

■ GEOFF ELEY

Germany and its Colonies: Margins and Metropole

Sebastian Conrad, *Globalisierung und Nation im Deutschen Kaiserreich*, München (C.H. Beck) 2006, 445 S., 41.10 Euro.

Gisela Graichen; Horst Gründer, *Deutsche Kolonien: Traum und Trauma*, unter Mitarbeit von Holger Diedrich, Berlin (Ullstein) 2005, 480 S., 22.– Euro.

Ulrich van der Heyden; Joachim Zeller (Hg.), »... Macht und Anteil an der Weltherrschaft«: *Berlin und der deutsche Kolonialismus*, Münster (Unrast) 2005, 288 S. 28.– Euro.

Alexander Honold; Klaus R. Scherpe (Hg.), *Mit Deutschland um die Welt: Eine Kulturgeschichte des Fremden in der Kolonialzeit*, Stuttgart (J.B. Metzler) 2004, viii + 524 S., 59.95 Euro.

George Steinmetz, *The Devil's Handwriting: Precoloniality and the German Colonial State in Qingdao, Samoa, and Southwest Africa*, Chicago (University of Chicago Press) 2007, xxxvi + 640 S., \$90.– (hardback), \$35.– (paper).

Patricia M Mazón; Reinhild Steingröver (Hg.), *Not so Plain as Black and White: Afro-German Culture and History, 1890–2000*, Rochester (University of Rochester Press) 2005, vxiii + 247 S., \$75.–.

Frank Oliver Sobich, »Schwarze Bestien, rote Gefahr«: *Rassismus und Antisozialismus im deutschen Kaiserreich*, Frankfurt/New York (Campus Verlag) 2006, 424 S., 45.– Euro.

How might the current interest in all aspects of German colonialism be parsed? Some of the answers will concern more than just Germany alone, arising from the multiform encounters between the contemporary late-capitalist world and its colonial pasts (»the persistence of the colonial past in an uneasy present«, in George Steinmetz's words), whose effects have been intensifying since the 1990s at ever-accelerating speed.¹ »The return of history«, that well-worn cliché of post-Cold War commentary of the time, might just as well be used for the post-colonial too. The global restructuring of economies and labor markets under the sign of neoliberalism has surely been crucial, with all the mass migrancy that makes the »darker nations« of the former colonial and neo-colonial worlds into such an evident presence within Europe itself.² As post-Bandung sovereignties in Africa and Asia continue to implode, moreover, these events inside Europe's boundaries – the stigmatizing of refugees and asylum-seekers, the spectacle of xenophobia, the anxieties around Islam, the racialized

1 George Steinmetz, *The Devil's Handwriting: Precoloniality and the German Colonial State in Qingdao, Samoa, and Southwest Africa*, Chicago 2007, p. xxiii.

2 I take the expression from Vijay Prashad's study of »how the Cold War created the Third World«, *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World*, New York 2007.

excesses of anti-immigrant violence, the impasse of multiculturalism – conjoin with those outside, reaching greater and greater extremes in the wake of 9/11. These experiences collapse the differences of time and space previously buffering Europe against its colonial era in a shock of recognition that realizes its impact *whether or not* a country actually had colonial territories in its possession – »even in Sweden«, to quote the title of Allan Pred’s remarkable study of everyday racism in a society lacking overseas colonies altogether.³ Finally, the explosion of interest in genocide studies and human rights, likewise quickening since the Balkan and central African mass killings of the 1990s, also plays its part. The now massive historiography of the Judeocide, the racial state, and all aspects of Nazi antisemitism has pushed scholarship back into the *Kaiserreich*, where colonial violence, colonial administration, and colonial planning are all studied for their later relevance. Research on the genocide of the Ovaherero and Nama is one manifestation; major synthetic works emphasizing this longer perspective, such as Mark Mazower’s *Hitler’s Empire* or Shelley Baranowski’s *Nazi Empire*, become another.⁴

The new colonial history breaks decisively with an older consensus that dismissed Germany’s overseas empire because of its brief duration, economic marginality and thinness of domestic impact. In most general histories the topic still receives only perfunctory treatment, typically subsumed into the more general rubrics of foreign policy and *Weltpolitik*, with no cross-referencing to economy, culture, or social life.⁵ For the new scholarship, in contrast, the topic’s centrality has become completely axiomatic. Thus the volume that largely initiated the current wave of work, *The Imperialist Imagination*, published in 1998, centered powerfully on the cultural consequences of colonialism inside Germany’s home

- 3 Allan Pred, *Even in Sweden: Racisms, Racialized Spaces, and the Popular Geographical Imagination*, Berkeley 2000.
- 4 From the turn of the century, by their pioneering research and courageous advocacy, initially with little resonance in the profession, a small yet determined network of scholars succeeded in writing the genocide of the Ovaherero and Nama peoples properly into history. They included Gesine Krüger, Jan-Bart Gewald, Henning Melber, George Steinmetz, Reinhart Kößler, Joachim Zeller, and Jürgen Zimmerer. See especially Jürgen Zimmerer; Joachim Zeller (Hg.), *Völkermord in Deutsch-Südwestafrika. Der Kolonialkrieg (1904–1908) in Namibia und seine Folgen*, Berlin 2003. See also Mark Mazower, *Hitler’s Empire: How the Nazis Ruled Europe*, New York 2008; Shelley Baranowski, *Nazi Empire: German Colonialism and Imperialism from Bismarck to Hitler*, Cambridge 2011.
- 5 See most notably, Thomas Nipperdey, *Deutsche Geschichte 1866–1918. Zweiter Band: Machtstaat vor der Demokratie*, Munich 1992, pp. 445–53 and 629–70; and Hans-Ulrich Wehler, *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte. Dritter Band: Von der „Deutschen Doppelrevolution“ bis zum Beginn des Ersten Weltkrieges 1849–1914*, Munich 1995, pp. 977–90, and 1137–41. Nipperdey’s companion account of social, economic, and cultural history is completely silent on colonialism, while Wehler’s successor volume likewise ignores concepts of empire and imperialism: Nipperdey, *Deutsche Geschichte 1866–1918. Erster Band: Arbeitswelt und Bürgergeist*, Munich 1991; Wehler, *Vom Beginn des Ersten Weltkrieges bis zur Gründung der beiden deutschen Staaten 1914–1949*, Munich 2003. The same applies to Heinrich August Winkler, *Der lange Weg nach Westen*, 2 Bde, Munich 2000. James Retallack’s treatments of the *Kaiserreich* barely mention colonialism at all: *Imperial Germany 1871–1918*, Oxford 2008, and *Germany in the Age of Kaiser Wilhelm II*, London 1996. One important exception is Matthew Jefferies, *Contesting the German Empire, 1871–1918*, Oxford 2008, pp. 165–92.

society.⁶ If its contributors came almost entirely from the *literary* disciplines, moreover, the intervening boom in historical work has now dramatically transformed that picture. Large numbers of dissertations, published monographs, anthologies, conference proceedings, panels and roundtables at professional meetings, and initiatives of all kinds have transformed the historiographical scene. The salient questions, methodologies, types of archive, and grounds of inquiry look profoundly different from those inspiring historians of German colonialism of an earlier generation forty years before.⁷

In their respective ways the seven books under review make this abundantly clear. Three provide varying overviews aimed at a broader than specialized academic public: Gisela Greichen and Horst Gründer's general survey; Ulrich van der Heyden and Joachim Zeller's artful mosaic of colonialism's relationship to metropolitan Berlin; and Alexander Honold and Klaus Scherpe's compendium of the variegated cultural constructions of foreignness and the exotic elsewhere. A fourth volume edited by Patricia Mazón and Reinhild Steingröver then connects colonialism to one of its visible legacies, namely the Afro-German presence inside German society. Each discharges its purposes with clarity and success. Flagging in its title the key duality of perspective, *Traum and Trauma* offers an intelligently conceived, generously illustrated, and well-rounded general history of the colonial empire and its aftermaths, sandwiching the main treatment of the *Kaiserreich* between an extensive preamble (two chapters and 79 pages) and three concluding chapters on Weimar and the Third Reich (94 pages, roughly a fifth of the whole). Gründer's own earlier research on the Christian missions embeds many of the best parts of this account, which successfully balances the violence and spectacular eventfulness of the effective stabilizing of German rule (most dramatically in the suppression of the Southwest African and East African Uprisings) against the complex cultural negotiations that went into the making of colonialism on the ground. There is no evasion of colonialism's destructiveness or the balefulness of its longer-term legacies, and little of the romance, nostalgia, and special pleading that often shaped such retrospectives in the past. Yet at the same time the binarism structured into the book's overarching frame – ranging the consequences of violence and exploitation against the fantasies, exoticisms, wildly inflated ambitions, and idealistic desires for the mastery of the unknown world – encourages an over-judiciousness in the presentation of particular events and controversies that leaves the reader too often perched uncomfortably on the fence. Thus the Dernburg era becomes too easily sanitized into »ein kolonialpolitischer Lernprozess« (160), for example, while major areas of controversy, such as the precise ways in which the continuities between colonialism and Nazism might be conceptualized, seem far too comfortably resolved.

The three multi-authored compilations each make valuable contributions to our understanding. Building on their earlier *Kolonialmetropole Berlin. Eine Spurensuche* (Berlin 2002), van der Heyden and Zeller bring together forty-one astutely drawn vignettes, covering the making of colonial policy, colonial economics, the institutional worlds of the production of colonial knowledge, the »exhibitionary complex« and visual landscape of colonial representations, the particular importance of China and the Pacific, the black presence in

6 Sara Friedrichsmeyer; Sara Lennox; Susanne Zantop (Hg.), *The Imperialist Imagination: German Colonialism and its Legacy*, Ann Arbor 1998.

7 For my general reflections on the forms and consequences of the shifting from social to cultural history, see Geoff Eley, *A Crooked Line: From Cultural History to the History of Society*, Ann Arbor 2005.

»white Berlin«, and the voices of anti-colonial critique.⁸ Grounded by van der Heyden's own knowledge of the brief seventeenth-century episode of Brandenburg-Prussian colonialism in West Africa, while also reaching down into the 1920s and the Third Reich, the collection combines historical depth with an expansive conception of colonialism's cultural reach to bring us much closer to the plenitude of possible colony/metropole connections. Equally broadly, but far more substantially, Honold and Scherpe draw on the results of a major DFG research project on »Literatur- und Kulturgeschichte des Fremden. 1880–1918« to develop an extraordinarily rich and expansive picture of Germany's imperialist imaginary under the *Kaiserreich*. While not exactly interdisciplinary to a very developed degree – the team consists almost entirely of literary scholars, with an admixture from musicology, media studies, and history of art – *Mit Deutschland um die Welt* opens the more conventional boundaries of historical understanding of colonialism in exciting ways. In addition to addressing the programmatic discourse of colonialist advocacy, its fifty-four short contributions embrace not only literature and the arts in the stricter sense, but also museums and archaeology; travel, tourism, and exploration; commodification, marketing, and consumption; aviation, steamships, and other technologies of travel; medicine and eugenics; ethnology and racial classification; exhibitions, zoos, and commercial entertainments; formal and informal pedagogies of multiple kinds; and the new visual environment of posters, postcards, collectors' picture cards in packets of consumer goods, commercialized bric-a-brac, caricatures and newspaper illustrations, as well as the new visual media of film, photography, and advertising. It is impossible in a short review to describe the imaginative breadth of this volume or the wealth of illumination it sustains.⁹ While valuably mapping out the terrain, in comparison, *Not so Plain as Black and White* shows the history of Afro-Germans still at a more emergent stage. Fatima El-Tayeb grounds the volume with a fine opening essay (»Dangerous Liaisons: Race, Nation, and German Identity«), while several other contributors either preview or reprise their larger projects, including Tina Campt, Heide Fehrenbach, and Krista Molly O'Donnell.¹⁰ Anne Adams' essay on the legacy of W.E.B. DuBois (»The Souls of Black Volk: Contradiction? Oxymoron?«) overlaps interestingly with that by Marianne Bechhaus-Gerst in » . . . Macht und Anteil an der Weltherrschaft« (»W.E.B. DuBois in Berlin«), while

8 The quoted phrase is drawn from a classic essay by Tony Bennett, »The Exhibitionary Complex«, in Nicholas B. Dirks; Geoff Eley; Sherry B. Ortner (Hg.), *Culture/Power/History: A Reader in Contemporary Social Theory*, Princeton 1994, pp. 123–54.

9 Comparing *Mit Deutschland um die Welt* with *The Imperialist Imagination* shows just how far cultural readings of colonialism have come during the intervening decade and a half. For recent work in the English-speaking world, see also the following: Katrin Sieg, *Ethnic Drag: Performing Race, Nation, Sexuality in West Germany*, Ann Arbor 2002; H. Glenn Penny, *Objects of Culture: Ethnology and Ethnographic Museums in Imperial Germany*, Chapel Hill 2002; Nina Berman, *Impossible Missions? German Economic, Military, and Humanitarian Efforts in Africa*, Lincoln 2004; H. Glenn Penny; Matti Bunzl (Hg.), *Worldly Provincialism: German Anthropology in the Age of Empire*, Ann Arbor 2003; Eric Ames, *Carl Hagenbeck's Empire of Entertainments*, Seattle 2008; Kristin Kopp, *German Colonial Fantasies in Eastern Europe*, Ann Arbor 2011.

10 Fatima El-Tayeb, *Schwarze Deutsche: Der Diskurs um »Rasse« und nationale Identität*, Frankfurt am Main 2001; Tina M. Campt, *Other Germans: Black Germans and the Politics of Race, Gender, and Memory in the Third Reich*, Ann Arbor 2004; Heide Fehrenbach, *Race after Hitler: Black Occupation Children in Postwar Germany and America*, Princeton 2005; Krista Molly O'Donnell, *Servants of the German Empire: Sponsored Female Colonization in German Southwest Africa, 1896–1933* (forthcoming).

in the latter volume Robbie Aitken and Eve Rosenhaft («Politik und Performance: Deutsch-Kameruner in der Anti-Kolonialbewegung») also preview their forthcoming book.¹¹

The remaining three works each make major pioneering interventions that markedly advance the field. George Steinmetz's *The Devil's Handwriting* is a remarkable *tour de force* of archival erudition, commanding empirical analysis and sustained theoretical disquisition. Even amidst the current accumulation of new scholarship, no other work can match either the substance or sophistication of this treatment of the colonial state, which builds further on its author's earlier pathbreaking account of welfare-state formation under the *Kaiserreich*.¹² The very few existing works on the topic also speak from an earlier moment of state theory in the structuralist 1970s, moreover, and in the meantime the combined impact of the new cultural history and postcolonial theory has transformed the ways in which the character of the state and the organization of power in society need to be addressed. Steinmetz's versatile eclecticism makes him ideally equipped for the resulting challenge. If his first book concentrated on the emergence of a distinctive »social realm« in nineteenth-century Germany and the practices of governmentality and disciplinary intervention developed in order to regulate it, *The Devil's Handwriting* grounds its treatment of the colonial state in an argument about the impact of the prevalent ethnographic representations of precolonial peoples in structuring the colonizers' response to the three territories concerned (Southwest Africa, Samoa, Qingdao).

The richness of this study resides in the density of its analytical-empirical reconstruction of the ethnographic bases of colonial knowledge in the three cases, its meticulous arguing back to the heterogeneous »configuration of the colonial state as a specific type of field« (518), and the trademark lucidity of its author's deft and authoritative handling of an exceptionally wide-ranging body of difficult theory. Critically adapting the thought of Edward Said, Homi Bhabha's Lacanianism, and especially Pierre Bourdieu's concept of a social field, along with a huge amount of additional theory taken up for particular purposes, Steinmetz demonstrates brilliantly how Partha Chatterjee's otherwise descriptive »rule of colonial difference« may be put concretely to use.¹³ Working methodically through the histories and historiographies of each colony, he deploys five sets of determinants in order to capture the varying specificities of colonial rule: the thickly sedimented influence of precolonial ethnographic representations (the primary ground of his interest); intra-elite class conflicts inside the colonial state, emphasizing the distinctive aspirations of particular administrative and professional cadres from the *Bildungsbürgertum* (the most direct link with his earlier interests in *Regulating the Social*); cross-cultural identification with the colonized subjects; the heterogeneous responses of the colonized themselves, ranging from resistance to cooperation; and the globalized contexts of capitalism and geopolitics.¹⁴ On this basis he then lays out the decisive variations in colonial policy, from the »colonial grotesque« of genocidal violence in Southwest Africa, through the less brutally coercive cultural paternalism in Samoa

11 Robbie Aitken; Eve Rosenhaft, *Transnational Lives: German-Speaking Africans in Europe 1884–1960* (forthcoming).

12 George Steinmetz, *Regulating the Social: The Welfare State and Local Politics in Imperial Germany*, Princeton 1993.

13 See especially Partha Chatterjee, *The Nation and its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*, Princeton 1993, pp. 14–34.

14 This fivefold explanatory framework is laid out succinctly in the Preface, *Devil's Handwriting*, pp. xiii–xx.

(»salvage colonialism«), to the negotiable pragmatics in Qingdao. His goal is to show »that ethnographic discourse, colonial subjectivity, and the colonial state were less uniform and more internally complex and heterogeneous than has usually been argued.« His book demonstrates »that the ›hard‹ structures of colonial states, economies, and societies are shaped by and consubstantial with ethnographic discourses, symbolic struggles among the colonizers, and psychic identifications across the colonial boundary.« (517)

Steinmetz succeeds superbly. His case for grounding the particularities of colonial rule in the varying »precoloniality« that shaped the accumulation of ethnographic knowledge is compellingly made. In a nutshell: the practice of the colonizers rested vitally on the particular fund of ethnographic understanding that »wrote« their approach to the native peoples in each of the colonies concerned. Moving among his five levels of determination, he shows how tensions between aristocrats and bourgeois specialists traveled from metropole to colony via the terms of these differing regimes of understanding. For this reader, his analysis of the disputes and maneuvering among colonial officialdom both on the ground and in the machineries of policy-making inside Germany itself then become especially interesting, because in both contexts – the administrative and the ethnographic – a particular strand of distinctively Wilhelmine modernist governmentality was in play. As Steinmetz shows in fascinating detail, using Paul Rohrbach emblematically to embody the argument, the colonies provided a field of action for aspiring cohorts of reform-minded *Bildungsbürger*, whose sense of a future was precisely *not* benignly universalist or moved by democratic ideals of citizenship and emancipation, but was instead authoritarian, technocratic, and ruthlessly radical-nationalist. As in Steinmetz's earlier work on the Wilhelmine welfarist regime, the anti-aristocratic entailments of this drive for social and political validation in the colonial setting are made to illuminate the political conflicts of the late *Kaiserreich* in potentially very far-reaching ways. While it is hardly reasonable, in a book already fearsomely detailed, to have expected Steinmetz himself to have done this, the further pursuit of these implications is one place where the argument might well be further developed. Likewise, transposed to the metropole, his method could be applied to a variety of other knowledge regimes in their relation to the formation of politics, the »social question« and the »woman question« most obvious among them. As in both of these cases, a main logic in the state's purposes was the temptation to fix vulnerable colonial populations into molds and matrices of administrative regularity, creating an interventionist laboratory that seemed to render »the social« more susceptible to being stabilized than in the metropole itself.¹⁵ Finally, by demonstrating so acutely the diversity of German colonial practices of rule, Steinmetz disposes decisively of those surprisingly resilient assumptions about national styles of colonialism, laying in the process a much firmer basis for comparison.

Frank Sobich's excellently focused monograph on the intensifying dialectics of racism and anti-socialism during the *Kaiserreich's* final peacetime decade shows with admirable concreteness just how the explanatory connections between events in the colonies (in this case the genocidal destruction of colonial peoples in Southwest Africa) and key political departures in the metropole can be made. Using the so-called »Hottentot elections« of December-January 1906–07 as his main ground, Sobich searchingly examines the domestic impact of colonial violence, as the lurid imagery of African savagery came to be worked into a wider discourse of fear and endangerment aimed against Social Democracy, itself

15 See especially Dirk van Laak, *Imperiale Infrastruktur: Deutsche Planungen für eine Erschließung Afrikas 1880 bis 1960*, Paderborn 2004.

battening on older racialized perceptions of the »dangerous classes« and their degraded apartness from civilized society. Proceeding via careful analyses of the Southwest African background and public reactions to the 1904 Uprising, he shows first how the latter effected a brutalized reduction of Africans to a stereotype of black savagery, and then how the SPD closed ranks against the longer-standing but analogous mechanisms of its own demonization. Here Sobich finds a vital radicalization in train, as the violence in Southwest Africa stoked nationalist tempers at home. If as a result the articulations between racism and anti-socialism became much sharper for the German Right, then for the Social Democrats that process reconfirmed the need for collective self-defense of the labor movement's elaborately organized lifeworld. After tracing the dynamics of *Weltpolitik* in a populist remaking of nationalist priorities by an emergent new Right, Sobich centers the core of his account on the elections themselves. In five carefully grounded and well-argued chapters he makes an original and compelling case for seeing the Bülow Block as a decisive watershed in the »nationalizing« of Wilhelmine politics during the buildup to the First World War.¹⁶

Precisely in its bounded concreteness, this provides one of the best treatments of the common-sense everydayness of racialized thinking during its late-Wilhelmine radicalization that we yet possess, one certainly enabled by Sobich's carefully explicated view of ideology.¹⁷ With respect to the elections per se, there are perhaps *six* key theses. *First*, in contrast to most earlier work, Sobich shows the purposeful coherence of Bülow's own strategy, which made a decisive and largely irreversible move to the right, for the first time opening governmental politics towards radical nationalists and the Pan-Germans, including the Antisemites and others embracing the emergent identity of *völkisch*. *Second*, he shows the Center Party to have been only ambiguously cast into the opposition. *Third*, any residual left liberal hesitations about endorsing the Empire's expansionist needs were now set aside. *Fourth*, in drawing its lessons from the outcome of the election, the SPD crucially drew back from the fullness of its oppositional stance, seeking instead to emphasize its own patriotic credentials. *Fifth*, this continued to feed the polarization unleashed by the elections between a populist and antisemitic new Right vehemently equating Social Democrats with external enemies and an SPD whose defensive patriotism increasingly undermined its own oppositional élan. *Finally*, the demonized imagery of the »Schwarzen Bestie« underwent further radicalization after 1907, especially during the war, culminating in the virulent campaign against the »schwarze Schmach« in 1919–24. In this way, Sobich not only sutures the »colonial effect« into a beautifully concrete argument about the colony's impact on the metropole, but does so with sharply focused pertinence for the mainstream political history of the late *Kaiserreich* too. As he summarizes:

16 Actually a similar argument was developed in my own *Reshaping the German Right: Radical Nationalism and Political Change after Bismarck*, Ann Arbor 1991, pp. 239–90, 293–315; and for the argument about radical nationalism and populism, *ibid.*, pp. xx-xxiii, 160–205.

17 Drawing on Robert Miles, Sobich sees racialized common sense as part of the »akkumulierten, für selbstverständlich gehaltenen und oftmals widersprüchlichen Annahmen und Überzeugungen, die Menschen benutzen, um der sozialen Welt eine ideologische Struktur aufzuprägen, innerhalb derer sie handeln können.« See »Schwarze Bestien, rote Gefahr«, p. 13, quoting Robert Miles, *Rassismus: Geschichte und Theorie eines Begriffs*, Berlin 1991, p. 94. Here Sobich proves more helpful than another important recent work, Peter Walkenhorst, *Nation – Volk – Rasse: Radikaler Nationalismus im Deutschen Kaiserreich 1890–1914*, Göttingen 2007, which abstains from any concrete analysis of events per se.

»Und doch markierte dieses Bündnis das Ende jeder grundsätzlichen Kolonialkritik, die Disziplinierung und Zähmung der Opposition, sowohl der Sozialdemokratie als auch des Zentrums. Ferner gelang die nationale Integration des Liberalismus. Nicht die unmittelbaren Folgen, sondern die langfristigen Auswirkungen sind es, welche die ›Hottentot-Wahlen‹ relevant machen.«¹⁸

70

Finally, Sebastian Conrad's *Globalisierung und Nation*, already a classic only four years after its publication and now freshly translated into English, provides a fitting culmination for this review.¹⁹ Conrad's book has been so extensively taken on board by now that a detailed recounting of its arguments may hardly be necessary. Appearing on the cusp of a wave of new interest in the analytics of »the transnational« – a wave still swelling, with not the slightest indication of breaking – it brilliantly realized the intended program.²⁰ Conrad showed that German history could, indeed *should*, be boldly reconceived from a consistently global standpoint, allowing it to be written from the rest of the world »in« rather than from Germany »out«. Besides re-spatializing the study of German history by approaching it from elsewhere in the world (via »Regimes der Territorialisierung und die Globalisierung des Nationalen«, in the words of his final chapter), he also revised the sequential linearity of most understandings of the relationship between the »national« and the »global«. Thus so far from *preceding* the global, he insisted, nations were constituted in nineteenth-century contexts that were *always-already* tied into wider-than-national worlds. That well-entrenched developmentalist grand narrative of world history, which had nations first coalescing around markets, railways, schooling, and associational life, seizing their sovereignties, and only then entering into global rivalry or cooperation, was decisively overturned. Nationalism's dynamics, Conrad argued (using a formulation of Rebecca Karl's), grew not only from diachronic »stages of development«, but equally from a synchronic »staging of the world«. ²¹ This mutually constitutive interconnectedness between the national and the global – the multi-directional flows of history – meant that German nationalism, the discourse of Germanness, and the coordinates of German nationhood around 1900 were necessarily shaped by their relation to the complex incursions of globality. The radicalizing of German nationalism in the late-Wilhelmine years was intimately bound up with the intense consequences of this transnational back and forth: »Der wilhelminische Nationalismus war nur ein Teil innerhalb einer globalen Rekonfiguration des Nationalen um 1900«, in effect, a far-reaching »Re-Territorialisierung des Nationalen.«²²

But if, as Prasenjit Duara argues, »history is to be rescued from the nation« in that sense, then simply subsuming »the nation« into a superordinate story of »globalization« instead

18 Sobich, »Schwarze Bestien«, p. 322.

19 See Sebastian Conrad, *Globalization and the Nation in Imperial Germany*, Cambridge 2010.

20 For the general context, see most notably Sebastian Conrad; Jürgen Osterhammel (Hg.), *Das Kaiserreich transnational. Deutschland in der Welt 1871–1914*, Göttingen 2004; Gunilla Budde; Sebastian Conrad; Oliver Janz (Hg.), *Transnationale Geschichte. Themen, Tendenzen und Theorien*, Göttingen 2006; Heinz-Gerhard Haupt; Jürgen Kocka (Hg.), *Comparative and Transnational History: Central European Approaches and New Perspectives*, New York 2009.

21 Conrad, *Globalisierung und Nation*, p. 21; Rebecca E. Karl, *Staging the World: Chinese Nationalism at the Turn of the Twentieth Century*, Durham 2002.

22 Conrad, *Globalisierung und Nation*, p. 31.

would only reinscribe a new version of the earlier thinking.²³ In Conrad's words, »Die Absage an den Universalismus des Nationalen ... darf nicht dazu führen, die Ubiquität der Nation als kognitive Dimension und als Raum sozialer Praxis um 1900 zu ignorieren. Statt also den ideologischen (oder narrativen) Schleier zu lüften und nationalstaatliches Denken als ›falsches Bewußtsein‹ zu entlarven, muß es darum gehen, die Konstituierung (und Rekonfiguration) einer nationaler Ordnung der Welt aus den komplexen, machtbe-frachteten und asymmetrischen Prozessen zu erklären, für die um 1900 die Mobilität, der Kolonialismus und die spezifische Form des Kapitalismus die zentralen Parameter waren.«²⁴ And: »Wenn der deutsche Nationalismus um 1800 vor allem in einem europäischen Kontext gestanden hatte, ... dann entwickelten sich Nation und Nationsverständnis um 1900 im Rahmen globaler Bezüge.«²⁵

By developing a »multi-sited historiography«, Conrad seeks to resituate the very category of »Germany« and the *national* space it was deemed to inhabit. In questioning that category, he shows how it was being powerfully re-consolidated around 1900 in contexts that radically exceeded those of Europe-located territorial Germany itself. Using a master concept of »Deutsche Arbeit« (Chapter 6) in order to bind the coherence of the whole, stressing especially the centrality of »Mobilität und mobile Arbeit« to contemporary social and political debates, he builds his framework from four major case studies, and it is here that the value for the new colonial history becomes most tellingly apparent.²⁶ The importance of the Polish question to an argument about internal colonialism and a future »drive to the east« has long been established. But the other cases – the biopolitical mirror effects of African »native policies« and the social disciplining of the German laboring poor, the unrealized project of Chinese »coolie« labor, and the emigrationist anxieties surrounding German migrancy to Brazil – are far less familiar.²⁷ These are the settings that vitally broaden the discussion of colonialism per se. For to become properly intelligible colonial history in the stricter sense (direct territorial annexation) needs to be resituated in a much wider context of expansionism for which Conrad's thesis of global interconnectedness supplies one necessary key. As soon as we begin shifting the focus in that way, broadening the ways in which colonialism might fruitfully be understood (sea/land, overseas/continental, Africa/Poland), and setting our sights *beyond* the more finite episode of direct colonial rule towards some of the larger settings of German expansion into the wider-than-European world – as soon as we undertake the conceptual moves that *Globalisierung und Nation* now enables – then the current interest will become still more exciting than before.

23 Prasenjit Duara, *Rescuing History from the Nation: Questioning Narratives of Modern China*, Chicago 1995.

24 Conrad, *Globalisierung und Nation*, p. 335. See also *ibid.*, 24: »Während in der bisherigen Forschung die Radikalisierung des Nationalismus in der Regel als Voraussetzung für eine imperialistische oder ›weltpolitische‹ Wende galt, zielt die Fragestellung hier in die umgekehrte Richtung: auf die Effekte der Globalisierung auf nationale Parameter.«

25 *Ibid.*, 25.

26 »Eingeborenenpolitik« in Kolonie und Metropole. »Erziehung zur Arbeit« in Ostafrika und Ostwestfalen« (Ch. 2); »Zwischen den Polen. Mobilität und Nation in Deutschlands »eigentlich« Kolonie« (Ch. 3); »Politik der Segregation. Chinesische Arbeiter, globale Netzwerke und die »farblose Gefar« (Ch. 4); »Hier degeneriert der Deutsche nicht.« Brasilien, Auswanderung und der Jungbrunnen der Nation« (Ch. 5).

27 But see now especially Andrew Zimmerman, *Alabama in Africa: Booker T. Washington, the German Empire, and the Globalization of the New South*, Princeton 2010.