, official politics, science and academia, popular culture, theatre and caricature, poetry and songs, school books, banknotes, medals, postcards and stamps (Wigger, 2007, p. 13). It was national and international with major spokespersons and multipliers, including individuals such as E.D. Morel or Ray Beveridge, or organizations such as the International Labour Party, the American Campaign against the Horror on the Rhine or the pacifist Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. The Swedish women's' associations alone collected over 50.000 signatures against the "Black Horror" in Europe (Wigger, 2007, p. 16). Activities took place in Austria, Switzerland, Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, Italy, Hungary, Ireland, Poland, New Zealand, Australia and the US.

The moral panic represents a complex arrangement of elements related to several of the above-mentioned lines of thought, most of them with antecedents in colonialism, but also related to the historical situation in post-war Germany. The simultaneous mobilization of the categories race, gender, and nation and to some extent class defined the black soldiers as an incarnation of all types of deviance: existential (black), behavioural (rape) and miasmatic (transmission of diseases and metaphorically, pollution of the white race). At least indirectly there was a perceived threat of articulatory deviance (black emancipation) as well. The conception of "black humiliation" as a French attack on the German woman, the German people and the white race served to unify the German people in times of existential crisis. It is obvious that the whole story had concrete antecedents in the colonies, where German settlers felt similarly threatened by rebellions of the colonized on the one hand, but very concretely by the "black danger", i.e. the supposed permanent risk for white women to be raped by black men. The honour of white women and of the reproduction of the white race as such were difficult to protect in a colonial situation where, out of practical necessity, neither complete segregation nor extermination of the threatening colonized population were an option (Eckert, [2003] 2004, p. 234). We shall briefly elaborate on these distinct aspects of the moral panic around the "Black Horror".

#### *The political perspective: Versailles revisionism*

The *Schwarze Schmach* can easily be interpreted as a strategic means of opposing the Treaty of Versailles. Employed by foreign policy, it was suitable in order to change the power relations between Germany and its former enemies – to isolate France, responsible for the crimes of its colonial troops and for the humiliation of the German nation through the presence of "animal-like occupiers" – and thus to criticize the occupation as such. The campaign conceived of France as a degenerate nation that disrespected racial segregation. The "Black Disgrace" was verbally equated to a "French Disgrace" and Germany to a cultural nation raped by France (Wigger, 2007, pp. 19, 25, 33, 209). Rosenberg draws a picture of the neighbouring country that combines the most diverse accusations, from the invasion by Africans to the domination by Jews and the threat of contamination of the whole of the white race through France:

“It was the continuing strength of Northern France (Normandy was called ‘Little Germany’ during the age of heresy) that Germany had to face in 1914. This strength, however, was not under the command of persons of the same blood, but of the Rothschild bankers and the other financial powers racially related to them (...). Whole stretches of land in the South are completely desolate and have already started to suck people from Africa into them as Rome once did. Toulon and Marseille are continually sending seeds of bastardization into the country. The area around Notre Dame in Paris is being flooded by an ever more degenerate population. Negroes and mulattos are walking hand in hand with white women and an exclusively Jewish quarter with new synagogues is developing. South American mestizo-like swanks pollute the race of the still beautiful women who are lured to Paris from all over France. We are experiencing something in the present that already happened in Athens, Rome and Persepolis. Therefore, a close relationship with France is so very dangerous for racial-historical reasons, quite apart from the politico-military aspects. Instead, we must call for defensive measures against the African intrusion, for a closing the borders on the basis of anthropological features, for a Nordic European coalition that will cleanse the European mother country of those African and Syrian germs that are dispersed by France” (Rosenberg, [1931] 1934, pp. 101–102).

#### *The creation of a national myth*

An important aspect of the *Schwarze Schmach* was its inversion of racial hierarchies: blacks ruled over Germans, reinforcing the humiliation experienced by the loss of the war, the loss of the status of a world power and the Treaty of Versailles – the national disaster. This contributed to the creation of a national myth, incorporating the existential fears and revealing the identity crisis experienced by the nationalist, conservative and right-leaning bourgeoisie and people in academia, who all perceived social disorder and felt their status was threatened. The experience of collective dishonour could, thus, be mobilized in order to integrate the nation beyond political dividing lines and across classes. The moral panic about “black uncivilized hordes in the middle of Europe” went alongside complaints about the loss of authority, discipline, values and order and related in various ways to antidemocratic discourses (Lebzelter, 1985, p. 39). Supposed violence against German women, metaphorically related to aggression against and pollution of the *Volkskörper*, related to the organicist model of society and thus corresponded to a logic of power and control in which social classes are conceived of as different parts of the body (Wigger, 2007, pp. 20–21, 211). The call for “national honour” upheld the idea of a *Volksgemeinschaft* [national community], of a specific German character in which all regional, political and social differences were overcome.

#### *Race thinking*

A determinedly racialized discourse based on the binary opposition between black primitiveness and white culture thus combining racial and cultural elements, supported the aim of the unification of the German nation and of the whole of the white race against the “Black Horror”. The presence of a black occupation force challenged the principle of European supremacy. It also represented a danger of racial degeneration and contamination (for the miasmatic aspect see below). Wigger is probably right in dealing with race and culture as one conglomerate of ideas beyond their ideal-typical definition, in as far as both could not be separated in discourse and practice: “While the white race is

thought of as a representative for all types of culture, culture is also conceived biologically as an exclusive quality of the white race" (Wigger, 2007, pp. 32–33).

Lebzelter argues that social Darwinist thinking, the idea of a "natural urge towards expansion" of the Germans, and the "final battle" between Slavs and Germans that had already served as legitimation for the colonial and hegemonic aspirations before the war, were not withdrawn or revised, but redirected towards the "final battle" of the races within German territory (Lebzelter, 1985, p. 51). The moral panic in question had "structural, symbolic and semantic parallels with the anti-Semitic agitation", especially the so-called *Radau-Antisemitismus* [rowdy anti-Semitism] of radical right-wing groups in the after-war period. Propaganda directed against the Jews similarly aimed at unifying the German nation. Jews were equally defined as anti-moral sexual and miasmic deviants, but the spectrum was broader since the German-Jewish relations were much older and, thus, the mobilizing repertoire richer (Lebzelter, 1985, pp. 52 ff.). Interestingly, Hitler himself did not support the campaign against the "Black Horror" – he simply saw it as a strategy of Jewish manipulation aiming at disgracing the German nation: "The Jews were responsible for bringing negroes into the Rhineland, with the ultimate idea of bastardizing the white race which they hate and thus lowering its cultural and political level so that the Jew might dominate" (Hitler [1933] 2009: 254f).

Graph 2 about here

#### *Gendered aspects of the campaign*

The German woman as a victim of debauched black sexuality was in the centre of the debate. While the colonial soldiers were stigmatized as animal-like, instinct driven carriers of disease and as a danger for German women and for the German *Volkskörper* as such, the image of women mobilized in the discussion is no less interesting with regard to questions of deviance. German women are represented as the *Gattungsträgerin* [carriers of the species/race], in charge of the purity of the "blood" and of upholding the "honour of the nation". At the same time, however, women are viewed as fundamentally ambiguous, non-rational beings in constant danger of succumbing to their instincts – as opposed to the rational German man. As a consequence, those women entering into contact, let alone establishing a love relationship with the occupying forces and, in the worst case, with the black soldiers, were a dishonour to the German nation. The existing love relationships and marriages between German women and colonial soldiers were considered a betrayal of the nation and of the white race and accordingly termed the *Weißer Schmach* [white disgrace] (Wigger, 2007, p. 122). Liljeblad, a Swedish priest and international multiplier of the campaign stated, after a visit to the region: "There are also hoydenish girls among the Germans who do not shun from entering into voluntary connections with both white and coloured troops without minding the unheard of suffering they in this way inflict upon the German people" (cited in Wigger, 2007, pp. 241, footnote 11). Women are thus the "medium of the 'Black Danger'", they are either well-behaved but defenceless victims or immoral whores, to be excluded from the *Volksgemeinschaft* (Wigger, 2007, p. 107). Efforts to discipline and control the weaker sex, the instinctive female sexuality through such discourse was not limited to relations with black soldiers. A pamphlet warned: "German women! German girls! Keep away from Jews, Negroes, Russians, Mongols and all foreigners and men of

inferior race!” (quoted in: Wigger, 2007, p. 129). The tendency to exclude women who entered into relations with the black occupiers went as far as morally pushing them to commit suicide as well as calling for the infanticide of children conceived in these relationships in the name of upholding the “German honour” – cases of such “martyrs” are documented by Wigger (2007, p. 149).

However, looking more closely, we see that race was the principal category under which gender was subsumed: black women were not included in the category of the victims of aggression<sup>24</sup>. This gendered aspect of the campaign had predecessors in the colonies. There as well women were essentially regarded as instinctive creatures and special legislation was discussed aiming at preventing relationships between German women and colonized men. Colonial societies struggled hard to control female sexuality. Sexual aggression of black men towards white women was regarded as a particularly severe crime in the colonies. However, the anti-rape laws were essentially racial laws, as they excluded sexual crime against black women as well as sexual assaults by white men (Wigger, 2007, p. 199; Zimmerer, [2003b] 2004, p. 46).

In addition, the role of German women in the *Schwarze Schmach*-campaign appears as the reverse side of their role in the colonies. In the colonies as well, German women saw themselves as important protectors of the purity of the German nation or race. “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” (Campt, 2004, p. 48). In order to alleviate the situation in the colonies, “female colonial schools” formed and educated a female population to be sent to the colonies in order to serve their future husbands as honourable German wives (Conrad, 2008, pp. 75 ff). It is interesting to note that very similar patterns of gendered racial thinking and fear of racial mixing structured the regulations of forced labourers in the *Reich* during the Second World War (Herbert 1986).

#### *The black soldier as a miasmic deviant*

The campaign drew on yet another aspect of the “Black Horror”, namely that of infection and pollution. Scientific discourse in the domains of eugenics and social hygiene supported such accounts voiced in the media by various associations and public authorities, politicians and scientists. They referred to the danger of contagious diseases through the black troops on the one hand, the pollution of the white race and the German *Volkskörper* on the other.

The first went under the buzzword of the “black pest”, i.e. the spreading of diseases amongst the population in the occupied regions. Apart from fear of all sorts of tropical diseases, medical expert opinions warned of typhus, dysentery, pest and cholera, the danger of which was especially high in view of the “low cultural level of the blacks” (Wigger, 2007, p. 146). Fear of “syphilitization” (the spread of syphilis), was another frequent topic concerning a sexually transmittable disease. It can certainly be regarded as a structural equivalent to today’s discourses around the HIV/AIDS

---

<sup>24</sup> The police director of Wiesbaden, for instance, considered it to be an improvement that a brothel was opened with “black inmates”. The German Emergency Union also argued that “nigger females” had been introduced in order to direct the “coloured beasts” away from German women. Wigger (2007, p. 119).



pandemic. Moral panic around syphilis, in the same way, directly links individual sexual behaviour, public health and national wellbeing. The second aspect concerns miasmic deviance at a more metaphorical level, as voiced under the buzzword of „mulattoization“, „bastardization“ or „negroization“ of the occupied regions. The gender dimension of this sort of discourse that considers women as the breeders of the white race and the metaphorical shift from what was assumed to be rape of a German woman to the pollution of the *Volkskörper* is obvious. The black soldiers were sources of infection not only for the victims of their sexual hunger, but for the nation as such (Wigger, 2007, pp. 145 ff.). It is interesting to note that it was considered a fact that “every woman who was raped by a black man will never be able to get rid of the black blood” (Wigger, 2007, p. 150). This direct connection between female sexuality and the nation was particularly handy in the German context, where the nation was strongly defined through blood and descent.

As mentioned above, these discourses, which found support in scientific disciplines such as eugenics, biological and social hygiene, and race thinking, were produced in renowned institutes and published in common scholarly journals. These discourses were nothing new, but had re-emerged after the colonial situation, where the issue of racially mixed relationships and marriages had first been dealt with. It was in the colonies that racial mixing was first seen as a eugenic danger and as a threat to the supposedly natural hierarchy between the races (see below).

#### *Threat of black emancipation – the indirect assumption of articulatory deviance*

While the use of black occupation forces to rule over a German population clearly defied the supposed natural hierarchy between the races, this was combined with a perceived threat of emancipatory claims among the black soldiers. At a historical moment when international power relations, including colonial rule, were troubled by the war and in a situation of rule over European populations, the colonial troops could lose their “respect” for the colonizers and, empowered through military training, turn their energies against them. The “Black Horror” thus became a question of survival of the European powers and of the white race (Wigger, 2007, p. 202). This further helped to internationally stigmatize France, which actually empowered its colonial subjects in this way, and increased the international support for Germany in the campaign. Again, Rosenberg is straight forward about this argument: “This strong seething movement within the coloured people is a direct result of the world war. The entente powers have to bear the responsibility for the monstrous crime of mobilized blacks and half-castes [Mischlinge] against the German people and – supported by years of reviling Germany – of having led them into a war against a *Reich* of white race. Certainly, France has to bear the greatest and most direct share of guilt as, after the war, it occupied the cradle of European culture, the Rhineland, with coloured troops. It was France, whose military authorities declared openly in the French parliament that the French were a people of hundreds of millions and that they did not command two armies, a white and a coloured one, but one single army. Through this programmatic declaration, the French politicians have placed the black race on an equal footing with the white race. Similarly to 140 years ago, when France started the emancipation of the Jews, it stands again, today, at the forefront of the mongrelization of Europe. It is therefore hardly possible to still consider France a European state, but rather an offshoot of Africa led by Jews” (Rosenberg, [1931] 1934, pp. 646–647).

However, we cannot support this dimension of assumed articulatory deviance with historical insights, as none of the authors and sources under consideration contains any account of the viewpoint of the black soldiers themselves – the counter discourse or discourse from below is largely absent in the whole debate around the “black humiliation”<sup>25</sup>.

The fears of black emancipation refer to a broader dimension of rule and power underlying the whole debate. The “blacks” were largely regarded as useful manpower as long as they were kept within clearly regulated spaces and roles in a strongly segregated social situation. Obviously, the colonial troops violated the established dividing lines in ruling over Germans in Germany. The worst case mentioned is that of the French police court in Landau, where a black French army officer acted as a legal assessor. This provoked an outrage about the “shamelessness to having whites watched over by blacks in Europe and, thus, threatening the entire structure of civilization” (Wigger, 2007, p. 145).

### *White rule, racial mixing and eugenics – legacies of colonialism*

The links between “colonial discourses on miscegenation and citizenship and their influence on parallel and subsequent debates on the status of Black Germans within the Reich” (Campt, 2004, p. 6) are one of the favourite topics of the defendants of the continuity thesis. The colonial state built on maintaining and exploiting fundamental differences between the colonizers and the colonial subjects<sup>26</sup>. The coexistence of whites and colonial subjects lead to strong fears of loss of clear lines of demarcation, as expressed in the fear of *Verkafferung* [going native] of the colonizers (Conrad, 2008) as well as of racial mixing<sup>27</sup>. At the level of discourse, of images and metaphors that were used during the debate, the moral panic about the „Black Horror“ resembled that about mixed marriages and “mixed bloods” in the colonies, e.g. with regard to public stigmatization of syphilis and alcoholism, and the mobilization of the concept of “honour” or the negative perception of France.

The issue of love relationships or marriages between German women and black occupiers thus mobilized discourses around racial mixture that were first debated with regard to interracial marriages in the colonies: “Only six years before the Rhineland occupation, Reichstag debates on racially mixed marriages [in the German colonies, wk] prefigured many of the same arguments and fears voiced later in the newspaper protest campaign” (Campt, 2004, p. 43). Yet, before we go into detail, we have to remember that there were other antecedents apart from the colonial experience.

---

<sup>25</sup> Campt (2004) extensively quotes from interviews with one son of a black soldier and a German mother, but hardly refers to the biographies of the parents.

<sup>26</sup> In a situation of lack of ideological hegemony and need for control and repression, various measures were introduced aiming at ensuring better control over the colonized (Conrad 2008). Especially after the Herero-war, between 1904 and 1914, several *Eingeborenenverordnungen* [Regulations on the Native Population] sought to improve segregation. This was difficult, especially with regard to mobility of the population that undermined the established colonial order and bureaucracy. In order to facilitate identification, the colonized had to wear numbered marks on their clothing and carry a passport with them. Conrad quotes Governor Seitz in despair, who urges his officials in South West Africa to “ensure with all means that the indigenous keep one and the same name”. Conrad (2008, p. 67).

<sup>27</sup> In a similar vein, the presence of poor Europeans in the colonies, such as unemployed, vagabonds, beggars, criminals and prostitutes, i.e. typical white deviants, threatened the image of and respect for the colonizers. This is similar to the “poor whites problem” in South Africa (see Groenewald 1987). Typical reactions went from financial support to imprisonment and expulsions. Conrad (2008, pp. 75 ff).

For instance, the Christian churches had traditionally prohibited mixed marriages between Catholics and Protestants, and civil marriages had only been introduced in 1875 (Kundrus, 2003, p. 112).

According to official German imperial law, interracial marriages were allowed. However, colonial officials started to draft decrees prohibiting mixed marriages in the territories they ruled. They were motivated by racial and eugenic concerns and by political calculations concerning the conditions for colonial rule, i.e. for the maintenance of racial hierarchies, avoiding giving too much consideration to the colonized and their offspring, but also the going native of the German colonizers<sup>28</sup>. A major issue was the accession to citizenship of children with a German father, regardless of the fact that the mother was “indigenous”. The vice-governor Tecklenburg formulated these concerns in the following way: “‘The male half-castes will become liable to military service, it will be possible for them to obtain a public office, and they will be entitled to vote and to exercise other rights linked to citizenship which are to be introduced in the future. These results are a cause for great concern and are highly dangerous in view of the situation in German South-West Africa. They not only have a negative effect on the purity of the German race and German civilization but also endanger the position of power of the white man in general. Concerning the former, we should be aware that it is an old empirical fact, confirmed not only in Africa, that if a member of a higher race lives together with a member of the lower race permanently, the white male living together with the woman from a lower race will not uplift her to his own level, but he will be pulled down to hers. He will ‘go native’ [verkauffern], as they say here. In the same way, experience teaches us that such a mixture of races does not improve races, but worsens them. The descendants are usually physically and morally weak. They inherit the bad traits of both parents and, naturally, tend to follow their mother in language and behaviour rather than their white father. Should the government tolerate all of these consequences by legally permitting marriage between natives and non-natives, then it would act against its own interest in turning this protectorate into a land characterized by civilized German behaviour. Making the marriage of whites and natives illegal will, however, not prevent sexual intercourse and the procreation of half-castes. But this sexual conduct should remain outside the boundaries of the law so that the descendants will not be entitled to the same rights as legitimate children or to have any influence on the fate of the country whatsoever. These measures will also have an influence on our settlers that should not be underestimated, since they are often quite immature in their social opinions regarding this matter’” (Vice-Governor Tecklenburg to Colonial Division, quoted in: Zimmerer, (2003a) 2004, p. 28).

Governor Friedrich von Lindequist was the first to introduce such a measure in German Southwest Africa in 1905. The personality and political career of von Lindequist is revealing in its own right. He took over the rule of Southwest Africa from General von Trotha in the last phase of the Herero war in 1905, with the determined aim of unconditional subjugation of the Herero and Nama. He was responsible for several of the most restrictive of the *Eingeborenenverordnungen* [Regulations on the Native Population] between 1906 and 1908 and for pushing white settler expansionism. Appointed as sub-secretary in the *Reichskolonialamt* in 1907, then its general secretary in 1910, he favoured settler colonialism according to the South African model. In the First World War, he

---

<sup>28</sup> At the individual level, marriages with African women were an advantage for German settlers, as they usually came from well-off families, brought a huge dowry into the marriage, possessed land, and through their connections could improve the economic position of the couple. (Zimmerer [2003a] 2004, p. 26).

directed the project of founding German settler colonies in South Caucasus as *Generaldelegierter Ost* [General Delegate East]. During the Weimar Republic and under NS rule, he was a leading representative of colonial revisionism and co-initiated the Fatherland Party founded in 1917. Between 1914 and 1933, Lindequist was vice-president of the German Colonial Society, and during National Socialism, member of the Colonial Council of the German Colonial League and president of the *Kolonialpolitisches Amt* [Colonial Political Office] that Hitler had founded (Gründer, 1985, p. 601). So Lindequist was the first to make mixed marriages illegal in German Southwest Africa, and in 1907, the colonial High Court in Windhoek decided that the bans he issued were valid, even in retrospective. Thus, even mixed marriages concluded before 1905 were abrogated. Of enormous consequences was the court's decision that "any person whose ancestry can be traced to natives either paternally or maternally must be viewed and treated as a native" (Campt, 2004, p. 44), which meant that many people who had been white Germans until then became natives. This was a turning point in as far as being "indigenous" became a purely racial and biological issue (Zimmerer, (2003a) 2004, pp. 28–29). Following Lindequist's example, similar administrative decrees prohibited interracial marriage in the German colonies of East Africa in 1906 and Samoa in 1912. As these colonial decrees were in contradiction to the law of the *Reich*, the *Reichstag* experienced fierce protest and then a heated debate around the issue that contained much of the arguments put forward a few years later with regard to the "Black Horror" (Campt, 2004, p. 44). Interestingly, the policy regarding blacks in the US also served as an example in the debate<sup>29</sup>. In the end, the *Reichstag* passed a resolution affirming the legality of colonial mixed marriages (Campt, 2004, pp. 43–50).

Apparently, the colonial banning of mixed marriages was unique among European colonial powers. They were, in principle, ineffective; in as far as those wishing to get married despite the bans could do so in neighbouring countries or in metropolitan Germany itself. However, their importance lies in the fact that they represent the first attempt to introduce racial definitions into German citizenship law. Neither the *Reich's* citizenship law of 1870, nor the subsequent 1913 law contained explicit racial definitions. This ambition was only fulfilled by the National Socialists, who could build, however, on the debates and discourses initiated by the colonial prohibitions of interracial marriages, on working definitions as contained in administrative colonial decrees as well as on arguments put forward in the course of the "Black Horror" campaign.

#### *From Windhoek to Nuremberg...*

Kundrus questions the thesis of direct continuity from Windhoek to Nuremberg, referring to the differential treatment of blacks and Jews. She states that if there was continuity, it was a long and distorted way from the colonies into National Socialism. There is no reason to contradict her view; some continuities are obvious, other things were added and obviously no direct transfer of, for instance, legislative texts happened as such. Nevertheless, that the debates surrounding legislation

---

<sup>29</sup> „The official Reichstag discussion of colonial mixed marriages began in May 1912, when Colonial Secretary Solf was one of the first speakers in favour 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 representatives' emotions, urging them to allow themselves to be led by their 'instincts'" Campt (2004, p. 46).

and the state's way of dealing with the issue are related is beyond doubt. The issue of mixed marriages between Germans and Jews only started during the Weimar Republic. Rosenberg already outlined the ideological framework for upcoming NS legislation in 1931. He simultaneously marks "niggers, yellow people [probably Chinese], bastards and Jews" as off-limits for relationships with German women (notice again the gendered aspect): "This consideration can be supplemented by an evaluation of the mixture of races. If a German woman gets involved voluntarily with Negroes, yellow people, half-castes, Jews, she should not enjoy legal protection under any circumstance. This is also true for her children born inside or outside marriage, who are not to receive citizen status in the first place. If one of foreign blood commits rape, this should be punished by lashing, imprisonment, confiscation of property and life-long banishment from the German Reich" (Rosenberg, [1931] 1934, p. 595). The issue of the Jews, however, seems to be more urgent to him: "A marriage between a German and a Jew must be forbidden – in as far as Jews are allowed to live on German territory in the first place. That Jews should lose their rights as citizens and that a befitting law should be imposed upon them is self-evident. Sexual intercourse, rape, etc. between a German and a Jew is, depending on the gravity of guilt, to be punished by confiscation of property, banishment, imprisonment or death" (Rosenberg, [1931] 1934, p. 579)

These ideas were put into practice through the *Nürnberger Gesetze* [Nuremberg Laws] of 1935. These laws aimed at excluding Jews and people of African descent as well as Sinti and Roma with the aim of achieving racial homogeneity and an identity of race and citizenship in Germany. The first in a series of three laws, called the *Reichsbürgergesetz* [Reich Citizenship Law, Sept. 1935], divided the population into citizens of "German or kindred [artverwandt] blood" and into those of *rassefremdes Volkstum* [people of foreign races]. The latter, who were, thus, declared non-Germans, continued to be present on the German territory and, in consequence, to represent a threat as "enemies of the German race". Importantly, sexual relationships had to be forbidden. The second part of the *Nürnberger Gesetze*, the *Blutschutzgesetz* [Blood Protection Law] thus prohibited marriage as well as non-marital relationships between Jews and other people of "alien [artfremd] blood" and Germans. Marriages were forbidden when the offspring to be expected would "threaten the purity of the German blood" (Kundrus, 2003, p. 116). Comments on the legislation explicitly mentioned the "Rhineland bastards" as one case to which this rule needed to apply. The exact definition of "mixed blood" proved, however, to be a complicated issue. While for blacks and coloured people the one-drop-rule according to the US model applied, the issue was more complex with regard to the Jews, for they were more difficult to identify. They were divided into "full", "half" and "quarter Jews" (Kundrus, 2003, pp. 114 ff.). The essence of the Nuremberg legislation was anti-Semitic.

Besides the *Nürnberger Gesetze*, however, a *Kolonialblutschutzgesetz* [colonial law for blood protection] was drafted in September 1940 that aimed at regulating the "racial issue" in the colonies to be conquered. Here again, the differentiation according to "degrees of blood mixture" gave way to the one-drop-rule. It foresaw the prohibition of sexual contacts between whites and the colonized, again with a gender-specific aspect. The NS colonial experts found inspiration beyond Nuremberg in the 1927 "Immorality Act" of the South African Union as well as in Italian colonial legislation of the 1930s (Kundrus, 2003, p. 122). Thus, Kundrus concludes in her effort to differentiate between colonial and NS legislation on mixed marriages and miscegenation: "The vision of a racial order for the community was the foundation for the colonial project as well as for National Socialism. But the

questions of what this racial order was meant to look like and with which means it was meant to be established were answered differently in the German Empire and in the Third Reich, and it was answered differently for the colonies than for the metropolis" (Kundrus, 2003, p. 125).

Beyond the avoidance of existential deviance, however, the debate had a behavioural aspect as well. According to NS legislation of 1933, the offence of "racial betrayal" was aimed in similar fashion at relationships with blacks and with Jews, whereas "damage to the racial honour" referred exclusively to coloured people, e. g. "if German women mess about with negroes in a shameless way [...], e.g. when they dance indecently in a pub with a negro" (Kundrus, 2003, pp. 113 ff.). This behavioural deviance certainly referred to the fashion of Afro-American dancing at German nightclubs during the 1920s. Persons from the former colonies were present among others for performances and entertainment in the popular *Völkerschauen* [performances of "exotic people"] in zoos and panopticons, where they were also objects of anthropological research. The same von Lindequist prohibited these *Völkerschauen* during the NS period, as they had enabled too "intimate contact" between the actors and German women: "In 1939, the head of the newly revived Colonial Office, the former governor of Southwest Africa, Friedrich von Lindequist, prevented a show of Abyssinians proposed by the late Carl Hagenbeck's firm [the animal importer and zookeeper Carl Hagenbeck had been the most important promoter of *Völkerschauen*, wk]. He disapproved of such shows, he wrote, because in the past they had led to 'intimate contact with German girls and women, in which not the coloured man but the white women, forgetting their duty and honour, sought the contact'" (Zimmerman, 2001, p. 36).

It was still difficult to reach a conclusion about racial mixture as a fundamental form of existential deviance under National Socialism. With regard to the fate of the so-called "Rhineland Bastards", the legal status of the *Mischling* [half-caste] according to NS law is especially interesting. It was most often applied with regard to the Jewish "half caste", a difficult issue when the Reich Citizenship Law was developed, and eventually was specified more precisely in decrees supplementing the law as well as in subsequent racial legislation (the Marriage Law, the Law for the Protection of German Blood and Honour). "To dispel any confusion, Rudolf Hess spelled out the intent of the law in no uncertain terms in a 2 December 1935 circular sent to party agencies: 'The Jewish *Mischlinge*, that is, the quarter- and half-Jews, are treated differently in the marriage legislation. The regulations are based on the fact that the mixed race of the German-Jewish *Mischlinge* is undesirable under any circumstances – both in terms of blood and politically – and that it must disappear as soon as possible'" (Campt, 2004, p. 67). Prohibition of mixed marriages between Jews and Germans, as presented in the Law for the Protection of Blood and Honour (1935), also concerned the group of Sinti and Roma as well as blacks and their offspring. From then on, a purely "Aryan" identity was a requirement for marriage in the *Reich* (Campt, 2004, p. 67). This development in terms of legislation shows in how far various strands in social thought crystallized into legal practice. It also shows the pivotal role of the "Black Horror"-campaign that ensured continuities in terms of discourse on which the legislation in question was based from colonialism through Weimar right into National Socialism.

### *The fate of the "Rhineland Bastards"*

Following prolonged protest, the last 1000 French colonial soldiers left Germany at the end of 1929. However, beyond the effects of the propaganda campaign, the occupation through colonial troops had real results. It is estimated that 600-800 children were born who had German mothers and black fathers. These children, commonly referred to as "Rhineland Bastards", were the visible manifestation of the whole debate. They had to be dealt with.

We need not mention *how* existentially deviant these children were. Liljeblad, the Swedish priest who had travelled to the occupied territories in 1923 in order to get an idea of those "bastards", reported he had seen "a child with black and white stripes on the whole of its back". Elsewhere it was stated that these children suffered from syphilis right from birth, and that they were, thus, a source of pollution for their social environment. That they usually inherited the worst of the character and vices from both their parents. A populist pamphlet demanded as early as 1924 that "the whole brood be exterminated and the child in the womb be destroyed, as it will become venom just as its genitors were venom and scum." Those half-breeds were "a curse on the whole of Europe" (Wigger, 2007, p. 150). In the beginning, they were also regarded as a "problem" of social welfare. The *Zentrale für Pfälzische Angelegenheiten* [Central Office for Palatinate Affairs] stated that these "half-castes" were suffering from rachitis and, as their fathers "could not support them", lived "at the expense of public welfare". This made them a "specific danger", especially since – an estimate in total absence of any empirical data – after one year of the occupation, their number was "worrying" (Wigger, 2007, p. 149).

Faced with these facts, measures had to be devised. The *Staatskommissar der Pfalz* [State Commissioner of the Palatinate] asked as early as 1927 what "could be done" in order to ensure "the purity of the race in the occupied territories" (Wigger, 2007, p. 154). The *Notbund* suggested eliminating these persons from the German people and eventually reuniting them in some African colony (Wigger, 2007, p. 154). The Bavarian Ministry of the Interior was the first to mention the possibility of sterilization. After the National Socialists came into power, Hermann Göring initiated the documentation of all "bastards" by the police in order to prepare eugenic measures. He agreed with the renowned Eugen Fischer to delegate the study to Fischer's assistant Wolfgang Abel, who was based at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Genetics and Eugenics. Now, where did Eugen Fischer get his expertise in racial and eugenic studies from? It comes as no surprise that "the earliest and, by all accounts, most influential study of racial mixture was conducted in 1908 by a German scientist, Eugen Fischer, in a town called Rehobot in the German colony of Southwest Africa (currently Namibia). Fischer studied a population of mixed-race people then known as the 'Rehoboth Bastards', who were the descendants of white European Boers of Dutch descent and black women who migrated from the Cape in the late nineteenth century" (Campt, 2004, p. 39)<sup>30</sup>. With the

---

<sup>30</sup> We should note that Fischer's scientifically elaborated thesis on miscegenation did not exactly correspond to the conviction of the National Socialists, who were to draft the legislation. Not only did he assume that all races were inextricably mixed, but also that this did not in itself represent a major problem. The reference made to Fischer's work for the drafting, for instance, of the Nuremberg legislation, was partial and in part contradictory. Kundrus states that, particularly with regard to the racialism of anthropology as opposed to racial anti-Semitism, Fischer is not a good example for the continuity thesis (Kundrus 2003, p. 121). However, if we consider both to be discourses concerning existential deviance, the discrepancy need not be in fundamental contradiction to our argument.

support of public authorities and school teachers in the region, Fischer's assistant Abel provided a documentation of the children in question, whom he found to have "inferior intellectual and emotional predispositions". It is noteworthy that only in one single case had the mother indicated she became pregnant as a result of a rape. More than half of the mothers were married to Germans at that time, which gave legal legitimacy to those children.

NS policy dealing with "racially dangerous groups" foresaw various lines of action: either exclusion, deportation, or, later, extermination (as in the case of Jews, Sinti and Roma, and homosexuals). Further options were exploitation (as, among others, in the case of various groups of the populations in occupied Eastern Europe whose workforce was needed) and sterilization (as in the case of people with genetic diseases as well as "racially contaminated individuals)" (Campt, 2004, p. 68). As Campt explains, dealing with the "Rhineland Bastards" was a complex, partly incoherent, and illegal endeavour. More broadly, NS policy with regard to Afro-Germans was not systematic. Since the "Rhineland Bastards" were the most prominent group among them, the compulsory sterilization program was still one of the more elaborate measures.

Compulsory sterilization fell under the broader approach of eugenic treatment of the population in order to improve its "racial quality". It was an internationally respected policy measure by the 1930s and mainly aimed at individuals with (what were supposed to be) inherited diseases involving a major risk of "racial degeneration". Schallmayer suggested as early as 1891 the introduction of compulsory health tests for the purpose of marriage - something which, at this point, only existed in the US State of Michigan- and prohibiting marriage for those who were "mentally ill or idiots" as well as for individuals with sexually transmitted diseases. Schallmayer's second suggestion was the introduction of hereditary registers, which would require that the entire professional group of medical doctors be transformed into state officials (Schallmayer, 1910, p. 390). Finally, in case of "racially threatening" marriages, sterilization could be a requirement for the conclusion of marriage (Schallmayer, 1910, pp. 406 ff.). The US continued to be regarded as an international model, as for example when Indiana adopted a law for the sterilization of prison inmates in 1907 affecting "ordinary criminals", "idiots, "imbeciles" and "sexual offenders". Similar legislation existed in 16 US States by the time of the First World War. Furthermore, it also existed in the Swiss canton Waadt (1928), in Denmark (1929), in two Canadian provinces (1928, 1933) and in the Mexican state of Vera Cruz (1932) (Schmuhl, 2011b, pp. 201 ff.; see also Campt, 2004, pp. 69 ff.).

In the same vein, the control of reproduction under National Socialism was not only concerned with Jews and other groups of "foreign races", but also "homosexuals, people with disabilities, alcoholics, individuals with emotional disorders, and the homeless", who were regarded as "racially inferior" (Campt, 2004, p. 65). The sterilization programme was approved in 1933 under the *Gesetz zur Verhütung erbkranken Nachwuchses* [Law to Prevent Hereditarily Sick Offspring]. It mainly aimed at preventing "inferior genetic material" from reproducing, as in the case of hereditary feeble-mindedness, schizophrenia, manic depression, epilepsy, Huntington's chorea, hereditary blindness, hereditary deafness, severe physical handicaps and severe alcoholism (Schmuhl, 2011b, p. 204). This list reveals how medical and social diagnosis overlapped. At least in the cases of alcoholism and idiocy, the programme was aimed at "asocial psychopaths" and, in reality, could affect people who did not finish school, who had an illegitimate child, had no regular job or no stable home (Schmuhl, 2011b, p. 204).



The Law to Prevent Hereditarily Sick Offspring was the measure that propelled Germany into the status of an international role model, overtaking the US. Following the German example, eugenicists in a variety of countries put forward laws on eugenic sterilization, such as Norway (1934), Finland (1935), Sweden (1935), Estonia (1936), Latvia (1937), Iceland (1938) and Japan (1940). While in the US about 16,000 individuals had undergone compulsory sterilization by 1933, their number increased to 38,000 in 1941 (Schmuhl, 2011b, p. 202).

In NS Germany, between 1934 and 1945, around 300,000-400,000 people fell victim to forced sterilization. However, an uncounted number of secretly sterilized has to be added, as the policy also concerned many individuals who could not be sterilized according to the 1933 law. The sterilization of about 385 of the “Rhineland Bastards” fell under that second category of illegal eugenic practice (Campt, 2004, pp. 70–71): After Abel had provided the rationale for the need to sterilize the Rhineland children, pointing to their “inferior intellectual and emotional predispositions”, the plan was put into practice. In 1935, the *Sachverständigenbeirat für Bevölkerungs- und Rassenpolitik* [Expert Committee on Population and Racial Policy], Work Group II for Racial Hygiene and Racial Politics, dealt with the question. Various suggestions were voiced, including new legislation, deportation and others. The result foresaw “illegal sterilization by means of secret authorization, with a precedent in the abortions carried out during this period on eugenic grounds through a special directive from the Führer” as the most feasible solution (Campt, 2004, p. 78). *Sonderkommission III*, established at the Gestapo Headquarters in Berlin was in charge of “discrete sterilization of the Rhineland bastards”, according to lists provided in 1934 by local authorities, following the order of the Palatinate government and supplemented by various medical reports as well as reports on the location of those children, their behaviour and occupations. In one single and therefore noteworthy case, the municipal authorities and the youth welfare office of Langenschwalbach had refused as early as 1927 to collaborate in the listing and identification of the children concerned, believing that this would be to their future disadvantage (Wigger, 2007, pp. 154 ff.).

### *Conclusion*

We have shown in this section how several of the lines of social thought mentioned in the beginning of the chapter combined in the propaganda campaign against the “Black Horror”. In various respects, the connections go beyond discursive continuities and include legal definitions, policy measures or personal continuities from colonialism through Weimar into the NS regime, as in the cases of the eugenicist Eugen Fischer or the colonialist von Lindequist. We agree with Campt’s conclusion: “In this trajectory, the Rhineland campaign plays a pivotal role, because it articulates the central elements of a specter of the imagined danger of racial mixture that can be found in German public discourse both before and after World War I.” We have then outlined in how far these discourses led to brutal policy practice in dealing with the “Rhineland Bastards”, who manifested an almost unthinkable combination of deviances in their existence.

## 2. Assault on Eastern Europe

The second example for continuities between colonialism and National Socialism follows suggestions which draw parallels between colonial expansionism and the Nazi assault on Eastern Europe. Two defining elements of colonialism were crucial for the conquest and occupation of eastern European territories during the Second World War: economic exploitation and racial hierarchisation of the population. Apart from the racially based ideological justification of the conquest, it was also a matter of practical logic for Germany to foresee expansion towards the East first and foremost: Apart from supposedly “few Bolsheviks” that had to be removed, Russia counted as a mainly empty territory similarly to Northern America or Australia at the times of European conquest. Importantly as well, there was no concurrence by other leading world powers in Eastern Europe, as opposed to overseas territories<sup>31</sup>.

### *The thesis of NS colonialism in Eastern Europe*

Segal suggested as early as 1943 that: “(...) influential German elements were considering Poland as an excellent experimentation field for a future colonial European Nazi empire. (...) In other words, the population in Poland was to be considered the guinea-pigs for the German plans for a future Nazi European empire” (Segal, 1943, p. 9). His was thus “the first book to describe in scientific detail Nazi rule in Poland. (...) The thesis of this book is that Germany is attempting to carve a colonial empire out of the heart of Europe” (Buell, 1943, p. v). Lower agrees to his analysis with regard to “Nazi Empire-building and the Holocaust in Ukraine”: “Yet, only after Europe itself was destroyed by Hitler’s Reich did this historical pattern [of centuries of imperialistic warfare, forced migrations, frontier violence, and the displacement of non-Europeans in the Americas, Australia, and Africa, wk] come to light. The Nazi occupation of Eastern Europe demonstrated that such practices were not strictly overseas forms of conquest and rule, and that the worst aspects of colonialism – forced population movements, slave labor, and mass murder – could be combined and carried out on an enormous scale, in a matter of a few years, and in the heart of ‘civilized’ Europe” (Lower, 2005, pp. 19–20).

Lower emphasizes that the historical path towards such ideas and ensuing actions started with European colonialism: “As new and chilling as Hitler’s ideas for ‘inner colonization’ were, his concept of German imperial expansion did not develop within a historical vacuum (...) This emerging narrative of German colonial fantasies does not represent another deterministic version for Germany’s *Sonderweg* [special path, exceptionalism] toward Nazism; rather, it is understood within a broader European context of exploration, conquest, migration, and mass destruction of indigenous peoples” (Lower, 2005, pp. 18–19). However, she also acknowledges that Hitler was ready to go beyond the realities of overseas colonialism: “The intent was to transform the land and its people more radically than any of Germany’s imperialistic neighbours had attempted before in overseas colonies or in Europe itself. The Nazis arrogantly pursued a new racial concept of colonialism on European soil that turned out to be one of history’s most destructive and lethal attempts at empire-

---

<sup>31</sup> I would like to thank Ulrich Herbert for this overall historical orientation that he provided in a personal communication, 2012.

building" (Lower, 2005, p. 28). The aim of the author is, thus, to define "the colonial setting of Nazi rule [in Ukraine, wk]" (Lower, 2005, p. 10).

Apart from overseas colonialism, we need to mention various other factors that led to the assault on Eastern Europe. Obviously, the propagandist argument for the attack was to fight "(Jewish) Bolshevism". For Hitler himself, anti-Bolshevism took centre-stage at least in the immediate state of war: "The retreat of the Red Army into the Russian hinterland would not suffice as a victory for Hitler. Red Army prisoners and material were to be annihilated. The Bolshevik threat was not to be given any chance of reemerging. The conquered areas were to be totally 'cleansed' and reordered along racial lines" (Lower, 2005, p. 28). We have seen above that in NS propaganda, anti-Bolshevism was inextricably mixed up with anti-Slavic as well as anti-Semitic racialized discourses and the three of them formed simultaneously the core of the imperial project in regard to Eastern Europe. The war not only aimed at the extermination of Bolshevism but of the Jewish people of Europe. After the massacre of 33,000 people at Babij Jar near Kiev in September 1941, the hunt for Jewish inhabitants of the conquered regions was generalized. Three years later, the number of Jewish victims among the Soviet citizens amounted to two million (Jahn, 2007, p. 6).

We need to extend the perspective further. There is a history of German aspirations in Eastern Europe that goes further back in history than overseas colonialism, to the point that the idea of a *Drang nach Osten* [drive towards the east] was assumed to be inherent to the German people after centuries of settlement of Germans in various parts of Eastern Europe. The *Lebensraum*-idea was not exclusively, probably not even primarily related to non-European territories. Instead, the Reich's *Raumforschung* [(living) space research] targeted Eastern Europe as the primary place where conquest, Germanization and economic (especially agricultural) development should happen first. There had been German migration towards Russia in the Middle Ages. There had been movements of Germans who fled the war towards Poland and Russia encouraged by Tsars Peter and Catherine the Great and their successors in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Refugees from religious persecution (Mennonites, Baptists, and Catholics) moved east in the nineteenth century. Most of the time, these settlements were encouraged, for instance by Russian rulers, and, thus, Germans assumed they had contributed greatly to civilization in the east (Lower, 2005, p. 20). Another important antecedent to Nazi expansion towards the east was, obviously, the First World War. It had prepared Germany ideologically. While Poland had already been the victim of Prussian, then German colonialism before, the first total war had revealed "within German circles specifically a budding interest in Ukraine as a colony" (Lower, 2005, p. 21). Between 1914 and 1918, the Eastern empire under German rule covered previously unimagined dimensions, an experience that informed political and military practice in the Second World war. The old elite that had already aspired at an eastern empire during the First World War was still in leading positions (Müller, 1991).

### *The General Plan East*

After first successes of the *Wehrmacht*, Germany intended to agree on a compromise for peace with England, dividing the world between the two nations. The *Gesellschaft für europäische Wirtschaftsplanung und Großraumwirtschaft* [Society for European economic planning and large scale economy], a consortium of leading representatives of economy, bureaucracy and *Wehrmacht*, drafted a report in 1940 in which they foresaw a continental European economy under German

leadership, reaching “from Gibraltar to the Ural and from the North Cape to the Island of Cyprus”, with “colonial repercussion into Siberia and Africa” (Müller, 1983, p. 107). Since february 1941, the Nazis worked on the organizational and conceptual foundations for the economic exploitation of eastern Europe (Müller, 1983, p. 129).

The 1942 *Generalplan Ost* [General Plan East], a key document elaborated by leading German scientists under the supervision of *Reichsführer-SS* Heinrich Himmler and Alfred Rosenberg between 1940 and 1942, represents the political and military concretization of the *Lebensraum*-ideology (Furber, 2003, p. 31). It included projects of economic exploitation and reordering of the population along racial lines, building on the assumption of the extermination of Eastern European Jews. The Plan aimed at scientific modernisation of agriculture, infrastructure and urbanisation as planned from the German metropolis. Mass murder, massive deportations and resettlements, euthanasia and racial segregation as well as forced labour appeared as legitimate means to that end (Müller, 1991).

We have shown above how the Nazis managed to reconcile the economic interests of agricultural elites with those of big industry and how they fused these with racial ideology. Apparently this fusion was reinforced in the course of the war. In a very detailed analysis of the economic side of conquest in the East, Müller states that the assault on Poland “unleashed an unrestrained drive towards Germanization and depletion, in which racial and economic motives reinforced one another” (Müller, 1991).

#### *Exploitation and extermination along racial lines*

Racial ideology was the means of dealing with the practical problems of imperially ruling over non-German majorities (Mazower & Richter, 2009, p. 61). According to Lemkin, the German treatment of the subjugated people of Eastern Europe during the Second World War has to be considered genocide<sup>32</sup>. While populations that were supposedly racially close to Aryans, such as the Luxemburgers, the Dutch or the Norwegians, were assumed to have the potential to be Germanized, Hitler himself argued that in Poland, for instance, it was only the soil that could be Germanized, not the population. Consequently, those eastern regions inhabited by “racial” Germans, i.e. emigrants of earlier historical periods, were subsumed under the *Reich*, whereas those territories with Slavic inhabitants were regarded as *Lebensraum* (Lemkin, 1944, pp. x). One can easily deduce from this that, in order to “Germanize the soil”, the population needed to disappear somehow (Lemkin, 1944, p. 82). Dealing with the conquered populations changed in the course of war.

---

<sup>32</sup> This corresponds to his original definition of the term: "New conceptions require new terms. By 'genocide' we mean the destruction of a nation or of an ethnic group. (...) generally speaking, genocide does not necessarily mean the immediate destruction of a nation, except when accomplished by mass killings of all members of a nation. It is intended rather to signify a coordinated plan of different actions aiming at the destruction of essential foundations of the life of national groups, with the aim of annihilating the groups themselves. The objectives of such a plan would be disintegration of the political and social institutions, of culture, language, national feelings, religion, and the economic existence of national groups, and the destruction of the personal security, liberty, health, dignity, and even the lives of the individuals belonging to such groups. Genocide is directed against the national group as an entity, and the actions involved are directed against individuals, not in their individual capacity, but as members of the national group" (Lemkin 1944, p. 79).

The minutes of a meeting of state secretaries from various ministries with representatives of the *Wehrmacht* of May 2<sup>nd</sup> 1941 stated that “1. The war should only be continued if the entire *Wehrmacht* can be nourished from Russia in the third year of the war. 2. This means without doubt that tens of millions of people will starve, if we take from the land what we need for us” (quoted in: Müller, 1983, p. 146). This became the basis for the subsequent economic exploitation of the occupied eastern territories, where the population was regarded as a mere “tool” [Werkzeug], to be dealt with according to its “usefulness” for Germany. The consequences of such economic exploitation were debated in concrete detail, leading to statements like “The dying of the industry as well as of a large part of the humans” was inevitable and “Many tens of millions of humans in this area will be dispensable and will either die or need to emigrate to Siberia”, since their nourishment “would undermine the blockade-power [Blockadefestigkeit] of Germany” (Müller, 1983, p. 150).

Only ten months after the attack on the Soviet Union, in May 1942, out of three million prisoners of war, two million had starved or had been executed. The occupation of St. Petersburg was intended to starve the city’s population to death in order to facilitate dealing with it. Between September 1941 and January 1944, nearly one million people died there (Jahn, 2007, p. 5). They were all explicitly considered expendable surplus population that would only have eaten up what was to be left for the occupying force. In November 1941 *Generalquartiermeister* [Quartermaster-General] Eduard Wagner, who was in charge of alimentation, decided that “non-working prisoners of war in the camps have to starve to death” (Jahn, 2007, p. 5).

However, after it became obvious that the initially planned *Blitzkrieg* could not be won, i.e. with the prolongation and intensification of the war, attitudes towards the conquered populations changed as ideological and economic considerations were weighed differently against one another (Herbert 1986). The plan to get rid of useless eaters was altered and the usefulness of the workforce that was part of the war prey stressed. The exploitation of the workforce through forced work regimes had a clearly colonial aspect. It developed again along racial lines, within the conquered territories first. With the intensification of war and the urgent need for workforce in the industries that were based within the *Reich*, initial worries about the threat of forced labour on German grounds lost in importance. Approximately 10 Million workers were brought from Russia to Germany, part of them prisoners of war, but the majority civil (for a very detailed analysis of the policies in Belorussia, see Gerlach, [1999] 2000).

Forced work regimes had first been developed for political opponents in the concentration camps, euphemistically termed „education through work“ (Knigge, 2011, p. 31). In 1937, a new regulation of “crime prevention” foresaw to send all “idle” to concentration camps and discipline them to work. In 1938, more than 10,000 “asocial” men were arrested and had to work for the SS until the end of the war (Knigge, 2011, p. 41).

When large parts of Europe were conquered in the course of the war, German firms followed the *Wehrmacht* and civil administration in order to take over the industries. Their work scheme foresaw ruthless economic exploitation of the work force (Knigge, 2011, p. 49). It was only a matter of time for the Nazis to realize that it could be economically profitable to them to send workforce into the *Reich*. The *Reichseinsatz* started in big number when the prohibition to use Russian manpower – mainly motivated by fear of racial “pollution” of the population and of social unrest, especially with regard to potential political activism of Bolsheviks amongst the German workforce, –

was abolished in 1941, in the face of pressure from industry. Until then, around 2 Million Russian prisoners of war had died due to hunger, heat, cold and sickness or had been executed. It is ironic that for the surviving, forced work in Germany was a means of saving their lives (Knigge, 2011, p. 58).

In order to reduce the threat of racial mixing, the *Gestapo* and the labour administration drafted rigid rules to regulate the presence and behavior of foreign workers. Racial hierarchies determined the position of each individual (Herbert 1986: 153 ff.), with the Aryan *Herrenmenschen* at the top of the social structure, followed by foreigners from Northern and Western Europe. At the bottom were Polish and Soviet workers (*Ostarbeiter*, i.e. “Eastern Workers”), finally Jews and Sinti and Roma. The use of the Jewish and Sinti and Roma workforce was contradictory. While some firms, especially in the armaments industry, favoured their exploitation through forced work, the NS-leadership gave priority to their extermination for racial reasons (Knigge, 2011, p. 63).

Regulations mainly aimed at inhibiting contacts between Germans and foreign forced labourers. The “Eastern Workers” and Jews had to carry badges, could not move freely in public and were permanently threatened by draconic punishments (Knigge, 2011, p. 90). Again, as in the course of the “Black Horror”-campaign, separation measures mainly targeted German women. Again, separate brothels were opened for exclusive use of “Eastern Workers” – 60 brothels with about 600 Polish, Czech and French forced prostitutes in 1943, 50 more were under construction (Knigge, 2011, p. 111). Again, punishment for male foreign workers who entered into contact with German women was most severe. While western forced workers were punished with imprisonment, “Eastern Workers” were immediately executed. Inhabitants of “Eastern Worker” camps had to visit the execution site. The concerned German women were publicly humiliated and often sent to concentration camps. Again, German men who maintained relationships with foreign workers were less severely punished.

When the „total war“ was declared in 1942, in the face of actual defeat, the number of forced workers increased again, mainly in the armaments and construction industries. Working hours were prolonged, formerly allied Italian prisoners of war were forced to work, pregnant workers had to undergo forced abortion and newly born were left to starve from hunger (Knigge, 2011, p. 127). Those who were long-term unable to work were not sent back to their home regions, but brought into camps where they were left to die. Supposedly mentally ill amongst the workforce fell victim to euthanasia measures (Knigge, 2011, p. 136).

The colonial connection was already evoked during the Nuremberg Processes, where forced labour was termed “slave work”, a term later on reserved for the Jewish victims. Continuities were also strong, however, with regard to treatment of foreign workers and forced work during the first world war (Herbert 1986). Apart from analyzing the plans for and realities of occupation of Eastern Europe as colonial because of their main characteristics, extermination and exploitation along racial lines, we can also trace various connections with the historical experience of overseas colonialism.

#### *Colonial phantasies about Eastern Europe*

During the assault, Eastern Europe was a victim of colonial imagination and concrete aspirations (Conrad, 2008, pp. 118–119). 10 Million German soldiers were not only sent for military action, but were also promised land and a future as soldier-peasants, i.e. the leading strata of the conquered

territories. This corresponded to the romanticizing idea of antimodernist agriculture and of the peasant who defends Germanness in a country of barbarians (Müller, 1991, p. 8). The colonial archive was crucial, maybe for the simple fact that there were no other role models for the upcoming tasks. The example of British India seems to have had some impact in this respect. Lower reports that, during his 1924 visit to Vinnytsia in the Ukraine, Hitler was reading Ludwig Alsdorf's book *Indien* and was thoroughly impressed by its message that there was a need and legitimation for civilized Britain to conquer India, because it was populated by barbaric people. SS Reich Leader Heinrich Himmler also compared the role of the Nazis in Ukraine to that of the British in India. Similarly, Cortez' conquest of brutish Mexicans had shown that European colonizers were rather moderate, without any bad intentions and that their subjugation of indigenous people was legitimate. It was a widespread custom to distribute such colonial literature to regional functionaries in the Ukraine and in Poland in order to encourage them to "fashion themselves literally as imperial rulers" (Lower, 2005, pp. 3 ff.) and to support the assumption of German superiority. Besides Hermann Esser's *Die jüdische Weltpest [The Jewish World Plague]*, Rosenberg recommended books such as Kurt Freber's *Mit dem Rucksack nach Indien [With my backpack to India]*, Paul von Lettow-Vorbeck's *Um Vaterland und Kolonie [For the fatherland and colony]* or H. Schulz-Kampfenkel's *Im afrikanischen Dschungel als Tierfänger und Urwaldjäger [In the African jungle as an animal collector and hunter]* for distribution to the occupying forces in the Ukraine (Lower, 2005, p. 26). Jews as well as "racially inferior" Slavs were considered to correspond to these "barbaric" people – the Bolshevik crimes were considered the most certain proof. The idea of using the Ukraine as a buffer zone against Bolshevik Russia was of particular importance in this respect: "Hitler relished the idea of a contiguous German colony in Ukraine, a 'Garden of Eden' where the German settler, described as 'the soldier-peasant', tilled the soil with a weapon at his side, ready to defend the farm from the 'Asian hordes'. As for the Ukrainians, Hitler remarked that the Germans would supply them 'with scarves, glass beads and everything that colonial people like'" (Hitler's Table Talk S. 34, Hitler monologue of 17 Sept. 1941, quoted in: Lower, 2005, p. 24). This "Garden of Eden" that Hitler imagined was eventually realized in the population experiments such as the *Hegewald*-colony (Hegewald literally meaning "game reserve", "preservation forest"). Within the conquered Ukrainian Zhytomyr General District, Himmler installed a laboratory for his settlement plans, which was in this case the resettlement of "*Volksdeutsche*" (ethnic Germans outside Germany) from regions under Bolshevik threat or that were already occupied by the Russian forces (Lower, 2005, p. 3).

#### *Beyond imagination: personal connections*

Beyond the realm of imagination, the lost colonial empire served as a "reservoir of know-how and organizational expertise" (Conrad, 2008, p. 104). The know-how acquired through experimenting in German Africa was again (re-)transferred to Eastern Europe under NS rule. In order to understand how the transfer of knowledge happened, we need to remember that the colonialists and colonial experts had continued to organize and lobby for their interests (see *Kolonialverein* and *Deutsche Kolonialgesellschaft* above). Though Hitler's immediate priorities differed from those of the colonialists, he worked towards combining colonial revisionism and National Socialism after his accession to power. The emblematic figure of Franz Ritter von Epp (1868-1956) embodies this political move and gives an example of personal continuities (van Laak, 2003, pp. 71 ff.). Ritter von Epp was a loyal soldier in the colonial service who had fought during the Boxer Rebellion in China, in

the war against the Herero and Nama, and, in the First World War, in France, Italy, Serbia and Romania. In 1919 he rose to the status of leader of a *Freikorps* or militia in Bavaria and became a member of the NSDAP. In 1930 he held the Colonial Political Office of the party and then became leader of the *Wehrpolitisches Amt* [Military Political Office]. His biography is relevant for the historical changes and continuities from the *Kaiserreich* through Weimar into the NS period. His biographer assumes that von Epp's main motivation had always remained to increase Germany's military potential in a perspective of world domination. Joining the NSDAP, thus, provided him with a platform for agitation against Versailles and the democratic republic, against Jews and Marxists alike, for colonial and military revisionism and expansion (Wächter, 1999, p. 247). However, it seems that Eastern Europe was not so much von Epp's perspective, as he remained oriented towards Africa (Wächter, 1999, p. 248). A similar personality is that of Viktor Boettcher, vice-governor of Cameroon in 1914, who then became *Regierungspräsident* [District President] of Posen in the Warthegau. (Conrad, 2008, p. 101). Thus, concrete connections between overseas colonialism, the German colonialist lobby during Weimar and the NS regime and their influence on Eastern Europe can be traced in the biographies of single individuals<sup>33</sup>.

#### *Links with agricultural and exploitation practice from the colonies*

These personal and organizational networks could be drawn on to inform occupational practice in Eastern Europe. There was transfer in the business sector: "(...) major Hamburg and Bremen trading houses set up affiliates throughout the GG [part of occupied Poland, wk], among them the German-West African Trading Company and the DEKAGE, or German Cameroun Company. Since the Allied blockade had crimped international trade, it is only natural that the international trading houses sought markets in the east. They were encouraged to do so by the Four Year Plan ministry, which also recruited Western European firms for help with the 'economic opening up of the east'" (Furber, 2003, p. 62). Rosenberg encouraged a Dutch Trading Company "to lend their expertise as colonial economic developers" in the Ukraine in 1943 (Lower, 2005, pp. 27–28). Similarly, the colonial Togo Society established a Togo-East branch that became economically active in Ukraine. In 1943, regional officials also brought in German East Africans to serve as model farmers in the Warthegau in Poland

---

<sup>33</sup> A development that is confirmed by Furber: "When it appeared that Germany would defeat the Soviet Union, their solution was to call upon Germany's 'colonial pioneers' to follow the call to the east. The magazine *Die Frau und die Kolonien* [Women and the colonies] ran features on the contributions of German colonial women to the east. 'Work here has a great similarity with Africa', said one person transferred from Portuguese Angola to the Warthegau. 'Here as there one has to be on the backs of the natives, sit behind them and say, it will be so and not the old go-as-you-please'. In the December 1941 issue of *Der koloniale Kampf* [The Colonial Struggle], Fritz Spiesser – the son of a family of emigrants to Windhoek, employed in the *Presseamt des Kolonialpolitischen Amtes* [Press Office of the Colonial Political Office] in 1942, who returned to Windhoek after the war – urged Germany's colonial pioneers to put their dreams of Africa aside and help 'to weaken forever the 200-million-horde in the east, in order to render any threat to 'white' Europe impossible for all times'. With the threat of the east overcome, Germany could again turn overseas. Meanwhile, he writes, pioneering 'in the east is 'colonial work' as under the African sun'. Nobody was as prepared to do this kind of work as the colonial pioneers, 'who have the will to go forth, for the Reich, into unopened territories and transform the wilderness there into civilized landscapes'" Furber (2003, p. 59). Furber is cautious with regard to a massive employment of former colonialists in Eastern Europe and assumes the number of Germans with colonial experience was very limited. However, he acknowledges that it was precisely at the level of experts and high- ranking persons in the military and administration that we can observe these personal continuities.



and to put their experience at the service of the settler policy there. Various examples<sup>34</sup> show that experience in dealing with occupied populations, especially with regard to their economic exploitation, was shared not only between German overseas colonies and Eastern Europe, but even included transfers from the US-American South.

### *No civilizing mission in Eastern Europe*

However, we need to make a few reservations in order not to overstretch the assumption of similarities between situations in different places of German occupation. It goes without saying and need not be detailed here that there were numerous and very important differences between German overseas colonization and the conquest and occupation of Eastern Europe. With regard to dealing with deviance, one important difference in the approach towards the conquered populations has yet to be mentioned: As opposed to Eastern Europe, in the overseas colonies, the civilizing mission assumed that the colonized subjects were “reformable deviants” and that it would, thus, be worth some effort in order to “raise their cultural level” [*Hebung*]. The same applied to deviants inside the German population, such as unemployed, vagabonds, homeless and idle people, who were all in the focus of educational programmes that wanted to raise alphabetization, change medical and hygienic care, or “educate for work” by increasing discipline<sup>35</sup>.

Of course, that was the official version. A closer look at the idea of “educating for work” reveals that, although there were differences in the perception of the individuals concerned as well as in degrees of oppression and violence involved, the ultimate aim was economic exploitation and using the work force to its very limits. Eckart rightly points out that these measures were all aiming at an optimized use of the “human capital”, i.e. medical and hygienic care in order to improve the physical fitness to work, and “education” to make the colonized work hard and understand they were actually in a better situation under the supremacy of the white man (Eckart, 1997, pp. 57 ff.). We might start with the concentration camps in which the Herero and Nama of German South West Africa were incarcerated and which served among other things the purpose of “educating for work”. This meant disciplining them and getting them used to their new “role” as a work force for the post-war future, and as providers of private as well as public services. It was, again, Governor von Lindequist, who said: “Getting the Herero used to work during their captivity as prisoners of war is, in fact, quite healthy for them. Indeed, it is fortunate for them that, before they are given back full freedom, they learn to work, since, otherwise, they would probably continue to be work-shy and drift about. And since they have lost all their cattle, they would, thus, lead a miserable existence.” (quoted in: Zimmerer, [2003b] 2004, p. 56). The main aim of von Lindequist’s Regulations on the Native Population was also to ensure total bureaucratic control over the African workforce by regulating the most intimate details of their lives. The policy’s declared long-term goal was to get

---

<sup>34</sup> The literature indicates various examples, see e.g. Zimmermann 2005.

<sup>35</sup> There are examples of concrete connections, such as the priest Friedrich von Bodelschwingh who installed various „working colonies“ inside the Empire, aiming at educating marginalized people to get used to work. Simultaneously, he directed the Evangelic Missionary Society that opened up centres in Eastern Africa where Africans were to be educated under the aspects of work and Christianity. According to Bodelschwingh, “Inner and outer mission cannot be separated” (quoted in: Conrad 2008, p. 70).

away from the forced labour regime towards the disciplined, hard-working subject, who defined himself through work.

The Tuskegee expedition from the southern US to Togo and the “education of the Negro for work” were broadly discussed during the German Colonial Congresses in 1905 and 1910 (Zimmerman, 2005, pp. 45). And the need to discipline people to work was also supported by social scientists. Schmoller, for instance, believed that small-scale agriculture could improve the “entire mental and economic development of the natives” and the “future of the conquered, lower races” (quoted in Zimmerman, 2005, pp. 45). The colonial cotton production under the favoured concept of *Volkskultur* would, thus, not only discipline the workforce, but also have other desired effects such as “a patriarchal, monogamous domesticity” among the Togolese: “Gruner explained to a meeting of local political notables and missionaries that growing cotton would improve family life by allowing a man to make a living as a ‘free farmer on his own plot, at home with his family.’ Men would no longer have to travel long distances to earn money as day labourers or porters, and ‘the women would cease to ramble around.’ ‘Orderly family relations,’ Gruner concluded, ‘could take hold.’” (Zimmerman, 2005, pp. 35).

This effort to civilize and educate was regarded a legitimate endeavour, or at least pretext, with regard to the African colonized population, as well as with regard to inner-German deviants. In contrast, the project of “cultural uplifting” played no role with regard to Eastern European people. According to racial ideology, they were regarded as “helot people” (Conrad, 2008, p. 103). As described above, attitudes oscillated between regarding them as expendable surplus population on the one hand, total exploitation on the other (Herbert 1986). These ideas could build on the broadly shared historical imagination of Eastern Europe as a place of uncivilized people, dating back to the times of the Renaissance (Wolff, 2003). Lemkin describes the policy towards the populations of Poland and Russia as “despoliation” – as opposed to the approach in other neighbouring and European regions occupied by the Nazis during the war, where the occupant focused on “absorption” or assimilation, or on (forced) “cooperation”. In contrast, the eastern territories were considered *Interessengebiete* [areas of interest] and mainly used to “draw (...) raw materials, food, and labor” (Lemkin, 1944, p. 9).

### Conclusion

This subchapter explored the continuity thesis with regard to the NS assault on Eastern Europe. It seems possible to analyse the plans and realities of occupation as colonial with regard to their characteristics of extermination and exploitation along racial lines. In addition, there are various elements – colonial fantasies about Eastern Europe, personal continuities and cases of knowledge transfer with regard to settlement, agriculture and exploitation practices – that make a continuity-hypothesis convincing. It also seems necessary, however, to hint at various features that diverge from a strict assumption of continuity. Thus, the planning for future overseas colonies involved “relatively ‘moderate’ forms of racial segregation, when compared with the imagined future geographical order of Eastern Europe that foresaw a thorough ethnic cleansing of the territory. As opposed to the official discourse on the civilizing mission and cultural uplifting, the *Generalplan Ost* was devoid of any sort of humanitarian considerations (van Laak, 2003, p. 83). We conclude with Lower: “The Nazi pursuit of Lebensraum in the East was a multipronged campaign: a genocidal war

against racial and political enemies and a colonization campaign of German migration, total economic exploitation, and a subjugation of the 'native' population and its culture. In places such as Zhytomyr one sees Nazi notions of progress, humanity, and utopia not as the glimmering landscape that Hitler envisioned but as the grisly reality of his violently racist, imperialistic ambitions" (Lower, 2005, p. 28).

Furthermore, and still more generally, the major difference is that no overseas colony was a site of war that could compare to the scope of the Second World War. This means, however, that colonial aspirations and practice often remained in the state of plans, whereas concrete realization and execution could not be fully realized due to the state of war. The dynamics of the war undermined the conditions for a (long-term) colonial regime in Eastern Europe. Talking about the assault on Eastern Europe as a form of colonialism, despite common features and despite historical connections, means, at least in part, taking the intention of the Nazis for a practice. In order to fully develop the colonisation plans, NS-Germany had to win the war first. We are thus rather talking about the failure of a colonial project, than about fully fledged colonial realities.

### 3. Violence and industrial extermination

The crucial aspect in drawing parallels between colonialism and National Socialism is the excessive level of violence inflicted upon major parts of the populations in both cases. In the colonies, the argument goes, the ultimate taboo of mass murder on whole populations was broken, genocidal murder became imaginable and had been realized for the first time. This facilitated the repetition under National Socialism. Indeed, the colonial form of governing territories and their populations included massive violence, mainly due to the lack of legitimacy of rule and lack of control of unknown territories and foreign cultures and populations. The colonial state was the opposite of the ideal-typical "modern state" with its monopoly of violence and bureaucratic functioning. While this ideal had not been realized in the metropolis, the situation was totally unvarnished in the colonies. Violence in the colonies was fundamental and structurally "necessary" and it resulted in very palpable violent situations such as punishment, repression of uprisings and colonial wars. It was based on fundamental asymmetries in terms of military and technological development (Conrad, 2008, p. 49). There was the *Araberaufstand* [uprising of the Arabs] in Eastern Africa 1888-89, the Maji-Maji-war in East Africa (1905-08) or the Boxer Rebellion in China. But it is the war against the Herero and Nama in South West Africa (1904-1907) that is most often referred to as the first German genocide and, thus, as the direct antecedent to the Holocaust (Conrad, 2008; Zimmerer, [2003b] 2004). Indeed, the above-mentioned quotes from Jahn regarding the intended starvation and mass murder in Eastern Europe do bear resemblance to the discourses around the Herero war.

If we agree that the colonial experimentations with violence were indeed a paramount antecedent to National Socialism, we, nevertheless, must not overlook the fact that there had already been massive violence within Germany before 1933. The First World War, the first total war, had ended only 15 years before. During the short-lived Weimar Republic, German society was highly militarized and violence was an omnipresent phenomenon. Important in this respect were the militias [*Freikorps* and *Wehrverbände*], i.e. armed wings of political parties, publicly present and strongly visible through marches and demonstrations that often culminated in street fights with

excessive violence: *Stahlhelm* [Steel Helmet] for the Conservatives (Berghahn 1964), SA and SS for the National-Socialists (Longerich, 1989), *Reichsbanner Schwarz-Rot-Gold* [Reich Banner Black-Red-Gold] (Rohe, 1966) for the democratic parties, *Rotfrontkämpferbund* [Red Front Fighters League] for the Communist Party<sup>36</sup>. While the ambitions of the right-leaning militias is obvious, those of the more centre and left-wing parties intended to defend the Republic, since army and police often cooperated with the extreme right. There were social and economic reasons for the existence and popularity of the militias: The profession of soldier had been a respected and rather secure one up to the First World War. Then, following the Treaty of Versailles, the army had to be reduced to 100,000 men, which meant that many former soldiers, incompetent for anything but fighting and war, were in the streets. Many joined either the militia or the National Socialists (Archiv der sozialen Demokratie der Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, 1983, p. 8). The high levels of violence and militarization in everyday life under the Weimar Republic cannot be understood simply as a result of violence in the colonies. There cannot be any doubt that the experience of the First World War was crucial for these phenomena.

There had been another direct antecedent of violence inside Europe – one in which the mobilizing powers of the ideological issues at stake had been put to test: the Spanish Civil war (1936-39). Spain had become a military and a political laboratory for the opposing ideologies and corresponding political systems. Anti-communism in particular was considerably strengthened throughout Europe in this period. The National-Socialists, alongside Mussolini, lent decisive support to the fascist putsch. Beyond seeing their support against the Republic as a contribution to the worldwide fight against bolshevism, Hitler's war plans favoured the strategic implementation of a sympathetic regime in Spain, as well as access to mining industries relevant for the armaments industry – delivery of arms was directly paid off with concessions to Spanish mines.

Finally, in order to give the continuity argument the necessary differentiation and complexity, we have to highlight a major difference between the colonial system and the Holocaust. What gave the latter a new quality was the industrial dimension of the extermination. In comparison with earlier phases of extermination, the creation of the extermination camp, combining in one site the camp itself and the extermination machinery, was unprecedented. Its functioning corresponded to the complexities of mass production at the assembly line: "a man would step off a train in the morning, and in the evening his corpse was burned and his clothes packed away for shipment to Germany" (Hilberg 1961: 555). Since "industrial extermination" is a rather abstract and technical term, we shall turn to narrative accounts of the process as expressed in literature, as opposed to scholarly texts. Maybe a novelist is better equipped to outline the dimensions of what is meant by an extermination industry:

"I read that tests had been carried out on human subjects in Frankfurt and in one of the suburbs which no longer exists. Experiments were carried out on groups of five, groups of ten, on standardised groups: families - father, mother, son, daughter, grandmother, even the maid if she was Jewish or a little soft in the head. The purpose of the experiments being to determine how much gas was needed in both cases to kill

---

<sup>36</sup> Among those militias was also the Jewish *Frontkämpferbund* [Front Fighters League] that had remained from the First World War and grouped veterans of the war and nationally committed Jews who could not understand that they, German nationalists, were to be excluded, and later exterminated. The Jewish *Frontkämpferbund* kept organizing after 1933.

quickly and efficiently. (...) These experiments demonstrated that people could be gassed in groups without regard to sex, age or physical condition. (...) There was no need to separate prisoners into groups, something of an advantage in a mass extermination. The problem, however, remained a complex one with many variables – the stress levels of the subject, the dosage, the shape and size of the gas chambers, the skill of those operating them, etc. There were fears that, though life and death are abstract concepts, the supernatural and the religious might produce unwelcome thoughts in the minds of those operating the chambers, there was talk of the rabbi's curse, of avenging ghosts, of strange miracles. A production line process, they concluded, would put paid to such nonsense by giving each individual worker the impression that he was performing only the most innocuous task in the extermination process. (...) A production line approach was applied to every stage of the process, from the rounding up of the Jews, through their arrest and transportation to the burning of the bodies in the camps. The link does not know it is part of the chain. (...) A means therefore had to be found to take into account the principal variables. Calculating devices were created to make the process easier for a workforce that was not especially bright. By turning a dial to the number of people packed into the chamber, and moving a slider to the volume of the chamber in cubic metres, it was possible to read off the quantity of Zyklon B necessary, this quantity was further refined by setting one slider to the temperature of the chamber and another to the initial figure of the quantity of Zyklon B. In warm weather, say 25°C, death could be guaranteed for 97 per cent of the subjects in a thirty-minute period. In cold weather, however - below 5°C - the mass of air is stationary, gas disperses poorly and productivity is negatively affected, making it necessary to repeat the procedure to increase the quantity of Zyklon B, either of which represented a waste of the Reich's time and money. A loss of ten minutes and three *Reichsmarks* per subject may seem insignificant, but with some 10 million subjects marked out for death, the shortfall would amount to 100 million minutes and 30 millions *Reichsmarks*, an unacceptable folly for a country already involved in an otherwise profitable world war. (...) The shape and size of the chambers also proved to be critical. Although a long, narrow, low-ceiling chamber produces excellent results, it is difficult to persuade subjects to go inside; they panic when they see what looks like a tomb. Were they to refuse it might result in chaos, something which had been declared a cardinal sin in Germany. This happened in a number of camps, and the authorities were obliged to enlarge the chambers. (...) Overseeing an operation of this nature is not as easy as it might seem. It is a complex industrial process with all the flaws inherent in such systems: a poorly-educated workforce prone to absenteeism, power failures, stock shortages, disparities between supply and demand at the *Kremas* which disrupt schedules and break the working rhythm creating bottlenecks and resulting in workers unable to work. (...) Experts had to be on site to do the real-time problem solving. (...) An experienced chemical engineer needed to be on hand for the gas chambers, and a combustion expert was needed for the furnaces. Then there were the doctors, the lab assistants, the accountants and quartermasters; the operation involved much more than the gas chambers and the *Kremas*. (...) A good-sized camp, after all, comprised 3-4000 prisoners, turnover was high, you needed enough guards to supervise everyone, a dozen service sectors and a systems management team keeping everyone working to full capacity. Ask any CEO, he'll tell you running a town or a company of that size is no easy task. Murder on this scale is not something that can be achieved by a random serial killer. And coordinating twenty-five extermination camps spread over several countries is a colossal undertaking, one that would cripple many a government today. The logistics of the railway system alone give some idea of the countless tasks which have to be timed to the split-second. A railway system is not a toy. Before they would be gassed, these millions of people had to be tracked down, identified, inventoried, captured, grouped, transported and shipped out according to various, sometimes contradictory, criteria, then re-registered, fed, clothed, examined, made to work according to the standards of the *Reich*, guarded, disciplined and finally

destroyed, and all of this had to be done according to a strict timetable and in complete SECRECY" (Sansal [2008] 2010 [2008], pp. 138–143).

The SS department in charge of extermination was entitled *Wirtschaftsverwaltungshauptamt* [Main Office of Economic Administration]. The name mirrors the fact that the measures and bureaucratic functioning at work in the extermination were the same as in any normal, well organized administration and economy (Bauman, 1994, p. 28). This is what Hilberg concludes from his study of the Holocaust: "The machinery of destruction, then, was structurally no different from organized German society as a whole; the difference was only one of function. The machinery of destruction was the organized community in one of its special roles" (Hilberg 1961: 640). It was a matter of bureaucratic, impersonal routine, of disciplined workers and functionaries following orders from superiors, of researchers and engineers doing value-neutral science and technology. Modern bureaucracy and industrial organization allowed for this immoral rationality that works purely according to means-ends analyses. Bauman outlines in how far the modern organizational division of labour helped to distance each member of the chain from the results and in how far obeying an order reduced moral responsibility to a form of technical responsibility necessary for fulfilling this order received from superiors (Bauman, 1994, pp. 114ff). The war situation after 1939 probably made this sort of state policy and bureaucratic functioning easier than in times of peace.

The "final solution" was the product of a process of trial and error. It underwent changes and modification, adapting to new situations and events during the war. The Nazis had decided that all Jews, all Sinti and Roma, should be eliminated from German soil. This again was not based "on ignorant prejudice or on the paranoid delusions of a madman, but rather on the readings of what was at the time considered to be rigorous and authentic scientific research conducted by highly respected professional scientists. (...) the Holocaust was, to a considerable extent, scientifically 'justified'" by racial theory (Weinstein & Stehr, 1999, p. 4). Yet, the idea of "German territory" itself changed massively with the annexation of Austria, the assault on central Europe and then the war against Russia. Thus, ideas as to how to realize the elimination had to be revised several times. While a deportation towards Eastern territories, then to overseas (Madagascar plan) had been debated for several years, the territorial growth of the Reich, and, by implication, of its Jewish population, made such solutions more and more expensive and less practicable. Thus, the decision for industrial extermination was based on cost-benefit calculations, on expert advice, on considerations of logistic feasibility (these were against overseas deportation, as the distances were too long, the costs too great, and the risks too high due to British presence at sea), on financial aspects, and on the practicability of alternative solutions. The result was that mass extermination was the only practicable and efficient means for achieving – not a Germany without Jews – but a Europe without Jews (Bauman, 1994, pp. 29ff). They had to "end in smoke" (Bauman, 1994, p. 119). The rest was an issue of bureaucratic realization, of fine-tuning the technology, the institutions, processes and instruments in order to identify, dispossess, concentrate and then exterminate the victims (Hilberg 1961: 31). In this logic, it was the most rational, the most modern solution and the one that ensured progress towards what was considered the ideal society.

#### 4. Articulatory deviance under National Socialism

The foregoing mainly relates to existential, in some parts to behavioural and miasmic deviance. This book chapter would remain incomplete, however, without mentioning the NS persecution of articulatory deviance, i.e. deviant thinkers, authors and artists, as well as the broader realm of oppositional and resistance activities, as a threat to the regime in power.

There had been massive support by scholars and artists for the NS-regime, evidenced, for instance, in the *Bekennntniss der Professoren an den deutschen Universitäten und Hochschulen zu Adolf Hitler und dem nationalsozialistischen Staat* [Avowal of German University Professors for Adolf Hitler and the National Socialist State] (1933) signed by 950 university-based academics (Sauder, 1983, p. 27), the *Gelöbnis treuester Gefolgschaft* [Vow of Most Faithful Allegiance] signed in 1933 by 88 German authors and poets, or the *Aufruf der Kulturschaffenden* [Call to the Artists, 1934] signed by architects, composers, musicians, painters, authors and sculptors. The *Nationalsozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund*, NSDStB, [National Socialist German Students' Association] played a leading part in many German universities before 1933. Approval of the NS-programme by Germany's students was such that after the 14th German Students' Meeting in Graz, July 1931, where NSDStB-presidency and vice-presidency came under the rule of National Socialists, Hitler stated : "If anything makes me believe in the victory of the movement, it is the progress of National Socialism among the students" (quoted in: Sauder, 1983, p. 21). This self-imposed *Gleichschaltung* [coordination]<sup>37</sup> was countered, however, by massive critique of the NS-regime's accession to power from inside Germany and then increasingly from the exiled community<sup>38</sup>. Among those articulatory deviants was the broader oppositional and resistance movement with strongholds in the working class and trade union structures, amongst the youth subcultures, in communist and social-democratic circles, the pacifist movement as well as in a certain spectrum of the Church. Apart from these broader groupings, the diversity and heterogeneity of the many splinter groups of opposition and resistance (Foitzik, 1986) cannot be dealt with here, nor are we able to represent the movements of resistance against NS occupation in all regions that fell under NS-rule in the course of the war or the specific forms of opposition and resistance within the concentration and extermination camps. Most of these can count as a mixture of articulatory and behavioural deviance, since they not only expressed dissatisfaction with the regime but also organized resistance activities and support structures. Apart from them, there were the purely articulatory deviants, representatives of "degenerate art" and many blacklisted authors as well as ordinary people expressing extraordinary thoughts.

Between 1939 and 1944, nearly 12.000 people were executed in the German Reich, excluding executions following decisions of military courts, killings by the SS and the murdering of

---

<sup>37</sup> Minister of Culture Rust proclaimed in 1933 that: „The future shape of university teaching should be communicable in a less intellectual manner; it must be grasped *intuitively*. Formerly there was more ideological variety. Our 'Gleichschaltung' [ideological coordination] means that the new German world view will occupy a dominant position over all others because it is quite plainly valid". Sauder (1983, p. 27).

<sup>38</sup> Literature on exile from National-Socialism is as numerous and heterogeneous as the exiled community itself. To indicate only a few examples for the importance of intellectuals going into exile, see the study of 2500 German-speaking authors who emigrated for racial or political reasons during the NS-period: Kantorowicz (1978) 1983, p. 7; Wittebur (1991) portrays 141 German sociologists in exile; for the socialists in exile in Great Britain, see Röder (1968).

Jews, i.e. this figure mainly relates to behavioural and articulatory deviance as represented by the various forms of divergence, opposition and resistance to Hitler and the NS-state (Schad, 2001, p. 7).

### „Degenerate Art“

There were purely articulatory deviants. The *Gleichschaltung* and regulation of cultural life could easily build on long-standing positions of cultural pessimism in German philosophy that facilitated understandings of deviant arts and of culture as degenerate. Here again, ideas of *Volk*, racialized notions of purity and Germanness combined. There was an exhibition of *Degenerate Music* in May 1938 that aimed at discrediting modern music such as swing and the so-called Nigger-jazz or the “Music Bolshevism” of composers like Hanns Eisler.

For the domain of the visual arts, the NS had orchestrated in 1937 the parallel opening in Munich of the *Große Deutsche Kunstausstellung* [Great German Art Exhibition], where the new, revolutionarily real German art (mainly artistically mediocre nudes and landscape paintings) were exhibited, and of the exhibition *Entartete Kunst* [Degenerate Art] (Barron, 1992). The latter, initiated by Goebbels and directed by the president of the *Reichskammer der bildenden Künste* [Reich Chamber of Fine Arts], Adolf Ziegler, showed about 650 art works out of about 20.000 that were confiscated from museums all over Germany.

Graph 3 and Graph 4 about here.

The confiscation, selling out to international clients and destruction of art works in question was also an important step in the so-called “cleansing” of German collections of art. There was little agreement as to what the definitions of “great German art” and of “degenerate art” were. Under the latter fell, among others, avant-garde currents such as expressionism, impressionism, the much hated Dadaism, new realism and surrealism, cubism as well as fauvism, including works of Ernst Barlach, Otto Dix, Max Ernst, George Grosz, Ernst Ludwig Kirchner, Paul Klee, Käthe Kollwitz or Paula Modersohn. Nor was the status of “degenerate artists” clear. Three artists were subjected to a suspension from work: Emil Nolde, Karl Schmidt-Rottluff and Edwin Scharff (Baier, 2007). All the others continued to create art, but faced massive problems in exhibiting or selling their works. The conceptualization of the exhibition in Munich had happened quickly and in a haphazard way. But it initiated a broader campaign of confiscation of art works all over the country, and by the time the exhibition moved to Berlin in spring 1938, the main focus had shifted from expressionism to socially critical art and anti-war art – Dix, Grosz and Felixmüller were represented much more strongly in Berlin (Baier, 2007).

The exhibition *Degenerate Art* deliberately exhibited their works under bad conditions, framed by photos of disabled persons, in Berlin also equating the works with paintings of mentally disabled people. This framing as sick, or also as “Jewish-bolshevist” was to ensure that visitors understood this modern art was a sign of moral, racial and intellectual decay (Deutsches Historisches Museum - Lebendiges Virtuelles Museum Online, s.d.). *Entartete Kunst* was a deviance-defining



cultural policy measure that remains unequalled in world history (Baier, 2007). It should be emphasized that the attack on art represents a particular form of defining articulatory deviance. It cannot be equated with the overall persecution of resistance or opposition to the regime, but stands for the aim of National socialist power to dominate yet another domain of social life and human existence, that of artistic creativity and cultural imagination. Interestingly in this respect, one of the artists most hated by the NS, Max Beckmann, who had lost his right to lecture in 1933 and whose works had been integrated into the Munich exhibition *Entartete Kunst*, did not understand his work as being a political act. After emigrating to Amsterdam in 1937 right after listening to Hitler's opening speech for the *Große Deutsche Kunstausstellung* (Reimertz, 1995, p. 145), Beckmann stated: „As a precondition of my attempt at an explanation (that means a priori an almost impossible explanation) I would first like to emphasize that I have never been politically active in any form. I have always only attempted to realize my world picture as intensively as I could” (Beckmann, 1938).

### *Burning of books*

Apart from the burning of books by Ch'in Shih-huang in China in 213 B.C. and by the Church in the Middle Ages, culminating in the times of the Inquisition, the fascist biblioclasm is certainly one of the most well-known in history (Körte & Ortlieb, 2007; Rafetseder, 1983; Sauder, 1983). As we have seen, anti-democratic, reactionary and nationalist-racist thought was well anchored in the German universities. In March 1933, a well-organized *Aktion wider den undeutschen Geist* [Action against the non-German Spirit] aimed at the persecution and silencing of “noxious” and “damaging” authors. It reached its culminating point on May 10<sup>th</sup> 1933, when, on the Opernplatz in Berlin as well as in 90 other German cities, students, professors and NS-agents, in an orchestrated and ritualized manner, burned tens of thousands of books from the domains of literature, sciences and the humanities (Bracher, 1974; Schoeps & Treß, 2008). Among the authors branded as articulatory deviants were Walter Benjamin, Ernst Bloch, Bertolt Brecht, Albert Einstein, Lion Feuchtwanger, Sigmund Freud, Theodor Lessing, Georg Lukács, Rosa Luxemburg, Heinrich Mann, Karl Marx, Bertha von Suttner, Kurt Tucholsky – but also authors writing in other languages, such as André Gide, Romain Rolland, Ernest Hemingway, Jack London or John Dos Passos. On May 20<sup>th</sup>, the Berlin police issued a preliminary report in which they stated that in the course of the “cleansings”, they had “confiscated about 10,000 hundredweight of books and journals and brought them into the barns of the formerly mounted security police”. They also reported a series of acts of resistance on behalf of several libraries which had tried to hide their stocks of literature (Sauder, 1983, p. 107)<sup>39</sup>.

The burning of books was carried out with the help of “Black Lists” that had been assembled in spring 1933 under the coordination of the Berlin librarian Wolfgang Herrman. The list included the literature that was to be removed from public libraries and was handed to the organizers of the *Aktion wider den undeutschen Geist*. In November of the same year, the *Reichsschrifttumskammer* [Reich Chamber of Literature] was founded, which was responsible for the control of authors, publishing houses and the book market, in order to improve the banning of “un-German” literature.

---

<sup>39</sup> One needs to be aware of the importance of libraries that were the main sites of confiscation of books at the time: In 1933, there were 15,000 commercial libraries with a total volume of about 30 million books. Sauder interprets their existence as a sign of the impoverishment of the reading strata of society. Sauder (1983, pp. 30 ff.)

It established a “List of noxious and undesired literature” with more than 4500 items, in many cases all publications of one author or the whole catalogue of a publishing house (BerlinOnline Stadtportal GmbH & Co. KG, s.d.).

The “Guidelines” published in the NS-journal *Die Bücherei* [The Library] in 1935 in order to orient librarians and publishers registers the works of all those articulatory deviants who were to be silenced because they either opposed the underlying ideological principles of National Socialism, or threatened the existing social and political order, or were guilty of existential and behavioural deviance as defined by National Socialist practice, namely:

1. The works of traitors, emigrants and authors from foreign countries who believe they can attack and denigrate the new German (H.G. Wells, Rolland).
2. The literature of Marxism, Communism and Bolshevism.
3. Pacifist literature.
4. Literature with liberal, democratic tendencies and attitudes, and writings supporting the Weimar Republic (Rathenau, Heinrich Mann).
5. All historical writings whose purpose is to denigrate the origin, the spirit and the culture of the German *Volk*, or to dissolve the racial and structural order of the Volk, or that denies the force and importance of leading historical figures in favour of egalitarianism and the masses, and which seeks to drag them through the mud (Emil Ludwig).
6. Writings of a philosophical and social nature whose content deals with the false scientific enlightenment of primitive Darwinism and Monism (Häckel).
7. Books that advocate "art" which is decadent, bloodless, or purely constructivist (Grosz, Dix, Bauhaus, Mendelsohn).
8. Writings on sexuality and sexual education which serve the egocentric pleasure of the individual and thus completely destroy the principles of race and *Volk* (Hirschfeld)<sup>40</sup>.

---

<sup>40</sup> Controversies around this category are quite entertaining: Literature was blacklisted “in which [...] sexual problems are discussed with a serious ethical intention and that are artistically flawless” were not blacklisted, “even if details can be perceived as offending or if one cannot agree with the convictions of the authors”. Elsewhere, it was stated that for books to be acceptable “it is a precondition to acknowledge the German people’s basic norm (Grundnorm des deutschen Volkes)”, i.e. especially with regard to literature on erotic and sexual topics, the controversy established a difference between “normal” and “abnormal literature”. However, people realized that this distinction was problematic, especially in regard to those topics. The ensuing solution relied on the supposedly more precise concept of what is “German”: “If, however, we start our argument from the fact that, in accordance with its Nordic descent, the German people has a certain natural reserve with regard to its sex life, i.e. that all ‘oriental’ wallowing in sexual phantasies and images is not natural to him, then it goes without saying that an reproduction of ‘erotic’ books and images cannot be tolerated. There is no need for subtle case to case analyses about whether a book or image is objectively obscene once we lay down this rule: whatever goes against the instincts of the German people has no right to ask for public protection.” (Kampfbund für Deutsche Kultur: *Die Liste der unerwünschten Literatur. grundsätzliche Vorbemerkungen* (13.7.1933), Sauder (1983, pp. 117–119)).

9. The decadent, destructive writings harmful to the *Volk* of “Asphalt and Civilization” literati, (Graf, H. Mann, Stefan Zweig, Wassermann, Franz Blei). [transl. note: a derogatory term for writers dealing with upper middle class urban society].

10. Literature by Jewish authors, regardless of the field.

11. Popular entertainment literature that depicts life and life's goals in a superficial, unrealistic and sickly sweet manner, based on a bourgeois or upper class view of life.

12. Nationalistic and patriotic kitsch in literature (P.O. Höcker!). (“Richtlinien,” 1935, p. 279)

Dealing with these mobilized the metaphor of miasmic deviance as well, when it came to deciding what to do practically with the removed books. The recommendation given was to “retain a copy of even the most dangerous books in the poison cabinets of the large city and university libraries, pending the coming altercation with the ‘Asphalt’ literati and the Marxists” (Herrmann, s.d.; reprinted in: Sauder, 1983). The books in question could thus be divided into three groups: “Group 1 is to be destroyed (Auto da fé), e.g. Remarque. Group 2 goes into the poison cabinet (e.g. Lenin). Group 3 contains dubious cases requiring future assessment as to whether they belong to group 1 or group 2 (e.g. Traven)”. (Herrmann, s.d.; reprinted in: Sauder, 1983, p. 120).

It is more than noteworthy that one of the victims, Heinrich Heine, in his tragedy “Almansor” (1821), had predicted, through the story of al-Manṣūr billāh who had initiated the cleansing of libraries in the caliphate of Córdoba in the 10<sup>th</sup> century, that “this was only a prelude. Where they burn books, they will end up burning people”<sup>41</sup>. With regard to the burning of books of 1933 and the latter development of the NS-state, this was almost prophetic.

#### *Conclusion: the meaning of articulatory deviance under National Socialism*

We shall conclude by illustrating the concrete threat that deviant literature and arts represented to the regime in power. One of the victims of the burning of books was Anna Seghers (1900-1983), a German author of Jewish origins and founding member of the *Bund proletarisch-revolutionärer Schriftsteller* [Association of Proletarian Revolutionary Authors] After her books were burned and banned and she had been arrested by the *Gestapo*, she was forced into exile, first to Switzerland, then Paris, and from there to Mexico where she was granted asylum. While in exile, Seghers founded the antifascist *Heinrich-Heine-Klub* and became its president.

---

<sup>41</sup> The passage reads:

“Almansor

We heard that the dreadful Ximenes,

In the middle of the Market place in Granada,

- My tongue stiffens in my mouth –

Cast the Koran into the flames of a bonfire

Hassan:

That was only a prelude. Where they burn books

They will end up burning people.”

(Heine [1821] ca. 1910, p. 21).

Her paradigmatic novel *The Seventh Cross*, dedicated to “the antifascists of Germany, dead and alive” appeared in 1942 and had been written shortly before the Second World War. It is based on accounts and legends of detainees of the concentration camp in Dachau. “The Seventh Cross” saves humanness in the middle of the most inhumane times, by narrating a story of resistance. It is the story of seven detainees who escape from the concentration camp Westhofen. Each of them represents a different social and political background. The commander of the camp orders that they must be caught and brought back, and prepares seven trees from which he cuts the branches and nails a plank to each of them so they appear like crosses – one for each of the escapees. Six of them are caught and killed. The seventh, Georg Heisler, manages to escape – mainly due to the fact that his struggle is not an individual one, as he receives support from the communist networks of which he is part; due to the fact, as well, that good natured and well meaning Germans without any form of political organization help him, although they often do not meet personally, through the small scope of agency and decision-making they have.

There is fear among the resistance movement that their generation will be exterminated wholesale. Thus, when the detainee Wallau, the most experienced and politically most important of the seven escapees, is returned to the camp after his flight, the detainees in the camp assumed that “A whole generation had to be annihilated. These were our thoughts on that terrible morning; then for the first time we voiced our conviction that if we were to be destroyed on that scale, all would perish because there would be none to come after us. Almost unprecedented in history, the most terrible thing that could happen to a people was now to be our fate: a no-man's-land was to be established between the generations, which old experiences would not be able to traverse” (Seghers, [1942] 2004, pp. 164–165)<sup>42</sup>.

---

<sup>42</sup> The idea of generations of resistance plays an important role throughout the novel see, for instance, the passage where Mr. Bachmann comes home and meets his wife. It turns out only later in the text that he returned from a Gestapo interrogation in which he had betrayed a couple of close friends, the Wallaus: “The woman felt cold as ice. She hunched her shoulders and turned her body away, as if it were not her husband sitting at the head of the table but... She sewed on and on. She did not think; she asked no question, for fear that the answer might destroy her whole life. And what a life! An ordinary life, surely, with the usual struggle for one's daily bread and stockings for the children. But at the same time a bold, strong life, with a burning interest in everything that was worthy to be experienced. Add to it what they – she and the Wallau woman – had heard their fathers say when they were still two little pigtailed girls who lived on the same street, and there was nothing that had not resounded within their four walls; struggles for the ten-hour-day, for the nine-hour-day, the eight-hour-day; speeches that were read even to the women as they bent over the truly fiendish holes in the stockings; speeches from Bebel to Liebknecht, and from Liebknecht to Dimitroff. Even their grandfathers, the children were told proudly, had been imprisoned because they had taken part in strikes and demonstrations. Ah, to be sure, in those days no one had been murdered and tortured for such misdeeds. What a straightforward life! And now that a single question, a thought even, had the power to undo it all! But here it was already, the thought. What ailed her husband? Frau Bachmann, a simple woman, was fond of her husband. Lovers once, they had been together now for many years. She was not like the Wallau woman who had managed to add a good deal to her knowledge. Ah, but the man at the end of the table was not her husband at all. He was an unbidden guest, strange and sinister. Where had the man come from? Why had he been so late? While he had been a different man for a long time, now he seemed utterly destroyed. Ever since he had suddenly been discharged from prison that day, he had been a changed man. Though his wife had been glad and shouted with joy, his face had remained vacant and tired. A voice within her whispered: ‘Would you actually want him to share Wallau's fate?’ The woman wanted to answer: ‘No! No!’ But a voice, far older than she and at the same time much younger, had already replied: ‘Yes, it would be better.’ ‘I can't stand the sight of his face’, Frau Bachmann thought. As if she'd spoken aloud, the man got up and walked to the window, his back

What remains to give them hope is the success of the last of the seven escapees and the lesson that the oppressors could not destroy the most profound dignity of Georg Heisler. Both sides knew that. The commander of the camp Fahrenberg knew it: "To be the master of men, to rule them body and soul, to have power over life and death – how enviable a position! To have full-grown vigorous men lined up before oneself and be permitted to break them, quickly or slowly; to see their bodies, erect only a moment ago, become four-legged; to be able to relish the sight of bold, insolent fellows turning gray and stammering with deathly fear! Some had been finished off, some driven to turning traitor; some discharged, their necks bent, their wills broken. In most cases the taste of power had been well-nigh perfect. But in a very few, at some of the questionings – especially of that fellow George Heisler – things had not gone entirely according to schedule. Ah, if only there weren't that delicate slippery thing which in the last analysis spoiled one's whole taste because, supple like a little lizard, it slipped between one's fingers, elusive and unseizable, unkillable, invulnerable". (Seghers, [1942] 2004, p. 143). The success of Georg Heisler is what keeps the remaining prisoners alive: "Although we had known nothing of the plan [of escape], we had the sensation of having succeeded in some rare undertaking. To many of us the enemy had seemed all-powerful. The strong can afford to be wrong at times without loss of prestige, because even the most powerful are after all only human – yes, their mistakes make them all the more human – but he who claims omnipotence must never be wrong because there can be no alternative to omnipotence except insignificance. If one stroke, no matter how tiny, proved successful against the enemy's alleged omnipotence, everything was won". (Seghers, [1942] 2004, p. 164). Seghers thus plays on the dialectics of power: precisely because the NS-regime pretended to and nearly reached a status of omnipotent power, it was all the more vulnerable to the slightest form of successful resistance<sup>43</sup>. This is precisely the reason for the well orchestrated and systematic persecution and silencing of the slightest form of articulatory deviance.

The seventh cross in the yard of the concentration camp thus remains empty. It stands as a major symbol for hope and victory of the oppressed in the camp. The detainees gather around the oven in which the wood of the seventh cross burns in order to warm themselves: "The billets crackled. (...) Softly, with an oblique look toward the guard and without moving his lips, Hans said: 'Crackling!' Erwin said: 'The seventh one!' On every face there was a faint strange smile, a mixture of heterogeneous elements, of hope and scorn, of helplessness and daring. We held our breaths. The rain beat fitfully against the boards and the tin roof. Erich, the youngest of us, glanced out of the corners of his eyes, in which were merged his own inmost thoughts as well as ours, and said. 'Where is he now, I wonder!'" (Seghers, [1942] 2004, pp. 6–7)

---

to the room, although the shade was drawn." (Seghers [1942] 2004, pp. 137–138). In a later chapter, we learn that he committed suicide.

<sup>43</sup> In another passage, two workers on their way to the factory talk about the ever increasing control of the whole of the region around the concentration camp. Interestingly, this is understood by an SS agent himself as being a weak point of the regime, implicitly referring to potential undercover resistance within the lines of the Nazis: "'With such widespread control,' said Franz, 'it really ought not to be hard to find one solitary man.' - 'That's what I said to my cousin [an SS agent, wk]; but he said such control was not as easy as one might think.' - 'How's that?' – 'That's what I asked him. Says he, control like this is hard to control. (...)' (Seghers [1942] 2004, p. 313).

## Conclusion: Deviance, the Holocaust and post-fascist continuities

The story of modernity, as stated in the introductory chapter to this book, is one of improvement and development, of progress, rationality, institutional differentiation and complexity. We have seen institutional differentiation in terms of managing deviance in the colonies and under National Socialism. The realization of the *Endlösung* has to be considered an ultimate achievement of modern progress in terms of bureaucratic management, scientific advancement, industrial efficiency, efficacy and technical precision. Highly developed infrastructures and a social division of work with technical expertise in very particular fields were a precondition for the realization of the extermination policy. It was not an outbreak of barbarism in the middle of modernity. It would have been unthinkable without the achievements of modern science – a science aiming at social improvements –, industry and administration. The potential inherent in material progress, in the ideals of technical precision and efficiency and of perfect bureaucratic planning and execution had been strongly underestimated. In the destruction machinery of the Holocaust and in the Second World War, this reverse side of modern development became apparent.

What makes National Socialist mass killing singular when compared to other historical genocides, is this highly modern aspect. The possibility and realization of the Holocaust is related to the dual nature of modernity, where the progressive, liberal, enlightened rationalist side – what Weber aptly described as the typical characteristics of modern society – coexists with the underside, or reverse side. This is what is meant when we talk about the potential for the Holocaust being inherent in modernity, a strong anti-modern, irrationalist tradition that linked into anti-Semitism and combined it in complex ways with a broad popular acceptance of highly violent state behaviour. In doing so, this tradition was drawing in important ways on the know-how and experience acquired in the colonies. The distinction between potential and reality implies that both are in principle possible, but only one side is usually visible. Is it possible that the “normality” of modernity, its positive and praised side, was for a long time possible inside Europe because its underside was outsourced into the colonies? And if so, is it possible that the Holocaust changed this situation, which does not mean it was an abnormal aberration? What had happened indeed was a conflation of various trends that led to the realization of the potential for an outstandingly brutal way of dealing with deviance within Europe. It was realized basically with the same means that had led Europe to the supposed “peak of human development”: science, technology, bureaucracy and industry. It was intended as progress towards the ideal society according to the definitions of NS ideology. It did not, however, provide much freedom and autonomy.

The framing of our history of deviance is confirmed in this chapter: It is a generally accepted claim that there is no fascism without economic and political crisis. As outlined in the section on the German historical background to the rise of National Socialism, the crisis was manifest and massive. A moral panic such as the one concerning the *Black Horror* ensured the connections with colonialism, and the social thoughts and ideologies that enabled and accompanied it were safely transferred into the heart of Europe and kept the related disciplines and fields of social thought alive and socially useful. The assault on Eastern Europe mobilized discourses from colonial times, but also specifically German versions of the supposed “drive to the east”, of anti-Bolshevism and anti-Semitism alike. The Nazi narrative was thus a major discourse of “fixing” a set of deviances whose complexity was a

measure of the incoherence of the underlying ideology. It worked because social, political and economic despair was widespread and because resistance was too weak, too late, failed to unite in due time and was weakly organized, faced with an ever increasing totalitarian repression machinery that aimed at controlling all aspects of life and death. These are elements of an explanation that, however, remains half-convincing. For the sociologist, the big question, why National Socialism and the Holocaust, and why in Germany, remains enigmatic to a certain degree.

What consequences could be drawn and what concrete historical consequences have been drawn from this as a response to the experience of the NS period, in order to safeguard modern civilization against itself? Trying to understand sociologically the connections between colonialism and NS extermination policies with regard to the underlying social ideas, to the institutions and practices at work in administrating deviance, must lead to questioning the trends and institutions on which we rely to deal with deviance in the present. What has the world been looking like after 1945? (If we accept 1945 as a caesura, which means no least but ignoring situations in Spain and Portugal, for instance).

Lemkin had predicted in 1944 that Germany had prepared its biological and economic domination over other people within Europe beyond military defeat<sup>44</sup>. What remains of this foresight? Lemkin also formulated the most important challenge to the UN after 1945: "The United Nations in the present war are faced with a tremendous task: to destroy this amalgamation of master-race mythology and aggressive technology which makes of the German people a kind of technified myth that stupefies the world. They should plan to replace the aggressive industrial potential by objectively more peaceful patterns of economic life, such as for example agriculture, and by creating such political and spiritual conditions that the Germans will be impelled to replace their theory of master race by a theory of master morality, international law, and true peace" (Lemkin, 1944, pp. xiv). What were the measures taken to prevent a repetition of the potentially repeatable human disaster of NS extermination?

The official story of the fixers, i.e. the allied powers, turned the Nazis into major deviants of the post-1945 period. The measures to deal with them were denazification, demilitarization, democratization and reintegration of the country into the international community. But the official story was quickly cut short by this other arch deviant which had survived 1945 – the "brown danger" quickly paled against the "red danger". Here starts the less official story of continuities not only from colonialism into National Socialism, but from there right into the Federal Republic<sup>45</sup> after 1945. The post-colonial perspective urgently requires extension and complementary insights from a post-fascist perspective to apprehend this. Our chapter is supposed to end here and we can only outline a few

---

<sup>44</sup> "The picture of coordinated German techniques of occupation must lead to the conclusion that the German occupant has embarked upon a gigantic scheme to change, in favor of Germany, the balance of biological forces between it and the captive nations for many years to come. The objective of this scheme is to destroy or to cripple the subjugated peoples in their development so that, even in the case of Germany's military defeat, it will be in a position to deal with other European nations from the vantage point of numerical, physical, and economic superiority. Despite the bombings of Germany, this German superiority will be fully evident after hostilities have ceased and for many years to follow, when, due to the present disastrous state of nourishment and health in the occupied countries, we shall see in such countries a stunted post-war generation, survivors of the ill-fed children of these war years" Lemkin (1944, pp. xi).

<sup>45</sup> The story of the German Democratic Republic is another one with its own complexities, incoherencies and forms of dealing with deviance.

hints in some keywords. It might sound funny that the German Togo Company was only dissolved in 1975 due to lack of capital (Hanseatisches Sammlerkontor für Historische Wertpapiere, s.d.); or that the *German Colonial -Association* continues its existence. In 2005, it undertook a "Research expedition to South West Africa"<sup>46</sup>.

More seriously, German citizenship and especially immigration legislation is still related to the pre-1945 period. There was a little fuss about these immigration officers in Eastern European countries who allowed supposed "ethnic Germans" into Germany according to proof that their grandparents had formed part of the SS or the *Wehrmacht* (Anonymous author, 1989). This is also interesting with regard to the fact that during the war, legislation was partly incoherent in granting Eastern European people who joined NS forces citizenship despite "ethnic" difference (Rabkov, 2006; Rätzl, 1997).

More seriously as well, despite denazification, the fixers agreed that there was need for experts. And there were experts in Germany – in the public administration, in industry, in the schools and universities, in the hospitals, in the courts. Few are those who find it strange that the big business that profited greatly from the Holocaust continues. The "denazification" and continuities beyond 1945 in German firms, such as BASF or IG-Farben and their successors, has been a topic for rather marginalized activist publications (Morweiser, 1988, pp. 175 ff.).

The staff and the inhabitants of hospitals and especially of psychiatric institutions largely remained the same. In post-1945 Germany, the vast majority of medical doctors, nurses and scientists who had put the euthanasia-program into practice remained in their posts and continued their jobs and careers (Urbahn, 2009). The same is true of some key-academics. Eugen Fischer became Director of the *Institute of Human Genetics* in Münster in 1952, honorary member of the German Anthropological Society in the same year and of the German Anatomic Society in 1954. While the victims of Nazi persecution as well as the victims of the eugenic and euthanasia programmes are organizing and trying to make their voices heard and to defend their interests, e.g. for reparations, eugenics continues to be a reality – prominently outside Europe again<sup>47</sup>, but also, for instance, in Sweden<sup>48</sup>.

In education, science and academia, culture and arts, we need to inquire more about the effects of censorship and the systematic exclusion of a broad spectrum of thought and literature that

---

<sup>46</sup> <http://www.deutscher-kolonialverein.de/>, accessed December 2011.

<sup>47</sup> "Seen globally the epochal caesura of 1945 by no means meant the end of eugenic sterilization. Paul Weidling has distinguished between four phases of sterilization practice from an international perspective. The 'American phase' up to beginning of the 1930s with regional legislation and complex contexts of justification in the USA and Canada and a 'European phase' from 1934 to 1940 in which states allowed themselves to be inspired by the NS sterilization programme (or decisively distanced themselves from it) were followed also from the middle of the 1930s by a 'Scandinavian phase' with increasing rates of sterilization for social reasons after 1945 and finally by a fourth phase with compulsory sterilization programmes in countries of the Third World, above all in China, Singapore, India and Puerto Rico – with a peak in the 1970s. This last phase has continued up to the present".

Schmuhl (2011b, p. 210).

<sup>48</sup> Between 1934 and 1974, about 62,000 Swedes were sterilized as part of a national programme that defined them as "misfits in a forward-looking nation". The motives resemble those of compulsory sterilization during NS times: "The victims were young and mostly female, judged to be rebellious or promiscuous, of low intelligence or perhaps of mixed blood" Balz (1997).



could never be recovered again although a number of important intellectuals returned from exile. Apparently, the effects of the burning of books could be felt far beyond 1945, for instance in public schools: "A quick look into the course books of the post-war period demonstrates that the authors who had stayed in the country still represented German literature – the burning of books had effects for the following decades" (Sauder, 1983, p. 33). Most importantly, we need to find out more about where NS thought has gone after 1945.

Some experts were so good they were indispensable for the US themselves. Wernher von Braun, NSDAP-member and *Sturmbannführer* [Major of the SS], was the aerospace engineer who pioneered the construction of the A4/V2 rocket, produced under his responsibility in batches by concentration camp prisoners. His competency was transferred together with around 100 rockets to the US shortly after the war. He continued to construct aerospace equipment for the Cold War in the US space agency NASA, among other things the first US American atomic intermediate-range missile "Redstone".

In politics, various "great men" of NS history did have a career after 1945. Globke is a key example of personal continuities in the administrative elites. The Association of Democratic Lawyers stated in 1963: "It has been proved beyond doubt that, in accordance with the highest authorities of the Nazi state, the Nazi-party and the S.S. – especially with Himmler –, Dr. Globke has

1. participated in elaborating laws, decrees and other legal acts which formed the juridical bases and pretexts for the criminal schemes of 'Germanization', de-nationalization, expulsion and systematic annihilation of Jews as well as of large parts of the population in the territories occupied by Nazi Germany, especially in Poland and Czechoslovakia;

2. considerably influenced and assisted the criminal tendencies of the Hitler terror-machine by writing commentaries, circulars, directives and special orders, all of which were meant to help putting into practice these laws and decrees stigmatized by the Nuremberg tribunals (...) as illegal and criminal according to international law;

3. collaborated and played an active part in carrying out the 'Germanization' and extermination policy of the Nazi regime by presiding or prominently participating in ministerial meetings where the application of these laws was decided, and by assisting the high S.S., S.D. and police chiefs and dignitaries of the Nazi party in many other ways" (Vereinigung Demokratischer Juristen, 1963, pp. 7–8). By that time, Globke had been chief of Adenauer's *Bundeskanzleramt* [Federal Chancellery] and counted as the closest partner of the chancellor. In 1963, he was awarded the *Großkreuz des Verdienstordens der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* [Grand Cross First Class of the Order of Merit of the Federal Republic of Germany] by President Lübke. Another prominent example is CDU-Chancellor Kiesinger (1966-69). An NSDAP-member between 1933 and 1945, he had started his career as director of the *Rundfunkpolitische Abteilung* [Broadcasting Policy Department] in the *Reichsaußenministerium* [Reich Ministry of Foreign Affairs] under von Ribbentrop, maintaining contacts with Goebbels' *Reichspropagandaministerium* [Reich Propaganda Ministry].

The post-1945 history of intelligence services is the most certain proof that the "red danger" deviants were a concern bigger than any other: Reinhard Gehlen had been a key figure in the *Reichswehramt* [Reich Defence Office] for the Nazi information service on *Fremde Heere Ost* [Foreign Armies East], i.e. he was the chief director of espionage of Eastern Europe. In 1945 the US forces, which did not dispose of any secret information on the Soviet Union, flew him and six of his closest

colleagues directly to Washington: “Long before that day General Gehlen had already consulted with senior members of his staff and made plans to continue their efforts against the Russians after the inevitable capitulation of the German Army, but in cooperation with the American Army. General Gehlen consequently cached his files in the Bavarian Alps and withdrew to that area in the final days of the war. He subsequently surrendered to the Americans, and after his initial POW debriefings, he presented his plan for the continued collection of order of battle information of the Soviet Armies. General Gehlen was motivated by his strong view that the position of the Soviet Army so deep in Europe constituted a real threat to Western civilization. His views were so strong that he was able to convince his captors of these views. He was then flown back to Washington in 1946 for further debriefings, and the decision was made at the G-2 level to allow General Gehlen to reform his unit and to permit him to engage in a collection effort against the Soviet Army in Eastern Europe. Some [blank] were appropriated for this effort. General Gehlen succeeded in reforming his unit and retrieving most of his files. He operated under G-2 sponsorship from 1946 until 1949 when CIA assumed responsibility for the Gehlen organization as it was then known. From 1949 until 1956 General Gehlen devoted his full energies to legalizing his organization as the West German Federal Intelligence Service. He achieved this goal in March 1956 and thereby became its first president. He became directly responsible to the Chancellor’s officer” – Globke (CIA, pp. Biographic Sketch on General Reinhard Gehlen). In 1947, the US Security Council agreed upon a several million dollar programme for setting up paramilitary secret armies all over Western Europe – the “Stay behind”- or “Gladio”-programme. It was coordinated by NATO and national secret services without parliamentary control. Gehlen played a key role in mounting these structures and recruited among others veterans of the *Wehrmacht* and *Waffen-SS*, among them a number of NS war criminals who thus escaped trial<sup>49</sup>. After Gehlen’s organization came under the chief responsibility of the CIA and was renamed ZIPPER, they proceeded to undertake a check of NS-backgrounds of staff and came to amazing conclusions. A 1954 document states: “1. Over the years there have been numerous allegations made by various individuals and factions within the West German government to the effect that ZIPPER’s ranks are heavily weighted with former Nazi and SS-types. In view of the fact that Nazism in the German Government appears no longer to be a problem of such primary concern, it would seem that a report dealing with the incidence of these elements within ZIPPER might well be made at this time by way of finalizing the matter.

2. Study of POB’s [blank] files which contain background data on nearly 600 ZIPPERites (about half of the known total of ZIPPER membership) reveal 76 ZIPPERites known to have been either former SS, SD, SA members, NSDAP members, War Crime offenders and/or a combination of same. The 76 who fall into the above category represent about 13% of the ZIPPERites whose background is known to us (...)” (CIA, pp. Former Nazi and SS Membership in ZIPPER). They comfort themselves with the “further comparison” that “figures recently compiled by [blank] Bonn from Berlin Documents Center records” which show “that the present Bundestag has 129 or 16,5% former NSDAP members” (CIA, pp. Former Nazi and SS Membership in ZIPPER). In another part of the file it is

---

<sup>49</sup> The US formed about 2000 members of the Nazi *Bund Deutscher Jugend* [League of German Youth] for partisan battles against the Soviets within the Gladio program. Gladio is assumed to be responsible for a series of assassinations in Italy and Germany, first blamed on leftist groupings, which caused e.g. more than 80 deaths in the bombing of Bologna Station in 1980. Archives concerning Gladio remain closed until today. Schoen and Gutermuth (2011).

stated that "In terms of SS and SD percentage, ZIPPER claims they are better off than most West German ministries" (CIA, pp. ZIPPER/Nazi Elements). Gehlen remained President of the BND until his retirement in 1968 – and was succeeded by his former adjutant of *Foreign Armies East*, General Gerhard Wessel.

A request for information on “Dealing with the NS-past” by various members of Parliament to the German Parliament was answered in December 2011. It stated that due to the need for and high value of “administrative experience” in the 1950s, there had indeed been a great deal of personal continuity and also partly continuity in terms of the contents in German public administration. The 85-page document reveals, among others, that by the end of the 1950s, 77% of staff of the Ministry of Defence were former NSDAP-members, 50% in the Ministry of Economic Affairs, one third in the Foreign Office. Three quarters of the staff in the Federal Criminal Police Office had been NSDAP-members, and more than half members of the SS. A total of 27 Chancellors and federal ministers had been members of NSDAP, SA or SS, including, e.g., the former Minister of the Exterior Hans-Dietrich Genscher (Deutscher Bundestag, 2011).

Out of dangerous criminals, reliable partners<sup>50</sup>.

---

<sup>50</sup> In turn, those who had opposed National Socialism became increasingly suspicious again as potential “collaborators” of the Soviet Union – prominently Communists and Social Democrats, but even pacifist and church representatives. The German peace-movement against the Cold War became security issue number one.

## Bibliography

Richtlinien [Guidelines] (1935). In: *Die Bücherei [The library]* 2, 1935 (6), p. 279. Available online under <http://www.library.arizona.edu/images/burnedbooks/documents.htm#guidelines>, last checked on 10.01.2012.

Anonymous author (1989): Deutsch ist, wer guter Nazi war [*German is, who was a good Nazi*]. In: *Der Spiegel* (52): 25.12.1989.

Arbeitsgemeinschaft sozialdemokratischer Frauen (ed) (s.d.): Frauen in der SPD berichten über Erlebnisse unter dem Nationalsozialismus und über ihre Tätigkeit im antifaschistischen Widerstand [*Women in the Social-Democratic Party report on their experiences under National Socialism and on their activities in the anti-fascist resistance*]. Ed. Arbeitsgemeinschaft sozialdemokratischer Frauen. Frankfurt.

Archiv der sozialen Demokratie der Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (ed) (1983): Widerstand 1933 - 1945. Sozialdemokraten und Gewerkschafter gegen Hitler [*Resistance 1933-1945. Social Democrats and Trade Unionists against Hitler*]. Catalogue of the exhibition of the same name. Bonn.

Arendt, Hanna (1963): *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. 2<sup>nd</sup> and enlarged edition. Cleveland and New York: Meridian.

Baier, Uta (19.07.2007): "Die Nazis hatten kein klares Konzept". Vor 70 Jahren eröffnete in München die Ausstellung "Entartete Kunst" [*The Nazis didn't have a clear concept. 70 years ago the exposition „Degenerate Art“ opened in Munich*]. Interview with Andreas Hüneke. Die Welt online. [http://www.welt.de/welt\\_print/article1037695/Die\\_Nazis\\_hatten\\_kein\\_klares\\_Konzept.html](http://www.welt.de/welt_print/article1037695/Die_Nazis_hatten_kein_klares_Konzept.html), last checked on 10.1.2012.

Balz, Dan (1997): Sweden sterilized thousands of 'useless' citizens for decades. In: *The Washington Post* 120, 29.08.1997.

Barron, Stephanie (ed). (1992). *Entartete Kunst: Das Schicksal der Avantgarde im Nazi-Deutschland*. München: Hirmer. [*Eng. transl.: Degenerate art: the fate of the avant-garde in Nazi Germany, Los Angeles 1991*] Bauman, Zygmunt (1994): *Dialektik der Ordnung. Die Moderne und der Holocaust*. With collaboration of Uwe Ahrens. 2. edn. Hamburg: Europ. Verl.-Anst. [*Eng. transl.: Modernity and the Holocaust, Ithaca 1989*] Beckmann, Max (1938): *Über meine Malerei*. New Burlington Galleries. London, 1938. Available online under <http://www.kunstzitate.de/bildendekunst/manifeste/beckmann1938.htm>, last checked on 10.02.2012. [*Eng. transl.: On my painting, Madras 1988*] Berghahn, Volker R.: *Der Stahlhelm : Bund der Frontsoldaten 1918 - 1935 [The Steel Helmet: the league of front-line soldiers 1918-1935]*. PhD London Univ., 1964. Düsseldorf: Droste-Verl. (Beiträge zur Geschichte des Parlamentarismus und der politischen Parteien, 33).

BerlinOnline Stadtportal GmbH & Co. KG (ed) (s.d.): Online-Veröffentlichung der Liste der von den Nationalsozialisten verbotenen Schriften auf Basis der "Liste des schädlichen und unerwünschten Schrifttums" [*Online-publication of the list of writings banned by the National Socialists on the basis of the „List of noxious and undesired literature“*], Stand vom 31. Dezember 1938. Leipzig, 1938. With

the collaboration of Wolfgang Both. Berlin.de Das offizielle Hauptstadtportal. Berlin. Available online under [http://www.berlin.de/rubrik/hauptstadt/verbannte\\_buecher/](http://www.berlin.de/rubrik/hauptstadt/verbannte_buecher/), last updated on 10.01.2012.

Bley, Helmut (2003): Der Traum vom Reich? Rechtsradikalismus als Antwort auf gescheiterte Illusionen im Deutschen Kaiserreich 1900-1918 [*The dream of the Reich? Right-wing radicalism as response to the failed illusions of the German Kaiserreich*]. In: Birthe Kundrus (ed.): Phantasiereiche. Zur Kulturgeschichte des deutschen Kolonialismus [Empires of phantasy. On the cultural history of German colonialism]. Frankfurt am Main: Campus-Verl, pp. 56–70.

Bourdieu, Pierre ([1988] 1991): The Political Ontology of Martin Heidegger. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bracher, Karl Dietrich (1974): Die nationalsozialistische Machtergreifung. Studien zur Errichtung des totalitären Herrschaftssystems in Deutschland 1933/34 [*The takeover of the National Socialists. Studies on the establishment of the totalitarian regime in Germany 1933/34*]. Darmstadt: Ullstein-Taschenbuch-Verl (Ullstein-Bücher 2992).

Buell, Raymond Leslie (1943): Introduction. In: Simon Segal (ed.): Nazi rule in Poland. London: Robert Hale, pp. v–vi.

Campt, Tina (2004): Other Germans. Black Germans and the politics of race, gender, and memory in the Third Reich. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan (Social history, popular culture, and politics in Germany).

Cay, A. M. (s.d./1923). *Franzosen im Ruhrgebiet: 10 Zeichnungen von A. M. Cay* [*Frenchmen in the Ruhr region: 10 drawings by A.M. Cay*]. Berlin: Reimar Hobbing.

Césaire, Aimé ([1955] 2000): Discourse on colonialism. Together with Joan Pinkham. New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.

CIA: Biographic sketch on General Reinhard Gehlen. Declassified and approved for release by the Central Intelligence Agency 2001. Available at the Jewish Virtual Library online under <http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Holocaust/CIAGehlen.pdf>, last checked on 05.02.2012.

Conrad, Sebastian (2008): Deutsche Kolonialgeschichte. Munich: C. H. Beck. [*Eng. transl.: German colonialism : a short history, Cambridge 2012*]

Darré, Walther (1933): Das Schwein als Kriterium für nordische Völker und Semiten [*The swine as criterion for Northern peoples and Semites*]. Munich: J. F. Lehmanns Verlag.

Deutscher Bundestag (2011): Antwort der Bundesregierung auf die große Anfrage der Abgeordneten Jan Korte, Sevim Dagdelen, Ulla Jelpke, weiterer Abgeordneter und der Fraktion DIE LINKE. Umgang mit der NS-Vergangenheit [*Response of the German Federal Government to the major query of the Members of Parliament Jan Korte, Sevim Dagdelen, Ulla Jelpke et al, and the parliamentary group of the Party Die Linke. Dealing with the National Socialist past*]. Berlin (Drucksache 17/8134). Available online under <http://dipbt.bundestag.de/dip21/btd/17/081/1708134.pdf>, last checked on 10.01.2012.

Deutsches Historisches Museum - Lebendiges Virtuelles Museum Online (ed) (s.d.): Die Ausstellung "Entartete Kunst" [*The exposition 'Degenerate Art'*]. Deutsches Historisches Museum;

Haus der Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Berlin/Bonn. Available online under <http://www.dhm.de/lemo/html/nazi/kunst/entartet/index.html>, last checked on 10.01.2012.

Deutsches Historisches Museum - Lebendiges Virtuelles Museum Online (ed) (2012): 1871-1914. Statistische Angaben zu den deutschen Kolonien [1871-1914. *Statistical data on the German colonies*]. Deutsches Historisches Museum; Haus der Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Berlin/Bonn. Available online under <http://www.dhm.de/lemo/html/kaiserreich/aussenpolitik/kolonien2/>, last checked on 10.01.2012.

Dussel, Enrique (1993): Von der Erfindung Amerikas zur Entdeckung des Anderen. Ein Projekt der Transmoderne. Düsseldorf: Patmos. [Engl. transl.: *The invention of the Americas: eclipse of 'the other' and the myth of modernity*, New York 1995]

Ebert, Theodor (2002): Taugt die gewaltfreie Aktion auch zum Widerstand gegen Diktaturen? Eine Untersuchung am Fall Bonhoeffer [*Is non-violent action suitable for resistance against dictatorships? An analysis of the case Bonhoeffer*]. Evangelische Arbeitsgemeinschaft zur Betreuung der Kriegsdienstverweigerer in Württemberg. Stuttgart, 21.11.2002. Available online under <http://www.frieden-schaffen.de/kdv.schriften/kdv.schriften.widerstandbonhoeffer/index.html>, last checked on 10.01.2012.

Eckart, Wolfgang U. (1997): Medizin und Kolonialimperialismus. Deutschland 1884 – 1945 [*Medicine and colonial imperialism. Germany 1884-1945*]. Paderborn: Schöningh.

Eckert, Andreas ([2003] 2004): Namibia - ein deutscher Sonderweg in Afrika? Anmerkungen zur internationalen Diskussion [*Namibia: a German exceptionalism in Africa? Comments on the international discussion*]. In: Jürgen Zimmerer, Joachim Zeller (eds): Völkermord in Deutsch-Südwestafrika. Der Kolonialkrieg (1904 - 1908) in Namibia und seine Folgen [Genocide in German South West Africa. The colonial war (1904-1908) in Namibia and its consequences]. 2. Edn. Berlin: Links (Schlaglichter der Kolonialgeschichte 2).

Etkind, Alexander (2011): Internal Colonization: Russia's Imperial Experience. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fanon, Frantz ([1961] 2004): The wretched of the earth. New York: Grove Press.

Feder, Gottfried (1933): Kampf gegen die Hochfinanz [*The fight against the high finance*]. Munich: Eher.

Foitzik, Jan (1986): Zwischen den Fronten. Zur Politik, Organisation und Funktion linker politischer Kleinorganisationen im Widerstand 1933 bis 1939/40 [*Between the fronts. On the politics, organization, and function of small leftist political organizations in the resistance 1933 to 1939/40*]. Bonn: Verlag Neue Gesellschaft.

Furber, David Bruce (2003): Going East: colonialism and German life in Nazi-occupied Poland. PhD Thesis. Dept. of History, State University of New York, Buffalo.

Gerlach, Christian ([1999] 2000): Kalkulierte Morde. Die deutsche Wirtschafts- und Vernichtungspolitik in Weißrußland 1941 bis 1944 [*Calculated murder. The German economic and extermination politics in Belarus 1941 to 1944*]. 2. Aufl. Hamburg: Hamburger Ed.

Grimm, Hans ([1926] 1931): Volk ohne Raum [*People without space*]. Munich: Albert Langen.

Groenewald, Cornie J. (1987): The methodology of poverty research in South Africa: the case of the first Carnegie investigation 1929-1932. In: *Social Dynamics* 13 (2), pp. 60–74.

Gründer, Horst (1985): Lindequist, Friedrich von. In: Historische Kommission bei der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Ed.): *Neue Deutsche Biographie* [New German Biography], Vol. 14. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, p. 601.

Hanseatisches Sammlerkontor für Historische Wertpapiere (ed.) (s.d.): Info zur Deutschen Togogesellschaft [*Information on the German Togo Society*]. Available online under <http://www.historische-wertpapiere.de/de/HSK-Auktion-XXIII/?AID=39312&AKTIE=Deutsche+Togogesellschaft>, last checked on 01.12.2011.

Heine, Heinrich ([1821] ca. 1910): Heines Werke in fünfzehn Teilen. Fünfter Teil – Almansor. Eine Tragödie. [Heine's Works in 15 volumes. Volume Five: Almansor. A tragedy] Erwin Kalischer, Raimund Pissin (collaborators). Berlin, Leipzig, Wien, Stuttgart: Deutsches Verlagshaus Bong & Co.

Herbert, Ulrich (2012): Personal discussion about the deviance project and in particular about the assumption of German colonialism in Eastern Europe. FRIAS/Freiburg, 22.03.2012. Minutes of the talk.

Herbert, Ulrich (1986): Geschichte der Ausländerbeschäftigung in Deutschland 1880 bis 1980. Saisonarbeiter, Zwangsarbeiter, Gastarbeiter [*History of the employment of foreigners in Germany 1880 to 1980. Seasonal workers, forced labour, guest workers*]. Berlin, Bonn: Dietz.

Herrmann, Wolfgang: Grundsätzliches zur Anfertigung von Schwarzen Listen [*General Principles for the Compilation of Blacklists*]. Translated by Dr. Roland Richter. In: When books burn. Web Exhibit sponsored by the University of Arizona Library. Available online under <http://www.library.arizona.edu/images/burnedbooks/documents.htm#liste1935>, last checked on 10.01.2012.

Hilberg, Raul (1961): The destruction of the European Jews. Chicago and London: Quadrangle Books.

Hitler, Adolf ([1933] 2009): Mein Kampf [*My struggle*]. English translation available online under [http://www.archive.org/details/MeinKampf\\_483](http://www.archive.org/details/MeinKampf_483), last checked on 02.04.2012.

Hoffmann, Peter (1969): Widerstand, Staatsstreich, Attentat: Der Kampf der Opposition gegen Hitler. München: Piper. [Engl. transl.: *The history of the German resistance, 1933-1945, London 1977*]

Jahn, Peter (14.6.2007): Zweiter Weltkrieg. 27 Millionen [*World War II. 27 millions*]. In: *Zeit Online* (25) 14.6.2007, pp. 1–6. Available online under <http://www.zeit.de/2007/25/27-Millionen-Tote>, last checked on 20.01.2012.

Kant, Immanuel ([1800] 2006): Anthropology from a pragmatic point of view. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kantorowicz, Alfred ([1978] 1983): Politik und Literatur im Exil. Deutschsprachige Schriftsteller im Kampf gegen den Nationalsozialismus [*Politics and literature in exile. German-language authors in the struggle against National Socialism*]. Hamburg: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.

Karg, Berta Carola (1984): Mein Kampf gegen die braune Diktatur [*My fight against the brown dictatorship*]. In: Richard Löwenthal, Patrik von zur Mühlen (eds): Widerstand und Verweigerung in Deutschland 1933 bis 1945 [Resistance and refusal in Germany 1933-1945]. [Revised edn.]. Berlin: Dietz (Dietz-Taschenbuch, 8), pp. 102–110.

Knigge, Volkhard (2011): Zwangsarbeit. Die Deutschen, die Zwangsarbeiter und der Krieg : Begleitband zur Ausstellung [*Forced labor. The Germans, forced labour, and the war: companion volume to the exposition*]. 3rd edn. Weimar: Stiftung Gedenkstätten Buchenwald und Mittelbau-Dora.

Kolb, Eberhard (2005): Der Frieden von Versailles [*The peace of Versailles*]. Munich: Beck (C.-H.-Beck-Wissen, 2375).

Körte, Mona; Ortlieb, Cornelia (2007): Verbergen - Überschreiben - Zerreißen. Formen der Bücherzerstörung in Literatur, Kunst und Religion; [*Concealing, overwriting, shredding. Forms of book destruction in literature, arts, and religion*]. Berlin: Schmidt (Allgemeine Literaturwissenschaft - Wuppertaler Schriften, 9).

Kundrus, Birthe (2003): Von Windhoek nach Nürnberg? Koloniale 'Mischehenverbote' und die nationalsozialistische Rassengesetzgebung [*From Windhoek to Nuremberg? Colonial 'prohibitions of mixed marriages' and the National Socialist race legislation*]. In: Birthe Kundrus (ed): Phantasiereiche. Zur Kulturgeschichte des deutschen Kolonialismus [Empires of phantasy. On the cultural history of German colonialism]. Frankfurt am Main: Campus-Verl, pp. 110–131.

Lebzelter, Gisela (1985): Die 'Schwarze Schmach'. Vorurteile - Propaganda – Mythos [*The 'Black Disgrace'. Prejudices-propaganda-myth*]. In: *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 11, pp. 37–58.

Lemkin, Raphael (1944): Axis rule in occupied Europe. Laws of occupation, analysis of government, proposals for redress. Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Lemkin, Raphael, Series III: History of Genocide, undated. Raphael Lemkin Collection ; P-154; Box 7 (Folders 5-11) - Box 9; American Jewish Historical Society, Boston, MA and New York, NY. Available online under <http://findingaids.cjh.org/?pID=109202#serIII>, last checked on 01.12.2011.

Longerich, Peter (1989): Die braunen Bataillone. Geschichte der SA [*The brown bataillons. History of the SA*]. München: Beck.

Lower, Wendy (2005): Nazi empire-building and the Holocaust in Ukraine. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Lukács, György ([1962] 1981): The destruction of reason. Atlantic Highlands, N.J: Humanities Press.

Mann, Heinrich; Schneider, Peter Paul ([1918] 2004): Der Untertan. Roman. 12. edn. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer (Fischer-Taschenbücher, 10168). [Engl. transl.: *Man of straw, London 1984*]

Mazower, Mark; Richter, Martin (2009): Hitlers Imperium. Europa unter der Herrschaft des Nationalsozialismus. München: Beck. [Engl. title: *Hitler's empire: how the Nazis ruled Europe, New York 2008*]

Memmi, Albert ([1957] 1990): The colonizer and the colonized. London: Earthscan.



Morgenrath, Birgit; Rössel, Karl (eds) (2005): "Unsere Opfer zählen nicht". Die Dritte Welt im Zweiten Weltkrieg [*Our victims do not count. The Third World in World War II*]. Rheinisches JournalistInnenbüro; Recherche International e.V. Berlin: Assoziation A.

Morweiser, Hermann W. (1988): Pfälzer Juden und IG-Farben [*Palatine Jews and the IG Farben corporation*]. Ludwigshafen: Bauchladen.

Müller, Rolf-Dieter (1983): Von der Wirtschaftsallianz zum kolonialen Ausbeutungskrieg [*From economic alliance to colonial exploitation war*]. In: Horst Boog, et al (eds): Das Deutsche Reich und der Zweite Weltkrieg [The German Reich and World War II]. Bd. 4 Der Angriff auf die Sowjetunion [Vol. 4: The attack on the Soviet Union]. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, pp. 98–189.

Müller, Rolf-Dieter (1991): Hitlers Ostkrieg und die deutsche Siedlungspolitik. Die Zusammenarbeit von Wehrmacht, Wirtschaft und SS. Frankfurt a.M: Fischer. [Engl. transl.: *Hitler's war in the East, 1941-1945: a critical assessment, Providence 1997*]

Naber, Geert (2007): "Ausgangspunkt einer deutschen Weltmachtpolitik" - Kolonialismus, Rassismus und Deutschtum bei Max Weber [*Starting point of a German world politics' – Colonialism, racism, and Germanhood in Max Weber*]. In: freiburg-postkolonial.de (ed). Freiburg. Available online under <http://www.freiburg-postkolonial.de/Seiten/maxweber.htm>, last checked on 02.02.2012.

Otto Hintze; Friedrich Meinecke; Hermann Oncken; Hermann Schumacher (eds) (1916): Deutschland und der Weltkrieg [*Germany and the World War*]. Leipzig, Berlin: Teubner.

Plessner, Helmuth ([1935] 1959): Die verspätete Nation: über die politische Verführbarkeit bürgerlichen Geistes [*The belated nation: on the political temptability of the bourgeois intellect*]. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Rabkov, Irina (2006): Aussiedler in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Migrationserfahrung und Kriminalitätsrisiken von ethnischen Migranten im Kontext der bundesdeutschen Zuwanderungspolitik [*Aussiedler in the Federal Republic of Germany. Experience of migration and risks of criminality amongst ethnic migrants within the context of German federal immigration policy*]. PhD thesis. Albert-Ludwigs-Universität, Freiburg. Available online under [http://www.freidok.uni-freiburg.de/volltexte/2508/pdf/Rabkov\\_Dissertation.pdf](http://www.freidok.uni-freiburg.de/volltexte/2508/pdf/Rabkov_Dissertation.pdf), last checked on 25.11.2011.

Rafetseder, Hermann (1983): Bücherverbrennungen [*Burning of books*]. Univ. Wien, Vienna.

Räthzel, Nora (1997): Gegenbilder. Nationale Identitäten durch Konstruktion des Anderen [*Counter-images. National identities and the construction of the Other*]. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

Reimertz, Stephan (1995): Max Beckmann. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt.

Röder, Werner (1968): Die deutschen sozialistischen Exilgruppen in Grossbritannien. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Widerstandes gegen den Nationalsozialismus [*The German socialist groups in exile in Great Britain. A contribution to the history of resistance against National Socialism*]. Hannover: Verlag für Literatur und Zeitgeschehen (Schriftenreihe des Forschungsinstitut der Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung).

Rohe, Karl (1966): Das Reichsbanner Schwarz Rot Gold. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Struktur der politischen Kampfverbände zur Zeit der Weimarer Republik [*The Reichsbanner Schwarz*

Rot Gold. *A contribution to the history and structure of the political militias by the time of the Weimar Republic*]. Düsseldorf: Droste-Verl.

Rosenberg, Alfred ([1931] 1934): *Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts. Eine Wertung der seelisch-geistigen Gestaltenkämpfe unserer Zeit*. 23.-24. edn. Munich: Hoheneichen-Verlag. [Engl. transl.: *The myth of the twentieth century: an evaluation of the spiritual-intellectual confrontations of our age*, Newport Beach (CA) 1982]

Sansal, Boualem ([2008] 2010): *An unfinished business*. London, New York, Berlin: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Sauder, Gerhard (ed.) (1983): *Die Bücherverbrennung. Zum 10. Mai 1933* [*Burning of books. On the 10<sup>th</sup> May 1933*]. 2. Edn. Munich: Hanser.

Schad, Martha (2001): *Frauen gegen Hitler. Schicksale im Nationalsozialismus* [*Women against Hitler. Destinies under National Socialism*]. Munich: Heyne.

Schallmayer, W. (1905): *Beiträge zu einer Nationalbiologie. Nebst einer Kritik der methodologischen Einwände und einem Anhang über wissenschaftliches Kritikerwesen* [*Contributions to a national biology. Together with a critique of methodological objections and an addendum on scientific criticism*]. Jena: Hermann Costenoble.

Schallmayer, Wilhelm (1910): *Vererbung und Auslese in ihrer soziologischen und politischen Bedeutung. Preisgekrönte Studie über Volksentartung und Volkseugenik* [*The sociological and political relevance of heredity and selection. Award-winning study on racial degeneration and eugenics*]. 2. Edn. Jena: Gustav Fischer.

Schmuhl, Hans-Walter (2011a): *Eugenik und Rassenanthropologie* [*Eugenics and racial anthropology*]. In: Robert Jütte, Wolfgang U. Eckart, Hans-Walter Schmuhl, Winfried Süß (eds): *Medizin und Nationalsozialismus. Bilanz und Perspektiven der Forschung* [*Medicine and National Socialism. Balance and research perspectives*]. 2. Edn. Göttingen: Wallstein-Verl, pp. 24–38.

Schmuhl, Hans-Walter (2011b): *Zwangssterilisation* [*Forced sterilisation*]. In: Robert Jütte, Wolfgang U. Eckart, Hans-Walter Schmuhl, Winfried Süß (eds): *Medizin und Nationalsozialismus. Bilanz und Perspektiven der Forschung* [*Medicine and National Socialism. Balance and research perspectives*]. 2. edn. Göttingen: Wallstein-Verl, pp. 201–213.

Schoen, Wolfgang; Gutermuth, Frank (2011): *Gladio. Geheimarmeen in Europa* [*Gladio. Secret armies in Europe*]. Film. Frankfurt/Main: tvschoenfilm.

Schoeps, Julius H.; Treß, Werner (2008): *Orte der Bücherverbrennungen in Deutschland 1933* [*Places of the burning of books in Germany 1933*]. Hildesheim: Olms (/Wissenschaftliche Begleitbände im Rahmen der Bibliothek verbrannter Bücher, 1).

Scott, James C. (1998): *Seeing like a state. How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press (Yale ISPS series).

Segal, Simon (Ed.) (1943): *Nazi rule in Poland*. London: Robert Hale.

Seghers, Anna ([1942] 2004): *The seventh cross. Together with James Austin Galston, Kurt Vonnegut, Dorothy Rosenberg*. 1. edn. Boston: Godine.

Smith, Woodruff D. (1986): *The ideological origins of Nazi imperialism*. New York et al.: Oxford University Press.

Steinmetz, George (2006): Decolonizing German theory: an introduction. In: *Postcolonial Studies* 9 (1), pp. 3–13.

Troeltsch, Ernst; Baron, Hans (eds) (1925): *Deutscher Geist und Westeuropa: Gesammelte kulturphilosophische Aufsätze und Reden [German Geist and Western Europe: collection of cultural-philosophical essays and speeches]*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Tucholsky, Kurt (1985). *Die zufällige Republik: Schriften zur Politik [The Republic by accident: writings on politics]*. Frankfurt am Main, Olten, Wien: Büchergilde Gutenberg.

Urbahn, Theiß (2009): Medizinisches Mordregime. Vor 70 Jahren: Beginn des 'Euthanasie' genannten Vernichtungsfeldzuges gegen psychisch Kranke und geistig Behinderte [*The medical murder regime. 70 years ago: the start of the extermination campaign against mentally handicapped people*]. In: *Junge Welt*, 31.08.2009, p. 10 ff.

van Laak, Dirk (2003): 'Ist je ein Reich, das es nicht gab, so gut verwaltet worden?' Der imaginäre Ausbau der imperialen Infrastruktur in Deutschland nach 1918 [*Has ever a non-existent empire been so well administrated? The fictional building-up of the imperial infrastructure in Germany after 1918*]. In: Birthe Kundrus (Ed.): *Phantasiereiche. Zur Kulturgeschichte des deutschen Kolonialismus. [Empires of phantasy. On the cultural history of German colonialism]*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus-Verl, pp. 71–90.

Vereinigung Demokratischer Juristen (1963): Dr. Hans Maria Globke. Tatsachen und Dokumente [*Dr. Hans Maria Globke. Facts and documents*]. Selection of material from "Globke - bureaucrat of death". Ed. Online Academy Profit Over Life. Berlin. Available online under <http://www.profit-over-life.org/books/books.php?book=40&pageID=1&expand=no&addPage=0>, last checked on 05.02.2012.

Vranicki, Predrag (1974): *Geschichte des Marxismus. Zweiter Band [History of Marxism. Volume two]*. Frankfurt/M: Suhrkamp.

Wächter, Katja-Maria (1999): *Die Macht der Ohnmacht. Leben und Politik des Franz Xaver Ritter von Epp (1868-1945) [The power of impotence. Life and politics of Franz Xaver knight of Epp]*. Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Bonn, Frankfurt am Main, Bonn.

Weber, Max ([1912] 1995): *The Russian revolutions*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Weinstein, Jay; Stehr, Nico (1999): The power of knowledge: race science, race policy, and the Holocaust. In: *Social Epistemology* 13 (1), pp. 3–36.

Wiegrefe, Klaus; Altenhöner, Florian; Bönisch, Georg; Buschke, Heiko; Pyljow, Wladimir; Zeller, Anika (2007): Revolutionär Seiner Majestät [*Revolutionary of His Majesty*]. In: *Der Spiegel* 50, 10.12.2007, pp. 34–48.

Wigger, Iris (2007): Die ‚Schwarze Schmach am Rhein‘. Rassistische Diskriminierung zwischen Geschlecht, Klasse, Nation und Rasse [*The 'Black Disgrace on the Rhine'. Racist discrimination between gender, class, nation, and race*]. 1. edn. Münster: Verl. Westfäl. Dampfboot.

Wilhelm-Leuschner-Stiftung (s.d.): Wilhelm Leuschner - Gewerkschafter, Politiker und Widerstandskämpfer [*Wilhelm Leuschner – trade unionist, politician, and resistance fighter*]. Wilhelm-Leuschner-Stiftung. Bayreuth. Available online under [http://www.wilhelm-leuschner-stiftung.de/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=29&Itemid=99&lang=de](http://www.wilhelm-leuschner-stiftung.de/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=29&Itemid=99&lang=de), last checked on 01.10.2012.

Wittebur, Klemens (1991): Die deutsche Soziologie im Exil. 1933 – 1945. Eine biographische Kartographie [*German sociology in exile. 1933-1945. A biographic cartography*]. Münster: Lit (Soziologie).

Wolff, Larry (2003): Die Erfindung Osteuropas. Von Voltaire zu Voldemort [*Inventing Eastern Europe. From Voltaire to Voldemort*]. In: Karl Kaser et al (eds.): Wieser Enzyklopädie des europäischen Ostens. Bd. 11: Europa und die Grenzen im Kopf [Wieser Encyclopedia of the European East. Vol. 11: Europe and imagined frontiers]. Klagenfurt: Wieser-Verlag, pp. 21–34.

Zimmerer, Jürgen ([2003] 2004a): Der koloniale Musterstaat? Rassentrennung, Arbeitszwang und totale Kontrolle in Deutsch-Südwestafrika [*The colonial exemplary State? Racial segregation, forced labour, and total control in German Southwest Africa*]. In: Jürgen Zimmerer, Joachim Zeller (eds): Völkermord in Deutsch-Südwestafrika. Der Kolonialkrieg (1904 - 1908) in Namibia und seine Folgen [Genocide in German South West Africa. The colonial war (1904-1908) in Namibia and its consequences]. 2. edn. Berlin: Links (Schlaglichter der Kolonialgeschichte 2), pp. 26–44.

Zimmerer, Jürgen ( [2003] 2004b): Krieg, KZ und Völkermord in Südwestafrika. Der erste deutsche Genozid [*War, concentration camps, and genocide in Southwest Africa. The first German genocide*]. In: Jürgen Zimmerer, Joachim Zeller (eds): Völkermord in Deutsch-Südwestafrika. Der Kolonialkrieg (1904 - 1908) in Namibia und seine Folgen [Genocide in German South West Africa. The colonial war (1904-1908) in Namibia and its consequences]. 2. edn. Berlin: Links (Schlaglichter der Kolonialgeschichte 2).

Zimmerer, Jürgen; Zeller, Joachim ([2003] 2004): Vorwort [*Preface*]. In: Jürgen Zimmerer, Joachim Zeller (eds): Völkermord in Deutsch-Südwestafrika. Der Kolonialkrieg (1904 - 1908) in Namibia und seine Folgen [Genocide in German South West Africa. The colonial war (1904-1908) in Namibia and its consequences]. 2. edn. Berlin: Links (Schlaglichter der Kolonialgeschichte 2), pp. 9–10.

Zimmerman, Andrew (2001): Anthropology and antihumanism in Imperial Germany. Chicago. Ill: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Zimmerman, Andrew (2005): A German Alabama in Africa: The Tuskegee Expedition to German Togo and the transnational origins of West African cotton growers. In: *The American Historical Review* 110 (5), unpaginated. Available online under <http://www.historycooperative.org/cgi-bin/printpage.cgi>, last checked on 22.11.2011.

Zimmerman, Andrew (2006): Decolonizing Weber. In: *Postcolonial Studies* 9 (1), pp. 53–79.