

Dreaming of Empire

German Imperialism, The Use of Othering and the Evolution of the Nazis' Ideological
Imperialism from Bismarck to Hitler

by

Robert Dumont
BA, University of Lethbridge, 2013

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of History

© Robert Dumont 2020
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This Thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without the permission of the author.

We acknowledge with respect the Lekwungen peoples on whose traditional territory the university stands and the Songhees, Esquimalt and WSÁNEĆ peoples whose historical relationships with the land continue to this day.

Supervisory Committee

Dreaming of Empire

German Imperialism, The Use of Othering and the Evolution of the Nazis' Ideological Imperialism from Bismarck to Hitler

by

Robert Dumont

BA, University of Lethbridge, 2013

Supervisory Committee

Dr Oliver Schmidtke, Department of History, University of Victoria

Supervisor

Dr Kristin Semmens, Department of History, University of Victoria

Departmental Member

Abstract

Between 1933 and 1945, Nazi Germany engaged in an extremely aggressive form of ideologically based conquest throughout Central and Eastern Europe. Based on the imperial doctrine established in *Mein Kampf*, this 'ideological imperialism' sought to ensure that the German nation state had the resources needed to guarantee a "freedom of existence". As a result, ideological imperialism became a potent mix of nationalism, a desire for empire, and a rigid form of biological racism. Examining the origins of ideological imperialism has proven to be a difficult task for historians due to the rapid shift of German imperialism away from its traditional roots of overseas conquest. Therefore, this thesis seeks to challenge the argument that German colonialism in Africa and the military campaigns against the Nama and Herero directly led to the development of Nazi imperialism in the 1930s. It addresses this problem by exploring the evolution of German imperialism as a *long durée* in order to place the rise of the Nazis' ideological imperialism within the context of the wider German cultural understanding of identity, imperialism, and race.

To accomplish this task, this thesis constructs a narrative of othering within German imperialism to reveal how the racialization of the other and its influence on the development of German national identity contributed to the acceptance of the Nazis' ideological imperialism in the early 1930s. It traces how key events during the Bismarckian, Wilhelmine, Weimar and Nazi periods were framed with reference to the threatening other and how such a practice contributed to the development of the ideological imperialism of Nazi Germany. These events include the unification of Germany through the formation of a Prussian empire in Central Europe, the formation of German identity during the 1866 war with Austria and the *KulturKampf* as well as the creation of the German colonial empire in Asia and Africa. It also explores the impact of the First World War.

Table of Contents

Supervisory Committee	i
Abstract	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Dedication	iv
Introduction: The Narrative of Empire and Germany’s Place within It	1
Chapter 1: Unity Through “Blood and Iron:” Bismarck, The Unification of Germany and the Construction of an Imperial German Identity	39
Chapter 2: “We Demand Our Place in the Sun”: Wilhelm II, <i>Weltpolitik</i> and the Politics of Symbolism	69
Chapter 3: The Politics of Empire: Hitler, Ideological Imperialism and the Development of a German Continental Empire	98
Conclusion: The Ruins of Empire	143
Bibliography	151

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my mom, Carol, for without her support, encouragement and determination, this thesis would not have been possible. Thank you.

Introduction: The Narrative of Empire and Germany's Place within It

Between 1933 and 1945, Nazi Germany engaged in an extremely aggressive and rapid form of ideological based conquest throughout Central and Eastern Europe. Based on the prevalence of cultural and political conceptions of the East and the use of othering¹, these conquests were based on a form of imperialism that envisioned the creation of a permanent relationship of domination and submission between the conquering bearers of *Kultur* and the othered peoples of Eastern Europe.² As such, the ideological justification for this conquest was the imperial doctrine established in *Mein Kampf* where Hitler states that "as National Socialists we can...establish the following principle concerning the nature of the [imperial] policy of a folkish state: The [imperial] policy of the folkish state must safeguard the existence [of]....the race embodied in the state, by creating a healthy, visible natural relation between the nation's population and growth on the one hand and the quantity and quality of its soil on the other hand.... only an adequately large space on this earth assures a nation of freedom of existence."³As a result, the use of othering became a means of providing political and cultural justification for

¹ The concept of 'othering' is understood as a social and political practice of depicting another group as essentially different. In this respect, 'othering' is a fundamental component of forming and reproducing collective identities. This emphasis on fundamental cultural or ethnic differences is regularly accompanied by describing the other group as inferior and/ or threatening to the identity and well-being of another group. It originates from post-colonial scholarship (Said 1995). For more information on the theoretical foundations of the concept see: Sune Qvotrup Jensen, "Othering, identity formation and agency" *Qualitative studies* Vol 2, No. 2 (2011): 63-78. Also see G. C. Spivak, "The Rani of Sirmur: an essay in reading the archives" *History and Theory*, Vol 24 No. 3 (1985): 247-272.

² Andrew Porter, *European Imperialism, 1860-1914* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1994), 5-8.

³ Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, trans. Ralph Manheim (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1971), 643.

the Nazi conquests, creating the conditions necessary for Hitler and the Nazi party to link their imperial desires with those of Bismarckian and Wilhelmine periods of German imperialism.⁴

However, unlike earlier forms of German imperialism, during the Third Reich, the Nazi government took little interest in overseas colonies, turning instead to a focus on continental empire and the acquiring of colonies in Eastern Europe.⁵ As such, the Rhineland, Austria, the Sudetenland, Czechoslovakia and Poland were either annexed or outright conquered while France, the low countries, Denmark, Norway, most of Eastern Europe and European Russia all fell under the occupation of the German Wehrmacht.⁶ As a result, ideological imperialism was not focused on cementing Germany's position at the top of the "great game" of great power politics. Instead, it was based on three key elements that were designed to shift the mindset of German imperial policy away from the abstract and paradigmatic concept of the interactions of nations and peoples towards the more emotional concepts of race, conquest and space.⁷ In short, ideological imperialism became a potent mix of nationalism, a desire for empire and a rigid form of biological racism.⁸ Ideological imperialism should therefore be considered as a form of cultural imperialism that refers to the exercise of domination in cultural and political relationships where

⁴ Laura Chrisman, *Postcolonial Contraventions: Cultural Readings of Race, Imperialism and Transnationalism* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2003), 25-26.

⁵ Mark Mazower, *Hitler's Empire: How the Nazis Ruled Europe* (New York: The Penguin Press, 2008), xxxviii.

⁶ Gerhard L. Weinberg, *The Foreign Policy of Hitler's Germany: Diplomatic Revolution in Europe 1933-36* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 18.

⁷ Robert L. Nelson, 'The Archive For Inner Colonization, The German East And World War 1' in *Germans, Poland And Colonial Expansion To The East: 1850 Through The Present*, et.al. Robert L. Nelson (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 87.

⁸ Mazower, *Hitler's Empire*, 4-5.

“the values, practices and meanings of a powerful foreign culture are imposed upon one or more native cultures.”⁹

This radicalization of German imperialism under the direction of Nazi ideology however, presents a significant problem for historians examining the role of imperial legacies in the development of Nazi ideology. A new wave of historians are beginning to examine the role that German colonialism and the violence of the Herero and Nama wars from 1904 to 1907¹⁰ played in the development of the Nazis’ ideological imperialism and its desire to initiate wars of conquest and extermination across Europe.¹¹ As a result, historians are now focused on providing a more nuanced and detailed framework that will allow for a deeper analysis of the links connecting the brutal and violent German military campaigns in Africa to the rise of the highly racialized ideological imperialism of the Nazis.¹²

This attempt at providing a clearer connection between German colonialism and the construction of the Nazi empire is seen in Benjamin Madley’s article, “From Africa to Auschwitz: How German South West Africa Incubated Ideas and Methods Adopted and Developed by the

⁹ John Tomlinson, “Cultural Imperialism: A Critical Introduction (London: Continuum, 2002), 68.

¹⁰ The Herero and Nama wars were a series of campaigns conducted by the German *Schutztruppe* (colonial forces) in German Southwest Africa (Namibia) between 1904-1907. During these Campaigns, the *Schutztruppe* under the command of Lothar von Trotha engaged in a campaign of mass killings through the forced expulsion of the Herero, Nama and Ovaherero tribes, forcing them into the Namib dessert where thousands died from starvation and dehydration. Once defeated, the survivors were then imprisoned in concentration camps where the majority died due the outbreak of various diseases, acts of violence by the colonial authorities, and exhaustion. As mentioned in the discussion of Benjamin Bradley’s article, these campaigns are increasingly linked by historians to the rise of Nazi imperialism in the 1920’s and 1930’s due to the emergence of various terms used by the Nazis during these campaigns. Proponents of this argument also link these two events. For more information, see Tilman Dederig’s article, “The German-Herero War of 1904: Revisionism of Genocide or Imaginary Historiography” as well as George Steinmetz’s *The Devils Handwriting: Precoloniality and the German Colonial State in Qingdao, Samoa and Southwest Africa*.

¹¹ Volker Langbehn and Mohammad Salama, “Introduction: Reconfiguring German Colonialism” in *German Colonialism: Race, the Holocaust, and Post War Germany*, et al. Volker Lanbbehn (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011), viiii-x.

¹² Volker and Salama, “Introduction: Reconfiguring German Colonialism”, x.

Nazis in Eastern Europe.” In this article, Madley argues that the colonial wars in German Southwest Africa are a “crucial precursor” to the Nazis’ ideological imperialism of the late 1930’s and early 1940’s. To prove this connection, Madley examines how many of the terms used by ideological imperialism such as *Lebensraum* emerged during the brutal colonial wars against the Herero and Nama tribes between 1904-1907.¹³ The problem with this argument is that it ignores the fact that German colonial rule in Africa lasted only thirty years, making it less plausible that German colonial rule in Africa was the “crucial precursor” to Nazi imperialism.¹⁴

In addition, this focus on German colonialism in Africa becomes even more less plausible when examining the actions of the other European empires in Africa. There are multiple similar events to the Herero and Nama wars, such as British actions during the Boer War and French military actions in Syria, sub-Saharan Africa and Asia that further weakens the argument that the German colonial wars in Africa were the major precursor to the annihilationist and expansionist policies of the Nazis.¹⁵ More importantly however, the narrow focus of Madley’s research ignores how, although terms such as the ones mentioned above may have been coined during the colonial wars in Southwest Africa, the basis for the brutal actions of the German colonial forces had already been established in Europe.

¹³ Benjamin Madley, “From Africa to Auschwitz: How German South West Africa Incubated Ideas and Methods Adopted and Developed by the Nazis in Eastern Europe” *European History Quarterly*, Vol 35 No. 3 (July 1, 2005), 1-2.

¹⁴ Sebastian Conrad, *German Colonialism: A Short History*, Trans. Sorcha O’Hagan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

¹⁵ John Laffey, *Imperialism and Ideology: An Historical Perspective* (Montreal: Black Rose Books, 2000), 4-5. Also see Birthe Kundrus, “German Colonialism: Some Reflections on reassessments, Specificities and Constellations” in *German Colonialism: Race, the Holocaust, and Postwar Germany*, et al. Volker Langbehn (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011), 36.

As such, his narrow focus on connecting German colonialism in Africa to the ideological imperialism of the Nazis' causes Madley to overlook the longer-term developments within German imperialism. It reveals how the focus on German colonialism as a means of explaining the rise of the Nazis' ideological imperialism conflates the developments that occurred during the short period of German colonialism with the long-term trends of German imperialism that ultimately resulted in the annihilationist policies of the Nazis' ideological imperialism.¹⁶ Madley's article therefore reveals three key problems with this approach to examining the rise of the Nazis' ideological imperialism through the lens of Germany's colonial wars. The first of these problems is that by focusing strictly on German colonialism in Africa, historians such as Madley are overlooking other trends that contributed to the development of ideological imperialism such as the bureaucratization of violence, a rising obsession within Wilhelmine imperialism with the East¹⁷ as well as the concepts of race and space, and the Prussian origins of German imperialism.¹⁸

The overlooking of these trends also leads to the other two problems created by this focus on German colonialism in Africa, which are the interconnected nature of imperialism and colonialism as well as the use of othering. In terms of the interconnected nature of imperialism and colonialism, it simply does not make sense to use the short period of German colonialism as the sole medium for examining the rise of the Nazis' ideological imperialism after the First World War. Imperialism and colonialism are by-products of one another, the one can not exist without

¹⁶ Shelley Baranowski, "Against "Human Diversity as Such": *Lebensraum* and Genocide in the Third Reich" in *German Colonialism: Race, the Holocaust, and Postwar Germany*, et al. Volker Langbehn (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011), 51-53.

¹⁷ This term has been deliberately capitalized to signify that it is being used conceptually versus geographically.

¹⁸ Baranowski, *Against Human Diversity as Such*, 51.

the other. While a detailed examination of German colonialism in Africa can reveal certain aspects of the influences that contributed to the development of the Nazis' ideological imperialism, it cannot provide a full picture of how the evolution of German imperialism ultimately led to the racialized expansionist policies of Nazi imperialism.¹⁹

Lastly, this focus on German colonialism in Africa obscures the long-term effects of racialized othering as a component of German imperialism and how this othering impacted its development. While some historians such as Sebastian Conrad have attempted to address this problem by including discussions of Edward Said's theory of *Orientalism*, it still represents a problem with Madley's approach to examining the rise of Nazi imperialism. In short, this approach to examining the development of the Nazis' ideological imperialism disregards a key aspect of Said's argument, which is that the use of othering and its influence over state policies and institutions is a long-term process, not a short term one.²⁰ In particular, it obscures how the institutionalization of racialized othering within German imperialism contributed to the German understanding of what it meant to be German vs what it meant to be a member of the "other" or what it meant to be associated with otherness.²¹ Specifically, it masks how the use of racialized othering within German imperialism became a process for constructing Germanness, a means of explaining an unequal power relationship between those supposedly displaying true "German" traits and those displaying otherness.²²

¹⁹ Emanuele Saccarelli and Latha Varadarajan, *Imperialism: Past and Present* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 18-26.

²⁰ Jane Hiddleston, *Understanding Postcolonialism* (Stocksfield: Acumen Publishing Limited, 2009), 83-93.

²¹ Sergei Prozorov, "The other as past and present beyond the logic of "temporal othering" in IR theory" *Review of International Studies*, Vol 37, No. 3 (July 2011), 1281.

²² Lajos Brons, "Othering, an Analysis" *Transcendence: A Journal of Global Studies*, Vol 6, No. 1 (2015), 70.

The role of racialized othering within the development of German imperialism and its connections to the development of German identity will therefore be the focus of this thesis. However, what needs to be established first is what othering is and why it was considered an effective tool for transforming German imperialism. Othering is the introduction of the notion of the other in opposition to the construction of the self and is deemed to be associated with otherness. It is an exclusion of everything deemed other in relation to an individual's or group's self-identity.²³ In essence, othering is the process by which the representation of the other becomes represented as "not one of us" through the identification of artificial traits marking sameness and difference. The use of othering is an exercise in power, allowing for one group to define membership within that group in opposition to another group with perceived inferior characteristics.²⁴

What make othering such an effective tool was identified by Edward Said in a series of essays where he established the theory of *Orientalism*. In these essays, Said sets out to define orientalism as an institutionalized form of othering which becomes an "ontological and epistemological distinction made between....the East and the West." The East therefore becomes the other as orientalism becomes an institutionalized system for dominating, restructuring and having authority over the other.²⁵ As such, Said identifies how European knowledge of colonized or perceived colonized regions became the identity of those regions. He provides a label to the previously ill defined and perceived geographic, moral and cultural inferiority of the East. Said

²³ Brons, "Othering, An Analysis", 69.

²⁴ Fred Dervin, "Cultural Identity, Representation and Othering" in *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Intercultural Communication*, edited by Jane Jackson (London and New York: Routledge, 2014), 185-187.

²⁵ Edward Said, *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1995), 2-3.

identifies what was self evident for European imperialists, that imperialism was the subjugation of an inferior race by a supposedly superior one.²⁶

Despite these revelations however, Said's theory has been criticized for its assumption that orientalism is a conscious political system. Other theorists have argued that orientalism has become an euphemism that justifies colonial rule in advance of the conquest and orientalizing of a particular region before rather than after the fact.²⁷ However, while these criticisms are perhaps accurate, they also make the same mistake as Said in that they both miss a key weakness of Said's theory, that is, his omitting of other forms of European imperialism. While this is understandable given his intense focus on British, and to a lesser extent French imperialism in the Middle East, it nevertheless presents a gap within the structure of Said's theory of Orientalism. Said's theory is unable to demonstrate how orientalism was used by the other major European powers (Prussia, Austria and Russia) to explain why these Central European powers had an imperial obligation to rule over and to extend their rule over the ethnically diverse populations of Eastern Europe and Eurasia.²⁸ However, this problem also raises the question of how European imperialism developed over the course of the 19th century.

During the period 1848-1914, European imperialism was transformed by the new technological, economic, political and social advances of the second industrial and financial revolutions in Europe. This "new imperialism" of the late nineteenth and early twentieth

²⁶ Edward Said, "Knowing the Oriental" in *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979): 31-32.

²⁷ Ibn Warraq, *Defending the West: A Critique of Edward Said's Orientalism* (New York: Prometheus Books, 2007), 43.

²⁸ Dirk Hoerder, "Transcultural Approaches to Gender Labour Migration: From the Nineteenth Century Proletarian to Twenty-First Century Caregiver Mass Migrations" in *Proletarian and Gendered Mass Migrations: A Global Perspective on Continuities and Discontinuities from the 19th to the 21st Centuries*, et al. Dirk Hoerder (Boston: Brill Leiden, 2013), 49.

centuries drove Europe's major powers into a renewed competition for exclusive claims to territory at a faster rate than at any point during the "old imperialism" of the preceding 18th century, as these major powers sought to break out of the increasing territorial stagnation in Europe.²⁹ European foreign and domestic policy was transformed from an Europe centered orientation that provided territorial, economic or political gains in Europe to a global competition for empire involving various forms of subordination, violence and oppression by the major European powers as well as (later) the United States.³⁰ As Benjamin Cohen argues, it was "a[n] archaic organization... of European states rooted... in the persistence of natural difference...[as well as] human nature," designed to allow the newly industrialized states of Europe to dominate the supposedly inferior states of the rest of the world, all while also extending and preserving the political and economic privileges of Europe's governing classes.³¹

It was this chaotic system that the newly united German Empire was confronted with as it emerged the most technologically, economically and militarily powerful state in Europe. Created out of the Prussian states' imperial desire for a Prussian hegemony over Central Europe under the direction of Prussia's Minister President, Otto von Bismarck, this newly crafted great power joined this new scramble for a global empire without any previous tradition of colonialism or imperialism outside of Eastern Europe and the Baltic region.³² During the previous 17th and 18th centuries, no unified German state existed to channel any desire for a global empire into concrete imperial policies and the German *Bürger* and aristocratic classes showed little interest

²⁹ Porter, *European Imperialism, 1860-1914*, 8-14.

³⁰ Porter, *European Imperialism 1860-1914*, 2-3.

³¹ Porter, *European Imperialism 1860-1914*, 11-15.

³² Helmuth Stoecker, "The Historical Background" in *German Imperialism in Africa: From the Beginnings until the Second World War*, et al. Helmuth Stoecker., trans Bernd Zöllner (London: C. Hurst & Company, 1986), 11.

in pursuing the conquest and settlement of non-European lands, preferring to allow the British, French and Dutch merchants to compete for control of the developing colonial trade networks while also depending on them to provide Germany's "colonial merchandise." Due to this, the few attempts the Germans made at overseas expansion, mainly the actions of the Welser's (a south German family of merchants and financiers) as well as the Prussian Elector's attempts to participate in the developing African slave trade, quickly failed. As a result, German imperialism during the 18th century played only a limited role in the construction of the European empires outside Europe, mainly through the newly established German shipping companies formed after Britain's granting permission in 1824 to German merchants to participate in its massive colonial trade networks.³³

German imperialism, unlike that of the other major powers, remained confined to the European continent, dependent on the changing foreign policies of Austria and Prussia to achieve its goals. However, this lack of a colonial tradition as well as German imperialism's limited role on the global stage quickly vanished following Germany's unification in 1871. Even today, the lightning pace with which Bismarck was able to establish a global empire is still shocking. In less than a year, Bismarck established an empire stretching across Africa and the Pacific, announcing the establishment of German protectorates over Angra Pequena, Togoland, the Cameroons as well as the East African mainland, the northern eastern half of New Guinea and a number of islands in Melanesia and Micronesia.³⁴ This rapid rise of Germany as the holder of a global empire

³³ Stoecker, "The Historical Background," 13.

³⁴ Arne Perras, "Colonial Agitation and the Bismarckian State: The Case of Carl Peter" in *Wilhelminism and Its Legacies: German Modernities, Imperialism, and the Meanings of Reform, 1890-1930: Essays for Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann*, et al. Geoff Eley (New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2003), 154-155.

raises the question of what were the factors that enabled this rapid pace to occur. It also poses the question of how German imperialism functioned within German society, contributing to the racialization of German imperialism under the direction of Adolf Hitler and Nazism.

In terms of the historiography of the “new” global form of European imperialism as well as Germany’s entry into this system, most modern historians of imperialism follow the argument that the differences between 18th century imperialism and its 19th century equivalent were superficial. They argue that although the Spanish and Portuguese empires were collapsing, as most of Central and South America was independent or nearing independence by 1815 and France’s former colonial and European empire was reduced to a few scattered naval bases, this represented a softening of imperialism’s control of European foreign policy over an outright shift away from it.³⁵ This argument is based on Britain, which was at the height of its influence and prestige as a global power. It continued a slow expansion of its territories with the acquisition of new naval and trading posts across Africa, Southeast Asia and the Far East.³⁶

This argument of one large phase of imperialism, however, is a recent development. One of the earliest and most influential studies of imperialism was Vladimir Lenin’s analysis of imperialism and his attempt at identifying the essential components of it. Examining imperialism from a Marxist framework, Lenin viewed it as the highest stage of capitalism which had developed out of the increasing dominance of large scale enterprises in the industrialized regions of the major European states.³⁷ Lenin saw the construction of empire as the “formation of

³⁵ Marcus Cunliffe, *The Age of Expansion 1848-1917* (Springfield: G&C. Merriam Company, 1976), 115-116.

³⁶ William Stearns Davis, *Europe Since Waterloo: A Non-Technical History of Europe From The Exile Of Napoleon to the Treaty Of Versailles, 1815-1919* (London: Leonard Parsons, 1927), 11-14.

³⁷ V.I. Lenin, “The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination,” in *V.I. Lenin: Selected Works, One Volume Edition* (New York, International Publishers Co, 1971), 157.

monopolies, the concentration of global production and capital under the dominance of Europe” by which “the monopolists throttle[ed] those who do not submit to them, to their yoke, to their dictation.”³⁸ The theme of economic domination was central to Lenin’s analysis of imperialism as he argued that imperialism represented a very high stage of capitalism, what he termed “monopoly stage of capitalism.”³⁹ At this stage of development, Lenin argued that capitalism built a colonial policy that merged the financial capital of the major banks with that of the capital industrialists. He asserted that the “division of the world [became] the transition from a colonial policy which extended without hindrance to territories unseized by any capitalist power, to a colonial policy of monopolist possession of the territory of the world, which has been completely divided up.”⁴⁰ For Lenin then, imperialism was the domination of financial capital over industrial capital as he asserted that imperialism seeks to “annex not only agrarian territories but [also]...the highly industrialized regions” in the search of a hegemony that could be used to weaken an enemy. In the case of Germany, Lenin argued that this is the true motive behind its desire to annex Belgium, one of the earliest and as a result most industrialized regions in Europe.⁴¹

Another significant source from this time period as well as one of the most influential amongst those developing early theories of imperialism is J.A. Hobson’s *Imperialism: A Study*. Constructed as a study of the development of imperialism through an extensive analysis of the growth of the British Empire as well as the causes of the British interest in “empire,” Hobson

³⁸ Lenin, “The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination,” 180-185.

³⁹ V.I. Lenin, “Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism” in *V.I. Lenin: Selected Works, One Volume Edition* (New York, International Publishers Co, 1971), 232.

⁴⁰ Lenin, “Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism,” 232-233.

⁴¹ Lenin, “Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism,” 233-234.

attempts to move beyond Lenin's analysis of imperialism on a strictly economic framework. As such, he examines the role that the concept of nationality and national identity played in the adoption of imperialism as a key factor in British foreign policy.⁴² Significantly, Hobson asserts that a fundamental component of this style of imperialism was colonialism, which he viewed as the "overflow" of nationality. For Hobson, this meant that colonialism represented the emigration of citizens from the mother country, who possessed access to the full rights of citizenship moving to isolated, "vacant or sparsely peopled foreign lands." From there, he argued, they soon established very similar local governments to that of their mother country, thus providing an indirect form of conquest for their original countries.⁴³

Hobson envisioned imperialism as the political and economic dominance of a small foreign minority (i.e. British) over a "majority of alien and subject peoples," who then import the culture and customs of their mother nation to "civilize" the region they now inhabit. Thus, Hobson concludes that imperialism in the immediate pre-war period (1900-1914) and the then dominant diplomatic theory of several competing empires was a "modern" concept that had slowly been formed out of the events of the French revolution and the resulting wars of conquest that engulfed Europe from 1789-1815.⁴⁴ He asserts that this "modern" imperialism was "an artificial stimulation of nationalism in peoples too foreign to be absorbed and too compact to be permanently crushed," leading to a "cutthroat struggle of competing [national] empires."⁴⁵

⁴² J.A. Hobson, *Imperialism: A Study* (New York: Cosimo Classics, 2005, originally published in 1902 by George Allen & Unwin LTD), 6.

⁴³ Hobson, *Imperialism: A Study*, 6-7.

⁴⁴ Hobson, *Imperialism: A Study*, 8-9.

⁴⁵ Hobson, *Imperialism: A Study*, 10-11.

For Lenin and Hobson then, imperialism is seen from a strictly economic, anti-capitalist and materialistic viewpoint. The problem with this viewpoint is that it is too broad. It fails to take into account the individual motives of the European great power's participation in late 19th century imperialism, viewing their participation through a universal lens.⁴⁶ For example, Lenin's analysis of imperialism fails to reveal why Britain was the only major power to consistently maintain a policy of overseas expansion nor does it explain why France began to rebuild its empire after 1820. Most importantly for the purposes of this study, it fails to adequately examine why Germany began participating in late 19th century global imperialism when, as mentioned above, it had no previous tradition of this.⁴⁷ Finally, they fail to take into account the observation by L.L. Farrar, that the imperialism of the late 19th century was not so much focused on outright conquest and expansion but about balance, a system based on the foreign policies of the great powers and their desire for the maintenance of "limited power."⁴⁸

This is particularly problematic as these early theories on imperialism make no attempt to examine the motives behind the perceived need for the construction of empire, especially in the case of German imperialism, which went through several altered phases of increasing radicalization before its final defeat in 1945 with the collapse of Nazi Germany. Even with new research, little has been done to examine why there was a sudden rebirth of intense interest in the establishment of global empire at the end of the 19th century. Additionally, most recent research on imperialism and the construction of empire has focused on British and French forms

⁴⁶ Porter, *European Imperialism 1860-1914*, 8-9.

⁴⁷ C.M. Andrew & A.S. Kanya-Forstner, "Centre and Periphery in the Making of the Second French Colonial Empire, 1815-1920," *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, Vol 16 No. 3 (1988), 9.

⁴⁸ L.L. Farrar, *Arrogance and Anxiety: The Ambivalence of German Power, 1848-1914* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1981), 6.

of imperialism. While this makes sense in terms of these two great powers having the largest global empires, it still leaves a gap in the historical narrative of imperialism as well as confining the definition of global imperialism to areas outside of Europe.⁴⁹

However, several recent publications have begun to close this gap as historians have begun to examine German imperialism, its objectives and its place within the larger narrative of late 19th century imperialism. One of the most significant of these publications is Vejas Gabriel Liulevicius's book, *The German Myth of the East: 1800-present*. In this book, Liulevicius examines the objectives of German imperialism in Central and Eastern Europe as well as the political and cultural motives behind them. Liulevicius's book is significant to this thesis due to his argument that a "frontier myth" developed within German imperialism. He compares the German image of the "East" to that of the American myth of the "Wild West" within the concept of Manifest Destiny in which the East was envisioned as a "dirty wild [place] marked by chaos and disorganization." In revealing this myth, Liulevicius points out an important component of German imperialism, the belief that Germany was engaged in an existential conflict in Eastern Europe between the dirty, wild east and the cultured German west.⁵⁰ As such, Liulevicius's source reveals how German imperialism survived and then further radicalized during the transitions of the Bismarkian, Wilhelmine and Nazi periods as it was conceived and portrayed as an existential crisis between the bearers of *Kultur* (Germanness) and the bearers of the barbaric *Zivilisation* in

⁴⁹ Wm. Roger Louis, *Ends of British Imperialism: The Scramble for Empire, Suez and Decolonization: Collected Essays* (London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 2006), 912.

⁵⁰ Vejas Gabriel Liulevicius, *The German Myth of the East: 1800 to the Present* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 1-2.

the East. This concept was also later expanded to take on a more global outlook beginning in the Wilhelmine period.⁵¹

Although his book has been criticized for not providing any new information on the subject of imperialism, that is not the intention of his argument. Instead, it focuses on revealing how the events discussed by Liulevicius were used to create the frontier myth, providing the basic outline of German imperialism for each successive regime to build on and create a more hardline, racialized form of imperialism that would eventually lead to the birth of Nazi imperialism and the concept of *Lebensraum* (living space).⁵² Thus, Liulevicius underscores how the narrative of German imperialism was constructed around a curious mix of nationalist literary scholarship mixed with Edward Said's concept of orientalism to "constitute a mysterious eastern realm to be mastered by western scientific knowledge." As a result, he reveals how this mix created the impression of not only representing Germany's physical borders but also a cultural frontier between the "cultured German blonds and the [dark], barbaric and savage [beings] beyond Germany's eastern borders."⁵³

A source with a similar theme to Liulevicius' is James E Casteel's book, *Russia in the German Global Imaginary: Imperial Visions & Utopian Desires, 1905-1941*. This source examines Russia's long and prominent role in modern German history with the aim of filling what Casteel believes to be a major gap in modern German historiography. He asserts that the gap exists due

⁵¹ Vejas Gabriel Liulevicius, "The Language of Occupation: Vocabularies of German rule in Eastern Europe in the World Wars" in *Germans Poland and Colonial Expansion to the East: 1850 Through the Present*, et al. Robert L Nelson (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 127.

⁵² Richard Blanke, "Vejas Gabriel Liulevicius: The German Myth of the East: 1800 to Present, a review" in *The American Historical Review*. Volume 116, Issue 5 (December 2011): 1585.

⁵³ Liulevicius, *The German Myth of the East*, 117.

to the lack of research involving Russia's prominent role in German history which he states "permeated German discourse [surrounding] politics, identity, modernity and...empire."⁵⁴ Casteel's book compliments Liulevicius' argument of the "frontier myth" existing in German history as he argues that the myth still exists in the historical writings on imperial Germany as Russia is still treated as separate, as though it was "somewhere out there in Asia."⁵⁵

As such, Casteel's book traces "the transformation of German imaginings of Russia and later the Soviet Union from the turn of the century to the outbreak of World War II, with a particular interest in how these imaginings informed German discourses about the status of their country in a world of empires."⁵⁶ He does this by focusing on the different ways intellectuals, nationalists, government officials and other commentators viewed Russia, both in terms as an imperial rival as well as a potential area of colonial expansion and influence. Most importantly, Casteel reveals how there was no homogenous German image of Russia but instead multiple images of Russia and all things Russian in the public sphere. He demonstrates how German imperialism became increasingly radical as more moderate images were perceived to be discredited at the end of each phase of its development, allowing more radical views and images to gain in popularity. Thus, Casteel describes how Russia became a site from which Germans projected their ambitions, expectations and fears about Germany's future as a modern global power. Casteel's source is significant to this thesis as it underscores how Liulevicius' argument of

⁵⁴ James E. Casteel, *Russia in the German Global Imaginary: Imperial Visions & Utopian Desires, 1905-1941* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2016), 1-4.

⁵⁵ Casteel, *Russia in the German Global Imaginary*, 5.

⁵⁶ Casteel, *Russia in the German Global Imaginary*, 6.

the “frontier myth” was not just geographical but also a cultural construct born out of the shared histories and interactions between Germany and Russia.⁵⁷

Finally, the last general history of German imperialism is Suzanne L Marchand’s, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire: Religion, Race, and Scholarship*. This book is significant to this thesis as Marchand showcases the disconnect that has existed between those studying German conceptions of empire and those using Edward Said’s concept of *Orientalism* to enhance our understanding of European imperialism. While she is clear that this disconnect started with Said’s exclusion of German imperialism from his concept, she also points out that Said excluded German imperialism due to his concluding that “what German oriental scholarship did was to refine and elaborate on techniques whose applications was to texts, myths, ideas and languages almost literally gather[ed] from the orient by imperial Britain and France.” This resulted in German imperialism (in Said’s opinion) not contributing anything unique on its own.⁵⁸ In doing so, Marchand demonstrates how orientalism as an institution within German society and its effect on German imperialism has been overlooked by historians.

As such, Marchand argues for a refining of Said’s paradigm through the removal of any ideological frameworks that have been constructed around Said’s theory to develop a “means of understanding orientalism which does not [automatically] become merely a critique of ideology.” She expresses her desire to develop a “synthetic and critical history, one that assesses oriental[isms] contributions to imperialism, racism and modern anti-Semitism that also... at least

⁵⁷ Casteel, *Russia in the German Global Imaginary*, 5-7.

⁵⁸ Suzanne L Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire: Religion, Race and Scholarship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), xix

[gives] some of the tools necessary for constructing the post-imperialist worldview we cultivate today.”⁵⁹ In doing so, Marchand’s book provides a unique perspective from which to analyze German imperialism as she prioritizes representations of the East over a German perspective of the “orient,” providing a contextual framework that compliments the arguments of Liulevicius and Casteel.⁶⁰

This contextual framework is provided through her examination of the German concept of *Orientalistik* as Marchand argues that it was German scholars who set the pace of its development from 1830-1930, despite Germany’s entering of the colonial race only in the late 19th century. She demonstrates that in concentrating on the significance of the development of *Orientalistik*, it will allow historians to better understand how some of the modern conceptions of empire developed in Germany and how this led to questions surrounding the meaning of Germanness as well as German identity. She also suggests that examining the origins of *Orientalistik* will potentially also lead to new insights about the rise of the Nazis and their highly racialized form of imperialism.⁶¹ Marchand reveals how the “Germans sought to explain the religious, historical and cultural significance of the “East””, providing the basis for a further evaluation of Liulevicius’s “frontier myth” by demonstrating how orientalism played a key role in the radicalization of German imperialism through the redefining of the perceptions of difference between the German(Aryan) and Semite races.⁶²

⁵⁹ Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire*, xxii

⁶⁰ Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire*, xxii

⁶¹ Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire*, xxiv

⁶² Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire*, xxii-xxiii

Moving beyond research that analyzes key aspects of German imperialism, it is also necessary to discuss publications focusing on a particular feature or characteristic of it. One of the most significant of these publications is David Ciarlo's book, *Advertising Empire: Race and Visual Culture in Imperial Germany*. Ciarlo's book traces the development of graphic advertising in imperial Germany and its use of images related to concepts of empire, colonialism as well as orientalism. It does this by analysing the development of a style of advertising in imperial Germany known as *Sachplakat* (object posters) and how they evolved into an "evolution of professional advertising as a new communicative mode of capitalism... a new technique of [product] branding."⁶³ In doing so, Ciarlo seeks to reveal how "the rise of modern advertising culture [contributed to] the subjection of colonized peoples" by highlighting the often precarious position given to subjugated peoples, usually represented as "dark" figures in a compromised position.⁶⁴ He showcases how "visuality" was used within German imperialism and its connections to the rapidly developing German advertising industry during the imperial period of German history (1871-1918), providing a glimpse into how the advertising industry contributed to the racialization of various groups in imperial Germany.⁶⁵

Ciarlo's book describes how Germany's colonized spaces, both within as well as outside Europe, were subjected to "phases of apathy, brutality, reform [and] the commercial[ization] of the imagery of [its] colonies... [creating] a logic that evolved the dynamics of commercialized pictorial power." It provides a unique view into how the advocates of German imperialism used

⁶³ David Ciarlo, *Advertising Empire: Race and Visual Culture in Imperial Germany* (Cambridge MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2011), 2.

⁶⁴ Ciarlo, *Advertising Empire*, 2-3.

⁶⁵ Andrew G. Bonnell, "A Review of David Ciarlo, *Advertising Empire: Race and Visual Culture in Imperial Germany*," in *European History Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No. 3 (July, 2014): 517-518.

Germany's rapidly expanding advertising industry for the purpose of "advertising empire." His book reveals how the advertising industry played a key part in the campaign of German imperialists attempting to showcase the benefits of empire to a disinterested public through the depiction of "overseas exoticism, the obsession with [imitating] the success of imperial Britain [as well as] a fascination with primitiveness."⁶⁶

Ciarlo's research builds on the observation made by Elazar Barkan and Ronald Bush, that the image of the "savage" became geographically exotic, "a foreign land beyond the borders of the German state where the violence and energy of the "barbarian" dominated the landscape."⁶⁷ His book demonstrates how a "small but vocal minority of German[s] looked to [imperialism] as the solution to all of Germany's social problems"⁶⁸ by using the image of the savage to create a highly racialized form of primitiveness to provide (for a short time) a brief surge of interest and enthusiasm for orientalism and empire in the German general public.⁶⁹ Ciarlo's research therefore showcases how these actions were an attempt to nationalize the German race against the "other as a means of reinforcing the recently completed unification of Germany into a single coherent state. He reveals how the *Sachplakat* and their depictions of the savage can be seen as the mixing of old myths as well as symbols with the modern language and imagery of 19th century imperialism.⁷⁰ It is significant to this thesis as it underscores how visuality was used to convey

⁶⁶ Ciarlo, *Advertising Empire*, 4-11.

⁶⁷ Elazar Barkan and Ronald Bush, *Prehistories of the Future: The Primitivist Project and the Culture of Modernism* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995), 2-3.

⁶⁸ Ciarlo, *Advertising Empire*, 4.

⁶⁹ Barkan and Bush, *Prehistories of the Future*, 2-3.

⁷⁰ Robert Nye, 'Savage Crowds, Modernism and Modern Politics' in *Prehistories of the Future: The Primitivist Project and the Culture of Modernism*, et al. Elazar Barkan (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995), 46.

Liulevicius's "frontier myth" as well as Marchand's "practice" of orientalism to a disinterested German public.

While Ciarlo's book deals mostly with the *Sachplakat* and the prominence of the image of the "savage" within them, the research of Russell A. Berman's source, *Enlightenment or Empire: Colonial Discourse in German Culture*, expands this examination by tracing how advertising was used in the popularizing of German imperialism in Africa. Berman demonstrates how illusion and imagery of "savage" Africa were used to sell the ownership of colonies to a perceived sceptical German public, attempting to encourage German immigration to its colonies in Africa. His source reveals how descriptive geographic imagery was used to evoke in its viewers the similarities between the colonized landscape and the landscape of Europe which is seen in editorials appearing in German newspapers proclaiming Mt Kilimanjaro as "our African Alps."⁷¹

As a result, Berman's source reveals an important aspect of German imperialism, the use of popular images of European geography to convince a reticent public disinterested in the conquest and settlement of lands outside Europe of the advantages of colonies and colonial expansion.⁷² It focuses on how discourse was used in the public cultural sphere of Germany to create "a formula for a mulatto geography" which could be used to symbolize the unequal power relationship between the colonizers and the colonized. However, his source is unique in that he examines this relationship differently than other research on German imperialism. Instead of simply following the focus of previous research on the colonial sites symbolizing the imagined

⁷¹ Russel A. Berman, *Enlightenment or Empire: Colonial Discourse in German Culture* (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 1-4.

⁷² Berman, *Enlightenment or Empire*, 2-4.

struggle until death between various competing races, Berman asserts that these sites should instead be viewed as locations where perpetuated acts of cross-cultured contact occurred despite the efforts of colonialized regimes to separate and control it.⁷³

Another publication that complements Ciarlo's research is William W Hagen's *Germans, Poles, and Jews: The Nationality Conflict in the Prussian East, 1772-1914* as it was meant as a "history of [the] nationality conflict in the lands seized by Prussia in the Polish partitions." It is a "study of the Prussian government's [efforts] to "Prussianize" and later to "Germanize" its Polish citizens, particularly in the Poznan, the heartland of Prussian Poland."⁷⁴ It focuses on the local, mostly Polish, opposition to Prussian rule and how this slowly led to the extremely nationalist imperialism of the Wilhelmine and Nazi periods. In doing so, Hagen's book reveals a "history of both Polish society in the Prussian east [as well as the] Prussian [governments] eastern nationalities policy," *Polenpolitik*. It examines how Polish resistance to Prussian rule in western Poland slowly drew the German, Polish and Jewish populations in the region into a triangular racial conflict with the Prussian state. In examining this conflict, Hagen argues that the government's failure in the eyes of the eastern German elite to disarm and assimilate the Polish population led these elites to embrace a racially defined eastern looking imperialism. He demonstrates how this radicalized imperialism legitimized this racialized conflict as well as the uprooting of a population by force for the purpose of the Germanization of the newly colonized territory.⁷⁵

⁷³ Berman, *Enlightenment or Empire*, 5.

⁷⁴ William W. Hagen, *Germans, Poles and Jews: The Nationality Conflict in the Prussian East, 1772-1914* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1980), vii.

⁷⁵ Hagen, *Germans, Poles and Jews*, vii.

An additional source that furthers this focus on the place of Germany's eastern frontier in German society is Henry Cord Meyer's book, *Mitteleuropa In German Thought and Action, 1815-1945*. This source traces the history of the German phrase *Mitteleuropa* and the changing interpretations of the term as well as how it contributed to German imperialism's fascination with the "East."⁷⁶ Meyer creates a narrative which traces the term's emergence in 1915 and how over the course of the First World War as well as the Weimar period, it came to represent a vague set of goals of empire building within German imperialism. As a result, Meyer reveals how *Mitteleuropa* became a means of interpreting German conquests of the past to provide legitimacy for the conquests of the future envisioned by German imperialism during the late Wilhelmine as well as Nazi periods.⁷⁷

To accomplish this, Meyer's book is divided into three distinct sections. The first section of the book is dedicated to examining some of the conquests of the past that played a key role in the development of the term. Meyer concentrates on the Habsburg dominated history of empire from 1815-1914 and how the Habsburg experience of ruling a German dominated, multi-ethnic empire influenced the German conception of *Mitteleuropa*. The second and third section of the book are dedicated to how, as mentioned above, the German experience of the war led to a consolidation of the idea of *Mitteleuropa* as well as the growing fascination with the term and its connections to empire among the German intellectual classes in the period following the war.⁷⁸ He does this as he expresses the desire to dispel the fanciful notions surrounding the term's

⁷⁶ Henry Cord Meyer, *Mitteleuropa In German thought and Action: 1815-1945* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1955), 2-4.

⁷⁷ Meyer, *Mitteleuropa In German thought and Action: 1815-1945*, 3.

⁷⁸ Meyer, *Mitteleuropa In German thought and Action: 1815-1945*, 3-4.

association with the theme of the novel written by E. Phillips Oppenheim, *The Great Impersonation* for the purposes of dispelling Oppenheim's revisionist and sensationalist interpretation of the term to showcase the complicated and complex history of it.⁷⁹

As for sources focusing on specific periods of German imperialism (ie. Bismarckian/Prussian, Wilhelmine, Nazi), there are several from each period that should be considered. The first source that should be considered is John Lowe's book, *The Great Powers, Imperialism and the German Problem, 1865-1925*. This book is significant to the study of Bismarck's form of German imperialism as it documents how Prussian imperialism after 1865, under Bismarck's direction, was able to unify Germany under Prussian rule while still maintaining a general peace amongst the European great powers. Lowe argues that between 1815-1871, peace was maintained due to the lack of any major change to the status-quo amongst the great powers, even after the end of the Crimean War. Lowe demonstrates how 1871 was a water shed moment for German imperialism as with the unification of Central Europe under the Prussian dominated German empire, the division of power in Europe among the major states was fundamentally reshaped.⁸⁰ German imperialism and its objectives were now a major consideration in the functioning of Europe's great power politics, leading to an increasing instability as the newly united and powerful German state wavered between a desire for war as well as conquest and the maintenance of peace.

⁷⁹ Meyer, *Mitteleuropa In German thought and Action: 1815-1945*, 4-5.

⁸⁰ John Lowe, *The Great Powers, Imperialism and the German Problem 1865-1925* (London and New York: Routledge, 1994), 1-2.

Lowe's book therefore reveals how this instability within German imperialism affected not only its continued development but also the foreign policies of the great powers as Lowe argues that after 1871, peace in Europe was maintained increasingly by the shrewd and calculating actions of Bismarck himself. Lowe asserts that the early objectives of German imperialism were quite modest and based around Bismarck's own objectives aimed at maintaining peace to secure Germany's newly acquired position as the most powerful state in Europe. For Lowe, this meant that German imperialism during Bismarck's years as chancellor was purely focused on a shrewd form of self-interest concentrated around a desire for "security from invasion, [the] maintenance of national prestige and the assertion of political influence" far from Germany's borders.⁸¹ Ironically, Lowe also argues that this shrewd form of imperialism is what led German imperialism to become increasingly radical and aggressive towards the end of Bismarck's tenure as chancellor as Germany's leaders increasingly considered it in the German state's interests to end the "encirclement" of hostile powers through a war of conquest in Eastern Europe.⁸² In doing so, he presents German imperialism under Bismarck as an opportunistic mix of careful military and organizational planning, along with diplomatic gambles meant to enable short term political gains domestically as well as internationally.⁸³

Another book that deals with German imperialism under Bismarck is Christopher Clark's *Iron Kingdom: The Rise and Downfall of Prussia, 1600-1947*. This source is significant to this thesis as it aims to realign the Post-World War II image of Prussia as the harbinger of militarism, racial

⁸¹ Lowe, *The Great Powers, Imperialism and the German Problem 1865-1925*, 2.

⁸² Lowe, *The Great Powers, Imperialism and the German Problem 1865-1925*, 14.

⁸³ Lowe, *The Great Powers, Imperialism and the German Problem 1865-1925*, 28.

conquest, arrogance and illiberality.⁸⁴ It attempts to reveal the exact role Prussia may or may not have played in the destructive nature of 20th century Germany, arguing that the history of Prussia cannot be viewed solely through the lens of Hitler's rise to power. He underscores that Prussia and its own independent form of imperialism must not be viewed solely through the teleology of Germany's war guilt for as Clark points out, Prussia was a European power long before it was a major German one.⁸⁵

This is particularly important as Clark asserts that the aims and objectives were far removed from that of the later German imperialism that it has been associated with. His evidence for this argument is that Prussian imperialism created a small, limited Prussian empire in Eastern Europe long before it was able to unify the scattered German entities under its control.⁸⁶ The importance of this, Clark argues, is that Prussian imperialism created a unique characteristic within German imperialism, a sense of vulnerability that it was never able to eradicate. He argues that this vulnerability caused the instability within the imperialistic ambitions of Bismarck, Kaiser Wilhelm II and ultimately the Nazi ideology of *Lebensraum*.⁸⁷

Clark's argument is complimented by the sourcebook, *The State of Germany: The National Idea in the Making, Unmaking and Remaking of a Modern Nation-State*. A multi author sourcebook edited by John Breuilly, it attempts to demonstrate how within German imperialism there was never a single, dominate narrative of what a united Germany was supposed to look

⁸⁴ Christopher Clark, *Iron Chancellor: The Rise and Downfall of Prussia, 1600-1947* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006), xiv.

⁸⁵ Clark, *Iron Chancellor*, xv.

⁸⁶ Clark, *Iron Chancellor*, xvi.

⁸⁷ Clark, *Iron Chancellor*, xviii.

like nor what it was meant to accomplish as a major European power.⁸⁸ Consequently, this source supports Clark's analysis by showing that there was never a complete and uniform set of goals for German imperialism, resulting in an institutional instability within its construction. Instead, this source's authors argue that multiple versions of German imperialism developed that competed for the German public's support. This caused German imperialism to lurch between a desire for a colonial empire outside Europe, the accumulation of global power and a racialized conception of imperialism seeking the unification of all German speaking populations in Central and Eastern Europe.⁸⁹

In terms of sources dealing with conceptions of German imperialism during the reign of Kaiser Wilhelm II (1888-1918) as well as his program of *Weltpolitik* and its influence over Wilhelmine society, the first sources that should be considered are the biographies on the Kaiser constructed by John C.G. Röhl. These sources are significant to this thesis as they reveal the extent to which Wilhelm's own personality and policies radicalized German imperialism as well as how they contributed to the pan-European deterioration of peace amongst the European great powers.⁹⁰ Röhl's sources reveal how the Kaiser's erratic personality and actions contributed to the instability of German imperialism and the inability of his government to impose an official narrative over it. They do this by seeking to reshape the narrative of the *Kaiserreich* (Imperial Germany) and its imperial ambitions by placing Wilhelm at the center of a constantly evolving and dynamic society and state, revealing how Wilhelm's position as the holder of all the levers of

⁸⁸ John Breuilly, "Preface" in *The State of Germany: The national idea in the making, unmaking and remaking of a modern nation-state*, edited by John Breuilly (London and New York: Longman Group Ltd, 1992), x.

⁸⁹ Breuilly, "Preface," x-xi.

⁹⁰ John C.G. Röhl, *Kaiser Wilhelm II, 1859-1941: A Concise Life*, trans. Sheila de Bellaigue (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), xiii.

power in imperial Germany contributed to the instability of not only the political power structures of the *Kaiserreich* but also its imperial ambitions.⁹¹

In terms of sources that examine how this instability translated into actual policy, one of the sources that should be considered is Raffael Scheck's book, *Alfred von Tirpitz and German Right-Wing Politics, 1914-1930*. It examines the connections between the instability mentioned above and how this created favourable conditions for the German far right and its supporters in the German elite to gain influence over Wilhelmine imperial policies through the use of *Nationale Verbände*.⁹² Scheck reveals how the fragmented German imperialism of the German right was able to survive the "defeat" of 1918 and the collapse of the *Kaiserreich*. He does this by demonstrating how these groups provided the Nazis' form of imperialism legitimacy by allowing the Nazis to claim that their version was the unified successor of these competing forms of imperialism within the German right.⁹³ It brings to light how the architect of the German High Seas Fleet, Admiral Alfred von Tirpitz, became a central figure within not only the fragmented imperialism of *Weltpolitik* but also the role he played preserving German imperialism after Germany's defeat at the end of the First World War with his "great" manipulation of the *Reichstag* (imperial parliament) and public opinion during the construction of the fleet.⁹⁴

Another source that compliments Scheck's argument is James Retallack's book *The German Right 1860-1920: Political Limits of the Authoritarian Imagination*. It details the

⁹¹ John C.G. Röhl, "Introduction" in *Kaiser Wilhelm II: New Interpretations, the Corfu Papers*, et al. John C.G. Röhl (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 7.

⁹² National pressure groups with connections and supporters within the imperial government.

⁹³ Raffael Scheck, *Alfred von Tirpitz and German Right-Wing Politics, 1914-1930* (Boston: Humanities Press, Inc, 1998), x-xi.

⁹⁴ Scheck, *Alfred von Tirpitz and German Right-Wing Politics, 1914-1930*, xvi-xvii.

increasing fragmentation of German conservatism throughout the Wilhelmine period which began with Bismarck's dismissal by Wilhelm II in 1890. Retallack argues that this fragmentation was the result of the German right's dueling desires to maintain its traditional loyalty to the monarchical state and its desire to compete for votes in the developing political system of mass politics.⁹⁵ He asserts that the political right in imperial Germany saw imperialism as a means of stopping this fragmentation by emphasising the right's image as the defenders of the throne, transforming this image into a partisan tool that would allow it to supplement its membership with fresh recruits from the lower middle and working classes. In doing so, Retallack shows how the German right hoped to strengthen and maintain the position of its leadership, whose grip was perceived to be weakened by the rise of "mass politics" and the vast societal changes caused by industrialization.⁹⁶

These sources do however raise the question as to whether this interest in imperialism was wide spread or limited to Germany's political classes. There are several sources that should be considered regarding this question. The first of these sources is Kristin Kopp's book, *Germany's Wild East: Constructing Poland As Colonial Space*. In her book, Kopp uses Paul Langhaus's source, *Deutscher Kolonialatlas* to examine the contours of German colonial discourse and the political and cultural contexts that it occurred in, allowing Kopp to examine the visual and textual strategies employed by Germany's imperialists to create a representation of Eastern Europe as a colonial space. Kopp seeks to explain how a colonial paradigm developed to describe Germany's as well as more generally Europe's relationship to the "foreign" spaces it colonialized or was

⁹⁵ James Retallack, *The German Right, 1860-1920: Political Limits of the Authoritarian Imagination* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006), 6.

⁹⁶ Retallack, *The German Right, 1860-1920*, 6-8.

perceived to have colonialized. She reveals how this discourse was adapted by Germany's imperialists to conceptualize the exaggerated differences between a "civilized" Germany and a barbaric, wild and chaotic East.⁹⁷

As a result, Kopp attempts to explain how the discursive reinvention of Poland as a German colonial space developed in tandem with a set of material practises that reflected the territorial desires and racial prejudices of Germany's imperialists. She argues that two different forms of German imperialism developed in the East, a material colonization designed to fulfill the economic, political and cultural desires of Germany's imperialist elite for the subjugation of the native populations of Eastern Europe by an invading foreign minority and a discursive form of imperialism meant to create a colonial subjectivity for the would be colonizers.⁹⁸ In making this argument, Kopp reveals how the use of othering was used to portray the Polish population as primitive and ahistorical, a race lacking the ability to achieve progress without an external intervention. Kopp demonstrates how othering became a means of reinforcing the image of the German people as a colonizing *Volk*, a race naturally positioned to bring order and progress to a supposedly wild, dirty and primitive East.⁹⁹

Kopp's source is also significant however, as it reveals another important development in the racialization of German imperialism and its use of othering, its use of the newly established professional disciplines¹⁰⁰ to legitimize the imperial desires of Germany's imperialist elite. This is

⁹⁷ Kristin Kopp, *Germany's Wild East: Constructing Poland as Colonial Space* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2012), 6.

⁹⁸ Kopp, *Germany's Wild East*, 6-7.

⁹⁹ Paul Julian Weindling, *Epidemics and Genocide in Eastern Europe, 1890-1945* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000), xix.

¹⁰⁰ This is a reference to the development of the social sciences and professions such as history, biology, medicine, law, geography, etc.

clearly seen in Kopp's analysis of Langhaus' source which uses history as well as geography to reveal a supposedly hidden past of German colonization. This argument is strengthened by Paul Julian Weindling's book, *Epidemics and Genocide in Eastern Europe, 1890-1945*. Weindling's book does this by examining how Germany's imperialists absorbed and used the vocabulary of bacteriology in their arguments for the creation of a German empire stretching across Eastern Europe. It provides a thorough examination of how "experts" in infectious disease control became a key component of the radicalization of German imperialism as they sought to use the language of containment to call for the defence of the German heartlands from the spread of disease through conquest, and colonization. He underscores how the symbolism of infectious diseases and their association with the races of Eastern Europe became "a rallying cry [for] stamping out epidemics[,which] clearly meant the eradicating of the racially inferior carriers of "disease.""¹⁰¹ Weindling asserts that "to recover how disease was manipulated, it [has] become necessary to examine the structures of medical expertise and public health organizations [as well as] the distinctive roots of biological forms of racism in bacteriology and eugenics" to reveal the ideological issues surrounding sanitation, imperialism, race and the desire to overcome disease that converged in the genocidal actions of the Nazi occupation of Russia. As a result, Kopp's as well as Weindling's books place the radicalization of German imperialism within a wider narrative of German interactions with Eastern Europe, placing the Holocaust and the attempted Nazi conquest of Russia within the context of a larger narrative of German imperialism in Eastern Europe.¹⁰²

¹⁰¹ Weindling, *Epidemics and Genocide in Eastern Europe, 1890-1945*, xix.

¹⁰² Weindling, *Epidemics and Genocide in Eastern Europe, 1890-1945*, xx-xxi.

Finally, there are several sources dealing with the climax of German imperialism under Adolf Hitler and the Nazis that should be considered. The first of these is Woodruff D. Smith's book, *The Ideological Origins of Nazi Imperialism*. Despite the title, this only briefly examines the objectives of Nazi imperialism. Instead its main focus is on the "complex process of ideological development extending back to the first half of the 19th century...[especially] the Wilhelm[ine]era, the period of greatest innovation in German imperialist ideology."¹⁰³ It is meant to reveal the "complex concept of continuity that involves consideration of the interaction between political ideology and the structure of politics over time." Smith's source is significant in that it underscores a central theme within German imperialism from Bismarck to Hitler, the contradictions of the social, cultural, political and economic goals within its construction.¹⁰⁴

Smith's book therefore seeks to move the discussion of German imperialism and its objectives beyond explanations that view the actions of the various social groups supporting German imperialism as an immediate response to the processes of modernization.¹⁰⁵ Smith's goal is to reveal the close connections between ideology and imperialism in the German context. He demonstrates how it became a means of building and maintaining consensus for guiding government policy regarding imperialism. Smith argues that the "imperial ideology" that arose in Germany as a result of the radicalization of German imperialism was the result of twin responses of different 19th century liberal groups to meet the social and political changes brought about by the rapid industrialization of the late 19th century as well as an economic imperialism

¹⁰³ Woodruff D. Smith, *The Ideological Origins of Nazi Imperialism* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 3.

¹⁰⁴ Smith, *The Ideological Origins of Nazi Imperialism*, 4-7.

¹⁰⁵ Smith, *The Ideological Origins of Nazi Imperialism*, 9.

aimed at supporting Germany's growing industrial sector.¹⁰⁶ In doing so, Smith's book provides a compelling demonstration of why ideology itself has to be included as an influential agent within the development and radicalization of German imperialism. Including ideology, Smith asserts, allows for a more in-depth analysis of the theme of continuity and discontinuity within German imperialism, which Smith argues has been neglected by previous analytical frameworks.¹⁰⁷

The final significant source regarding the Nazis and their interpretation of German imperialism is Shelley Baranowski's monograph, *Nazi Empire: German Colonialism and Imperialism from Bismarck to Hitler*. In it, Baranowski seeks to reveal the connection between the concepts of empire, colonialism and genocide within German history as well as to "offer new ways to historicize the Nazi regimes obsession with the biological endangerment of the German *Volk* and its mutually reinforcing remedies [of] the acquisition of living space [lebensraum] at the expense of the Slavs and the extermination of the Jews."¹⁰⁸ To do this, she draws links to long standing tropes within German imperialism, mainly the desire to create internal cohesion through the marginalization of domestic enemies as well as the desire for global power.¹⁰⁹ As such, Baranowski argues that "Germany offers an example of a less-appreciated "tension of empire," the aspiration to imperialist expansion and the simultaneous fear of dissolution at the hands of its imperialist rivals."¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁶ Smith, *The Ideological Origins of Nazi Imperialism*, 18.

¹⁰⁷ Smith, *The Ideological Origins of Nazi Imperialism*, 10.

¹⁰⁸ Shelley Baranowski, *Nazi Empire: German Colonialism and Imperialism from Bismarck to Hitler* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 3.

¹⁰⁹ Baranowski, *Nazi Empire*, 3-4.

¹¹⁰ Baranowski, *Nazi Empire*, 4.

This tension, Baranowski asserts, had built up over time as the memory of late Medieval and early modern conquests were followed by the decline of the German settlements created by these conquests. Combined with memories of the foreign occupation during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars as well as middle class concerns over the “incomplete” nature of German unification after 1871, a volatile mix of ambition and dread within the German public sphere was created. She contends that this created a “religious and millenarian vision of national death and resurrection” within German imperialism. Baranowski argues that this led to the development of a determination to not only challenge imperialist rivals but to also overcome them, ensuring the development of an imperial viewpoint in which the major states were viewed to be locked in a titanic struggle for existence.¹¹¹ In short, Baranowski provides a significant insight into Germany’s imperialist past, revealing how the rise of the Nazis and their radicalization of German imperialism was not a single isolated moment in German history but instead part of a much larger historical narrative of a dueling desire for a harmonious, racially pure empire along with a desire to accumulate global power. This source underscores that the final radicalization of German imperialism under the Nazis was as Baranowski asserts, the imperialism that dedicated itself to the “elimination of the enemy behind the enemy.”¹¹²

However, the problem with this source as well as the others listed above is that they only deal with one aspect of German imperialism and how that particular aspect contributed to the extreme form of imperialism that became Nazi ideology. They all tend to concentrate on either how the violence of Nazi imperialism became accepted by the wider German public or how the

¹¹¹ Baranowski, *Nazi Empire*, 4.

¹¹² Baranowski, *Nazi Empire*, 4-6.

imperial fantasies and images of empire in the East contributed to this acceptance over trying to construct a complete narrative of German imperialism and how the German “imperial experience” contributed to the rise of the Nazis.¹¹³ This thesis will seek to further Baranowski’s bold assertion that Nazi imperialism was a problem of empire that developed over the course of the period 1870-1918. However, as this assertion has been criticized as a modification of the *Sonderweg* theory, it will seek to avoid this by examining how German imperialism functioned as a social, intellectual and political entity to reveal how the rhetoric and articulation of imperial fantasies as well as the lack of the development of a cohesive “official” program of empire contributed to the rise of Nazi imperialism.¹¹⁴

It will seek to further Baranowski’s argument of the radicalization of German imperialism due to the “tensions of empire” by reconstructing Baranowski’s theory to argue that Nazism was not a problem of empire but the product of the “pursuit of empire.” To do this, it will draw on Edward Said’s concept of *Orientalism* as well as Liulevicius’ frontier myth to assert that the rise of the Nazis’ ideological imperialism was the result of a lack of any cohesive “official” goals within German imperialism. Imperialism and colonialism will therefore be treated as two interconnected systems designed to facilitate the accumulation of as well as the displaying of political, economic, cultural and societal power.¹¹⁵ In short, imperialism will be broadly defined as a division of the world between aggressors and those perceived to be submissive, an unequal relationship of dominance and submission through which the political, military and cultural

¹¹³ Michael Hamilton, “A review of Nazi Empire: German Colonialism and Imperialism from Bismarck to Hitler,” *History: Reviews of New Books*, Vol. 41, No. 1 (Nov 21, 2012), 37-38.

¹¹⁴ Hamilton, “A review of Nazi Empire,” 38.

¹¹⁵ Saccarelli and Varadarajan, *Imperialism: Past and Present*, 26-32, 70.

dominance of one nation over another is maintained. Within this context, German imperialism will be viewed as an intra as well as international process aimed at maintaining an unequal relationship between those deemed to be colonizers and those deemed to be the colonized.¹¹⁶ It will therefore explore how the gradual racialization of the representation of the other within German imperialism contributed to the rise of the Nazis' ideological imperialism by gradually dehumanizing subject populations.¹¹⁷ In short, this thesis will construct a narrative of othering within German imperialism to reveal how the racialization of the other and its influence on the development of German national identity contributed to the acceptance of the Nazis' ideological imperialism in the early 1930's.

It will do this through an examination of Bismarckian, Wilhelmine and finally Nazi imperialism to reveal how the functioning of these systems of imperialism contributed to the focus on the use of violence and race as markers of empire that became the hallmarks of Nazi imperialism. For the Bismarckian period, chapter 1 will analyze how the use of othering was introduced into German imperialism by Otto von Bismarck through an examination of the 1866 war with Austria, the consequences of Prussian internal imperialism during the period of the *KulturKampf* on the formation of a national German identity and finally the construction of the German colonial empire in the 1880's. For the Wilhelmine period, chapter 2 will examine how the other became increasingly racialized under the erratic leadership of Wilhelm II. It will do this through an examination of German imperialism in China to reveal how Wilhelm's own

¹¹⁶ Elisabeth L. "Gidengil. Centres and Peripheries: An Empirical test of Galtung's Theory of Imperialism," *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol 15. No. 1 (March 1, 1978): 51-52. Also see Chrisman, *Postcolonial Contraventions: Cultural Readings of Race, Imperialism and Transnationalism* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2003), 5, 25-26.

¹¹⁷ Edward Said, "Knowing the Oriental," 31-32.

conceptions surrounding the use of othering transformed the German understanding of the other through the fusion of symbolic politics, the escalating use of military power and an increasing emphasis on racial attributes as a marker of empire. These events were chosen as they represent some of the clearest examples of how othering was introduced into German imperialism as well as how it impacted the various stages of the development of German imperialism. This thesis will therefore use speeches, paintings, foreign policies, other forms of political imagery and finally intellectual sources expressing the merits of empire to reveal how the articulation of imperial aspirations through the use of racialized representations of the other combined with the perceived threat of dissolution by imperial rivals resulted in the radicalization of German imperialism and ultimately the violence and bloodshed of Nazi imperialism.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁸ Baranowski, *Nazi Empire*, 4.

Chapter 1: Unity Through “Blood and Iron:” Bismarck, The Unification of Germany and the Construction of an Imperial German Identity

Otto von Bismarck was born in 1815 to Karl Wilhelm Ferdinand von Bismarck, an eccentric country landowner and Wilhelmina Louise Menchen, the daughter of the Prussian Royal Cabinet Chancellor, Anastarius Ludwig Menchen. Bismarck’s career started in 1847 with his entry into the Prussian Landtag (Parliament) where he gave his maiden speech outlining his political priorities, attacking Prussian Liberalism and the assertion that it was the driving force behind the Prussian uprising against Napoleon in 1813. Specifically, he attacked the claim of the Prussian liberals that every element of Prussian society had risen up in revolt against Napoleon’s domination.¹¹⁹ He also disregarded the liberal nationalist notion of a German popular uprising against the French (Gallic) occupation as portrayed in Johann Gottlieb Fichte’s work, *Address to the German Nation*, with its racial overtones and argument that the “free” people of Germany rose to end Napoleonic French rule in Germany.¹²⁰

Instead, Bismarck argued that the campaign against Napoleon was not a war of liberation having anything in common with the above-mentioned concepts. He asserted that it was the king and Junker aristocracy that had liberated Prussia, directly contradicting the liberal viewpoint as well as placing himself within the ranks of the Prussian Ultra Conservatives in the Landtag. In this speech he also displayed his disinterest in the “pursuit of empire,” something he would use later

¹¹⁹ Jonathan Steinberg, *Bismarck: A Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 13.

¹²⁰ Johann Gottlieb Fichte, “Addresses to the German Nation” (1807/08), (Accessed on 16/10/2017). http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=3596

as part of his program of “diplomatic imperialism¹²¹” to achieve Germany’s imperial goals.¹²² As such, during the beginning of Bismarck’s political career, his focus was on preserving the position of the Prussian monarchy and the resisting of any change to the political system maintained in Central Europe by the Russian, Prussian and Austrian governments under the Holy Alliance.

However, Bismarck’s political views as well as his interest in imperialism began to change following the 1848 revolutions and Prussia’s brief support of the liberal nationalist movement sweeping across Germany as well as the resulting intervention of Russia in Germany and Hungary.¹²³ Bismarck explains this in his memoirs by underscoring that it was during the political and social upheaval caused by the revolutions that he became aware of how the competing interests within the Holy Alliance as well as *the Concert of Europe* could be manipulated to Prussia’s benefit. He does this by accusing the Prussian King, Frederick Wilhelm IV, of “neglecting the favorable opportune[ities] of ... 1848.” He argues that “Prussia was the only {state} that remained on a firm footing” during the various uprisings in Germany and that if Frederick Wilhelm IV had ordered his troops to crush the brief uprising that occurred in Berlin, Prussia would have been able to unite Germany in a “stricter form” than what was actually achieved in 1870.¹²⁴ The

¹²¹ An informal form of imperialism created by Otto von Bismarck that was focused on the cultivation of German political influence over the foreign policies of the other European great powers over the incorporation of foreign territories into Germany. For more information see, James Stone, “Bismarck and the Great Game: Germany and Anglo-Russian Rivalry in Central Asia, 1871-1890,” *Central European History*, Vol 48, No.2 (2015), 152 and Richard von Kühlmann, ‘Germany’ in *The Foreign Policy of the Powers: France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Soviet Russia, The United States*, et al. Hamilton Fish Armstrong, (New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1970, originally published 1935), 36-37.

¹²² Otto Von Bismarck, *Bismarck: The Man And The Statesman, Being The Reflections And Reminiscences of Otto Prince Von Bismarck* Vol 1., trans. A.J. Butler (London: Smith, Elder, &CO, 1898), 76-78.

¹²³ Bismarck, *Bismarck: The Man And The Statesman* Vol 1, 32.

¹²⁴ Bismarck, *Bismarck: The Man And The Statesman* Vol 1, 44-45.

period of 1848 through the early 1850's was therefore the first instance where Bismarck began to consider German unification as the goal of Prussian imperialism.¹²⁵

Following the 1848 revolutions as well as the Crimean War, Bismarck began to reject his earlier support of Prussian Ultra Conservatism and its focus on the position of the Prussian monarchy. He began to express his support for an aggressive form of Prussian imperialism within Germany, arguing that German unification had to become the central focus of Prussian imperialism through the exploitation of the growing hostility between Austria and Russia following the Crimean War. He did this by emphasizing to Germany's political classes that Prussia was the only "German" state capable of defending Germany's "national" frontiers. This marks the first instance of othering within Prussian/German imperialism as Bismarck subsequently embraced the *Klein Deutschland* argument with its exclusion of Austria and its empire from the unification of Germany as outlined in the Eisenach Declaration of the National Association which was published in 1859.¹²⁶ This shift towards support for imperial expansion in Germany is very important to understanding Bismarck's softening position and the gradual racialization of the use of othering to achieve the imperial goals of Prussia. It reveals that above all else, Bismarck was *Urpreusse* or essentially Prussian, a political opportunist dedicated to the strengthening of the Prussian crown's prestige and power. This softening viewpoint was therefore an evolution of his earlier views discussed above as he came to believe that the position of the Prussian monarchy could only be maintained and strengthened through Prussia's absorption of Germany.¹²⁷

¹²⁵ Bismarck, *Bismarck: The Man And The Statesman* Vol 1, 46-50.

¹²⁶ "Eisenach Declaration of the National Association" (1859), (Accessed on November 18, 2017). http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=240.

¹²⁷ Edward Crankshaw, *Bismarck* (London: Macmillan London Limited, 1981), 3.

This viewpoint is also essential to understanding Bismarck's imperialism as it reveals the other key aspect of Bismarck's life that factored into his decision to construct his own form of imperialism, his position as a Junker noble. The Junkers were the aristocracy of Prussia, whose political and social power had been gained from Frederick the Great's decision to maintain the feudal system known as the *Rittergüter*¹²⁸ in exchange for their agreeing to provide military and administrative service to the Prussian crown. This is critical to understanding Bismarck's slow embracing of imperialism as well as his introduction of othering. Bismarck clearly saw himself as a Junker and therefore saw Prussian territorial expansion in Germany, as well as the exclusion of Austria from a united Germany, as a more favourable means of strengthening the position of the Prussian crown versus the attempts of the Ultra Conservatives to maintain the political status-quo that had existed in the German confederation prior to the 1848 revolutions.¹²⁹

The introduction of othering into Prussian/German imperialism was implemented by Bismarck as a political tool that could be used to manipulate the fraying politics of the *Concert of Europe* but more importantly, the Russian dominated Holy Alliance. He did this by exploiting Russia's growing hostility towards Austria as a result of its mobilization of troops against Russia at the end of the Crimean War. Using his knowledge from his time as the Prussian ambassador to Russia in the late 1850s/early 1860s where he had gained a deep understanding of Russia's views on European diplomacy, its own foreign policy goals within the European political system

¹²⁸ The hereditary former Polish agricultural estates of the Teutonic Knights

¹²⁹ Erich Eyck, *Bismarck And The German Empire* (New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1968),12.

as well as how the Tsarist government hoped to achieve these goals, he began the process of isolating Austria.¹³⁰

Bismarck achieved this isolation through what became known as the Alvensleben Convention. Named after the treaty's architect General Gustavo von Alvensleben, the Prussian military attaché with the Russian army in Poland, the treaty called for the Prussian and Russian armies to assist one another anywhere along their shared former Polish border in the suppression of the Polish revolt. It directed the commanders of each army to contact one another for assistance if the rebels they were pursuing appeared to be attempting to cross the border into the other's provinces.¹³¹ In effect, Alvensleben's purpose was to rattle the Prussian sabre and ensure that the Russians continued to do the same in the face of increasing criticism from the other major powers, including Austria.¹³² Although this agreement quickly forced Bismarck to backtrack by claiming that the treaty was never ratified due to the anger it aroused against Prussia amongst the other great powers, it also proved very beneficial for Bismarck in his reorientation of Prussian imperialism towards a German centered focus. As Bismarck himself states in his memoirs, "it was simple common sense" to support Russia's repression in Poland as it forced Russia to take a non-interventionist policy in Germany, thereby strengthening Prussia's eastern frontier while also preventing any Russian intervention in Prussia's attempts to expand its position in Germany.¹³³ The treaty allowed Bismarck to portray Prussia as Russia's only friend

¹³⁰ Edgar Feuchtwanger, *Bismarck* (London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2002), 62.

¹³¹ Robert H. Lord, "Bismarck and Russia in 1863," *American Historical Review*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Oct 1923): 28.

¹³² Lord, "Bismarck and Russia in 1863," 26.

¹³³ Otto von Bismarck, *Bismarck: The Man And The Statesman, Being The Reflections And Reminiscences of Otto Prince von Bismarck*, Vol 2., trans. A.J. Butler (London: Smith, Elder, &CO, 1898), 342.

in Europe, earning him the Tsar's gratitude and friendship as well as an obligation from the Tsar to remain neutral in any future conflict between Austria and Prussia.¹³⁴

The catalyst of this agreement was that during the period 1864-66, Austria's position as the major German power in the German confederation as well as Europe became increasingly challenged as Bismarck sought to use the question of national unity to isolate and provoke Austria towards war.¹³⁵ Bismarck started this process by drawing Austria into another nationalist war against Denmark in 1864 over the duchies of Schleswig-Holstein. Using the Danish government's efforts to incorporate the duchies into Denmark proper, which it was forbidden from doing due to the 1852 *Convention of London*, Bismarck manipulated Austria into backing a Prussian led German nationalist war against Denmark and its perceived "Danishization" of the German majority province of Holstein.¹³⁶ For Bismarck then, the war was entirely about prestige. Not only did the resulting German allied victory restore the reputation of the Prussian army but it also forced Austria to acknowledge Prussia as an equal power in Germany by compelling it to support Prussia as the leading power in the campaign. It also forced Austria to commit to and defend a "German strategy" as the supposed leading German power, something the resource limited Habsburg monarchy could not afford.¹³⁷ As Edgar Feuchtwanger argues, the purpose of Bismarck's engagement of Russia and his provoking of Austria were all about beginning the process of the Prussianization of Germany as Bismarck's early imperialism was not as he claimed

¹³⁴ Lord, "Bismarck and Russia in 1863," 24.

¹³⁵ Volker Ullrich, *Bismarck: The Iron Chancellor* (London: Haus Publishing, 2008, originally published 1998), 62.

¹³⁶ C. Grant Robertson, *Bismarck* (London: Constable and Company, Ltd, 1918), 1918.

¹³⁷ Robertson, *Bismarck*, 173.

in 1865 about “merging Prussia into Germany but of submerging Germany into a Greater Prussia.”¹³⁸

However, supporting the nationalist desire for war with Denmark also had another impact on furthering Bismarck’s use of othering to achieve Prussia’s imperialist foreign policy goals. It put Austrian and Prussian imperial objectives regarding Germany into conflict with one another and started the process of the racialization of the other. Whether he actually wanted to use these conflicting objectives to start the eventual war that resulted from this is unclear. What is clear is that Bismarck wished to use the increasing friction that resulted from this contact between the two powers to Prussia’s advantage, probably in the form of forcing Austria to accept Prussian hegemony over northern Germany with the additional acknowledgement that this would possibly require war between the two states to achieve it.¹³⁹ Bismarck’s imperialism from 1864-1866 was therefore designed around a “diplomacy of alternatives” as Bismarck now sought to capitalize on Austria’s reluctance to sever the new partnership between itself and Prussia in Germany, seeking through negotiation or if required, military means to extract a heavy price from Austria for Prussia’s continued good will.¹⁴⁰

What Bismarck failed to consider in his development of this imperialist strategy was the preference of the Austrian monarchy to resort to war if it felt its possessions were being threatened. As the British Foreign Secretary, Lord Clarendon, asserted to the British Ambassador to Prussia, Lord Augustus Loftus, “Austria would rather face war than the humiliation which

¹³⁸ Feuchtwanger, *Bismarck*, 36.

¹³⁹ Otto Pflanze, *Bismarck and the Development of Germany: Vol 1, The Period of Unification, 1815-1871* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990). 254-266.

¹⁴⁰ Pflanze, *Bismarck and the Development of Germany*, 241.

Prussia seeks to inflict... a disastrous war is better than a voluntary disgrace.”¹⁴¹ As such in 1866, Bismarck was forced to conclude that war between Prussia and Austria over supremacy in Germany was unavoidable, with war being declared in early July, 1866.¹⁴² However, the war soon became one of Bismarck’s biggest imperial gambles, a conclusion that Bismarck himself was aware of as he declared to the British Ambassador (Lord Loftus) that “the struggle will be severe, Prussia may lose but she will, at all events, have fought bravely and honourably. If we are beaten, I shall not return here. I shall fall in the last charge. One can but die once and if beaten, it is better to die.” This fatalistic view became even more prevalent as Bismarck and his entourage followed the Prussian king to the various command posts as the Prussian army advanced into Bohemia (Czech Republic). This viewpoint is clearly seen in the description of the Prussian advance into Bohemia from Silesia by Heinrich von Abeken, a German theologian and Privy Legation Councillor in the Prussian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He describes in his memoirs how:

Prince Friedrich Karl met us on the battlefield, a little way from a village, where the shattered walls, burnt houses, trampled fields, dead horses and arms accoutrements scattered about, and even the bodies of the dead presented a sad spectacle. I never thought I should ever see a battlefield at such close quarters.....I should not have thought Austria was [so] un-German and so unknightly. Even foreign countries (The Times) find it undignified. Even Italy thinks so and is ashamed. Have no anxiety, With God’s help we shall fight it out..... The peacefulness of the country through which we drove was touching; there was not a sign of war and we proudly said to ourselves how differently it would have looked had it been one hundred thousand Austrian soldiers marching through Prussian territory. We are proud and thankful. Our soldiers behave in an exemplary manner.¹⁴³

¹⁴¹ “Lord Clarence to British Ambassador Lord Augustus Loftus” (March 16, 1866), (Accessed on Oct 25,2017). http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=1815

¹⁴² Heinrich Abeken, “Letter to his wife, July 1 1866” in *Bismarck’s Pen: The Life of Heinrich Abeken, edited From His Letters and Journals by his Wife*. Trans. IRS. Charles Edward Barrett-Lennard and M.W. Hoper (London: George Allen & Company Ltd, 1911),213-214.

¹⁴³ Abeken, “Letter to his wife, July 1 1866,” 215-217.

These statements are significant in the context of this thesis as they shed new light on Bismarck's famous assertion that the Prussian-Austrian rivalry was a "serious contest, a contest which could only be settled by "blood and iron."¹⁴⁴ Instead of being merely an attack on the German liberal nationalist demands for the unification of Germany built around the concept of *Gross Deutschland*,¹⁴⁵ it may have instead been an expression of Bismarck's disdain for Austria's competing aspirations in Germany. It may have reflected his belief that Prussia could not survive as a great power if it did not expand into Germany, enabling it to take an equal or superior position to Austria in Central Europe.¹⁴⁶ Bismarck had previously suggested that Prussia use Austria's limited military and financial resources against its position in Germany, arguing that Prussia needed to exploit this weakness either through a diplomatic agreement or (if necessary) on the battlefield. As such, Bismarck's statement of German unification by "blood and iron" did not refer to, as has been commonly assumed, to Bismarck's use of war to unify Germany but instead the use of the Prussian army to define Germanness, an extreme form of othering that Bismarck used to define German identity.¹⁴⁷

Prussia's victory over Austria in 1866 at Königsgrätz reveals several key aspects of the functioning of early Bismarckian imperialism and its use of othering to achieve the goals of its creator. Specifically, it reveals how the Prussian victory in 1866 became the defining event of German identity, imposing Bismarck's own interpretation of *Klein Deutschland* onto it. This is clearly demonstrated by Article II of the Peace of Nikolsburg signed on July 26, 1866, which

¹⁴⁴ Bismarck, *Bismarck: The Man And The Statesman* Vol 1, 312.

¹⁴⁵ A united Germany that includes the German speaking regions of Austria. Will later be modified by German nationalists to include the German speaking regions of the Balkans, the Baltic and the Ukraine.

¹⁴⁶ Bismarck, *Bismarck: The Man And The Statesman* Vol 1, 74-84.

¹⁴⁷ Pflanze, *Bismarck and the Development of Germany* Vol. 1, 292.

declares that the imperial government in Vienna consented to the dissolution of the German confederation that had existed since 1815 and to the formation of a new German entity under Prussian control. However, in terms of this thesis, what is most significant is the explicit exclusion of the “Empire of Austria” from this new political entity. In essence, with this passage, Austria was declared to be “not German”¹⁴⁸ with a non-German identity.¹⁴⁹ Prussian imperialism under Bismarck defined German unity and identity as Prussian in origin, militaristic and most importantly, membership that was defined by the union of all Germany except Austria.¹⁵⁰ Austrian identity became something separate, an enemy of German unity that had been removed by the Prussian sabre at Königsgrätz.¹⁵¹

The unification of Northern Germany under Prussian rule following the 1866 war was therefore portrayed by Bismarck as the natural and justified ambition of Prussian imperialism in Germany. Austria was now seen as different, non-German, an obstructionist weakened state determined to undermine the unification of Germany at all costs.¹⁵² The war with Austria in 1866 is significant to the development of German imperialism as it marks the first instance where the use of othering was used to implement an imperial goal, in this case the elimination of Austrian influence from Germany and the submersion of Germany into a greatly expanded Prussian empire. As a result, Bismarck successfully introduced a highly militaristic form of othering into

¹⁴⁸ This term has been used deliberately due to its later meaning under the Nazis. Its use is intended to reveal the evolution of the term’s meaning within the development of Germany imperialism from Bismarck to Hitler. It is meant to show how Hitler used older political terms such as this term to provide political and social legitimacy to his own form of imperialism.

¹⁴⁹ “Preliminary Peace of Nikolsburg” (July 26, 1866), (Accessed on Oct 27, 2017).
http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/docpage.cfm?docpage_id=2807

¹⁵⁰ Gordon A Craig, *Germany: 1866-1945*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 3.

¹⁵¹ Pflanze, *Bismarck and the Development of Germany* Vol.1, 292.

¹⁵² Bismarck, *Bismarck and the Development of Germany* Vol 1, 292-297.

Prussian/German imperialism by using it to not only secure his domestic political position but also by creating an enemy (Austria) which had not existed prior to his accession to power. It is important to note here though that the representation of the other during this early phase of the use of other was strictly political in nature. Austria was portrayed by Bismarck and his allies as a political enemy first with racial identity serving as a justification within Bismarckian imperial policy. Therefore, what is significant about this early phase of Bismarckian imperialism and its use of othering is that it set a precedent of using racial identity as a justification for military expansion and conquest as part of the expansionist agenda of the newly unified, Prussian dominated, Germany.¹⁵³

Following Germany's unification in 1871, Bismarck was confronted with the major impacts of this precedent, particularly its impact on the internal functioning of Prussian/German imperialism. The 1866 war with Austria had resulted in Prussia's relationship with the other German states being decisively tilted in its favour. Dubbed the *KulturKampf* (cultural war), this internal political conflict soon exposed the consequences of Bismarck's use of othering to unify Germany as well as his imposing of a Prussian dominated German identity on the rest of the German states. It revealed the uncertainties and insecurities that remained unsolved following the proclamation of the German Empire in 1871, exposing Bismarck's creation as an unstable hybrid form. This form was created by uniting elements of representative politics with the authoritarian traditions of the Prussian state through the use of othering and the concentrated violence of war.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵³ "Lord Clarence to British Ambassador Lord Augustus Loftus" (Accessed on Oct 25,2017).

¹⁵⁴ Liulevicius, *The German Myth of the East*, 98-101.

The conflict began the process of the racialization of the use of othering shortly after the unification of Germany in 1871. It started with Bismarck attempting to use the authoritarian elements of the imperial government to suppress what he saw as the subversive intersectional identities within German society. He argued that these elements gave foreign powers influence over German politics, in this case the Catholic Church and other Catholic powers such as Austria and France. It arose from Bismarck's assumption that he could use the new German interest in imperial expansion to consolidate the "new" Prussian dominated image of German identity but this assumption quickly backfired as the *KulturKampf* intensified, multiplying into several localized conflicts that became increasingly bitter. In particular, Bismarck had underestimated the dismay that many non-Catholic German nationalists felt over Bismarck's refusal to incorporate Austria's German population into the newly formed empire as well as the cultural aversion of a repudiated religious minority to the assimilationist designs, national exuberance and spirit of triumphalism that characterized Prussian/German imperialism shortly after unification in 1871.¹⁵⁵

The *KulturKampf* began on December 10, 1871 with the enactment of the "pulpit law," an amendment to the German penal code that stated if any cleric or other minister were to discuss state affairs in public, they would face up to two years in prison. Although, Bismarck argued that the law was strictly for the protection of the separation of church and state within the German government, the law was quickly recognised as an attack on the independence of the Catholic Church in Germany as Bismarck asserted that the freedom of the Catholic Church

¹⁵⁵ Ronald Ross, *The Failure of Bismarck's Kulturkampf: Catholicism and State Power in Imperial Germany, 1871-1887* (Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1998), 5.

allowed for undue foreign influence over German politics and culture.¹⁵⁶ This impression was soon strengthened by the enactment of the “School Inspection Law” on March 11, 1872 which placed all schools under state control, eliminating the Catholic Church’s educational independence that it had previously enjoyed. The law attacked the church’s ability to appoint staff for the public schools it operated throughout Germany under the guise of destroying any perceived foreign influence on German culture within the German education system.¹⁵⁷ The inspection law was then followed up with the “Anti-Jesuit Law” that was enacted on July 4, 1872. This law represented the most direct attack on the church itself as it declared that all religious orders associated with the Papacy were to be banned from operating in Germany as they were now considered to be foreign agencies operating within Germany’s borders.¹⁵⁸

As such, these laws were clearly aimed at the intersectional nature of the south German cultural identity that stood in contrast to the Prussian influenced German identity that dominated the northern regions of Germany after 1866, revealing that Bismarck was again using othering against other Germans to strengthen Prussia’s new dominance over the other German states. The representation of the other was therefore shifted by Bismarck from a strictly political outlook to one that included racial identity. Bismarck saw these laws and their use of othering as a means of dissolving south German identity and replacing it with the newly constructed Prussian

¹⁵⁶ “Pulpit Law” (December 10, 1871),” (Accessed on November 16, 2017). http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=669

¹⁵⁷ “School Inspection Law” (March 11, 1872), (Accessed on November 16, 2017). http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=670

¹⁵⁸ “Anti Jesuit Law” (July 4, 1872), (Accessed on November 16, 2017). http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=1837

dominated German identity discussed above.¹⁵⁹ However, Bismarck greatly underestimated the impact of these repeated attempts to use othering to achieve his political goals. The actual implementation and interpretation of these laws varied widely throughout Germany with many officials in the southern states choosing not to enforce them and even within Prussia, the enforcement of these laws varied greatly between regions, demonstrating the divisiveness of these policies.¹⁶⁰ In addition to this divisiveness, there was the more serious impact of the militarization of German identity in which othering and its links to the increasing debate over the traits of Germanness became the central focus of the *KulturKampf*.¹⁶¹ This was the result of Bismarck's and others within the new German intelligentsias' desire to project the image of a national state in which "the unity of Germans was stressed and national frontiers took on a new significance owing to the mobilization of the principle of nationality."¹⁶²

In doing so, the focus of the *KulturKampf* shifted away from the dissolution of south German identity to questions of empire, expansionism and racial identity on Germany's eastern frontiers as well as the status of the Polish and Jewish populations living there.¹⁶³ Demonstrating the lasting impact of this shift even after the official end of the *KulturKampf* in 1878, Bismarck gave a speech in 1886 reflecting on the use of "blood and iron" to unify Germany as well as to forge a Prussian dominated form of German identity. In it, Bismarck reflects on the perceived

¹⁵⁹ "Bismarck Tells the British Ambassador that Germany has Achieved its Legitimate Objectives" (February 11, 1873), (Accessed on November 16, 2017).

http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=1853

¹⁶⁰ "School Inspection Law" (March 11, 1872), (Accessed on November 16, 2017).

http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=670

¹⁶¹ Richard Wagner, "What is German?" (1865/1878), (Accessed on November 16, 2017).

http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/docpage.cfm?docpage_id=2537

¹⁶² Liulevicius, *The German Myth of the East*, 100.

¹⁶³ Liulevicius, *The German Myth of the East*, 100.

fragility of German identity, claiming that this was the result of Polish acts of defiance in Germany's eastern provinces, particularly Posen and West Prussia. He asserted that the "Polish Question"¹⁶⁴ was weakening Germany's eastern frontiers as it represented an opportunity for "foreign entities" to exploit Germany's internal divisions.¹⁶⁵

Describing it as a "irresistible call to arms," Bismarck sought to portray the *KulturKampf* as his attempt to remove these internal divisions through the imposing of a single national identity on Germany's various ethnic groups, an act seeking to remove France's ability to enact revenge on Germany for its defeat in 1870, declaring that " a Polish army would always be worth a French [army] corps on the Vistula."¹⁶⁶ In the face of his first major political defeat, Bismarck sought to use othering to salvage his political reputation by portraying the *KulturKampf* as a mechanism of the state that he enacted to remove a supposedly subversive element from German society. This cemented the impression within German imperialism that the newly united Germany would not only be a German empire but an empire of the German race, creating a fear of subversion from "the enemy beyond the enemy" and an obsession with the removal of that enemy.¹⁶⁷

By this time, the racialization of the use of othering by local officials in Prussia's eastern provinces began to transform the struggle over the character of the new German identity as represented by the *KulturKampf* (Protestant north vs Catholic south) to a racial struggle on Germany's eastern frontiers between Germanism and a supposedly militaristic Polenism.

¹⁶⁴ The argument for Polish independence

¹⁶⁵ "Bismarck's Speech to the Prussian House of Deputies on the "Polish Question" (January 28, 1886), 2-3, (Accessed on November 17, 2017). http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/docpage.cfm?docpage_id=2888

¹⁶⁶ "Bismarck's Speech", 5, (Accessed on November 17, 2017).

¹⁶⁷ Baranowski, *Nazi Empire*, 3.

Bismarck argued that German-Polish leaders were attempting to erode the German character of Prussia's eastern provinces through a program of "Polenization" designed around increased Polish birthrates in all German-Polish districts.¹⁶⁸ This is the moment where the gradual racialization of the other began to take shape along with the German obsession with the East, resulting in the belief that there were veiled threats within the population of the new nation state, creating the origins of the Nazis' ideological and highly racialized fear of the hidden enemy lurking within the shadows of the wider German population.¹⁶⁹

As such, the *KulturKampf* in Prussia's eastern provinces marks the juncture at which the dehumanization of the other within German imperialism began to take shape as prominent figures within German politics and culture began to advocate for the suppression of perceived subversive foreign elements within German society. As a result, this is the moment that modern forms of anti-Semitism are seen for the first time in German political discourse, an example of which is Wilhelm Marr's, *The Victory of Judaism over Germandom*, published in 1879. In it, Marr laments on what he sees as a "Germanic apathy" that he claimed had allowed the Jews in Germany's eastern provinces to "corrupt all society with its views." He continues by stating that Judaism had "driven out any kind of idealism [taking] possess[ion] [of] the controlling position in commerce, infiltrat[ing] increasingly into state offices, ...the theater... and finally has left [us] little more than the hard-manual labour that it always despised... in short, Jewry lords [victory] over [the Germans] today." It is important to note however that Marr's extremely racialized form of othering remained on the sidelines of German intellectual culture until it was popularized a few

¹⁶⁸ "Bismarck's Speech", 5, (Accessed on November 17, 2017).

¹⁶⁹ Pflanze, *Bismarck and the Development of Germany: Vol II*, 204.

months later by the work of Heinrich von Treitschke, a German philosopher and historian. This popularization started on November 15, 1879 with his pronouncement that the “Jews are our misfortune” which was intended to incorporate the eastern *KulturKampf*’s racialized othering of Germany’s eastern minorities into German imperialist theory.

Von Treitschke incorporated the *KulturKampf*’s repression of non-Germans and its flirtation with modern anti-Semitism in Germany’s eastern provinces as well as the efforts of the Polish and Jewish populations to resist Bismarck’s Germanization program into a wider narrative. He argued that the resistance of these populations to these efforts constituted a conspiracy of the Polish and Jewish elite to swamp German civilization in a massive human flood. Combining the influx of Jewish refugees fleeing the pogroms¹⁷⁰ in the Russian Empire with the Junkers’ growing fear of rising Polish birth rates in Prussia’s eastern provinces, he declared that “year after year, out of the inexhaustible Polish cradle, there streams over our eastern border, a host of hustling, pant peddling youths whose children and [whose] children’s children will someday command Germany’s stock exchanges and newspapers...” bringing with them a “benighted contempt against the German goye [that] is in no way merely the attitude of an isolated [few].”¹⁷¹

His pronouncement highlights how the growing desire expressed by the *KulturKampf* for a unified national identity led to an increasing racialization of those deemed to be the other. It reveals how Bismarck’s imposed image of German identity through “blood and iron” had created

¹⁷⁰ Large scale anti-Jewish riots which occurred multiple times throughout the nineteenth century.

¹⁷¹ Heinrich von Treitschke, "The Jews are Our Misfortune" (November 15, 1879), Accessed on January 23, 2019. http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=1799

a crisis of identity and a growing obsession with the elimination of perceived foreign elements from within German intellectual culture, which is clearly seen in von Treitschke's statement that:

“What we have to demand of our Israelite fellow citizens is simple: they should become Germans. They should feel themselves, modestly and properly, Germans – and this without prejudicing their faith and their ancient, holy memories, which we all hold in reverence. For we do not want to see millennia of Germanic morality followed by an era of German-Jewish hybrid culture... The influence of Jewry on our national life, which created much good in earlier times, nowadays shows itself in many ways harmful.”

This conclusion is further supported by Richard Wagner's essay, *What is German*. In the essay, Wagner questions what it means to be “German,” asserting that “it was predestined for the German spirit to seize and [eliminate] the foreign, the primarily remote from it in utmost purity and objectivity of intuition” so that the “German spirit arrive[s] at a capacity of restoring the purely-human itself in its pristine freedom [and existence].”¹⁷² The end result of this increased focus on racial cohesion marks a major shift within Prussian/German imperial policy which had previously focused on maintaining a population loyal to the Prussian monarchy regardless of racial or religious background. The *KulturKampf* in Prussia's eastern provinces marks the beginning of a gradual shift within the use of othering away from a purely political representation of the other to a representation of the other that was based on an individual's racial identity and the traits associated with that identity which over time slowly led to the dehumanization of the minorities residing in Prussia's eastern provinces.¹⁷³ It should be noted however, that at this early stage of the racialization of the use of othering, Germanys' Jewish population was simply

¹⁷² Richard Wagner, “What is German?,” (Accessed on 16/11/2017). 2.

¹⁷³ Giles MacDonough, *Frederick the Great: A Life In Deed And Letter* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1999), 319. Also see Liulevicius, *The German Myth of the East: 1800-present*, 38.

regarded as one of many smaller minority populations that needed to be assimilated into the wider German national identity that had been established by Bismarck.

As such, the *KulturKampf* quickly exceeded even Bismarck's ability to control its narrative as it became obsessed with the "othering of the internal," an attempt to purify Germanism through a removal of any element deemed "foreign."¹⁷⁴ The *KulturKampf* turned into an "internal imperialism" aimed at achieving the national cohesion and triumph of German culture that was deemed lacking in Bismarck's unification of Germany between 1864-1871.¹⁷⁵ It became an "internal preventative war" conceived by Bismarck as a means of using othering to manipulate German national sentiment to support the crafting of a policy conceived in the interest of the Prusso-German state whose themes of racialization quickly became embedded within the still developing German imperialism.¹⁷⁶

Germany's internal politics were not the only element of German society that experienced the influence of Bismarck's continued use of othering after German unification in 1871, as it also began to subtly influence Germany's imperial foreign policy. This was the result of increasing demands of Germany's new upper middle industrialist classes for the new nation state to showcase its military and economic might on the global stage through the acquisition of colonies. This represented a serious challenge for Bismarck as Germany lacked a colonial past to justify the military, political, economic and cultural expenses associated with the establishment of colonies as well as the totally changed political climate within the *Concert of Europe* following

¹⁷⁴ Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire*, 172-173.

¹⁷⁵ Baranowski, *Nazi Empire*, 13.

¹⁷⁶ Pflanze, *Bismarck and the Development of Germany: Vol II*, 208.

German unification.¹⁷⁷ Bismarck was forced to balance the competing desires of Germany's political and industrial classes to acquire colonies as a means of enhancing the wealth and virtues that had (in their opinion) made Prussia into Germany with the political realities of great power politics following German unification.¹⁷⁸

This new desire of Germany's industrialist classes is clearly seen in the petition submitted in 1867 by Friedrich List, the founder of the *Zollverein*.¹⁷⁹ While this document was crafted before Germany's official unification in 1871, it still provides a valuable insight into the motives of those pushing for Germany to develop colonies. In the petition, List asserts that colonies were needed as a "grand" demonstration of the national, economic and political might of the newly enlarged Prussian state. He calls for the foundation of German colonies through the concentrating of German overseas emigration to establish the supremacy of the German language and overlordship over large segments of South America, Africa and the Pacific. This was to be completed, he declared, through the use of a violent ruthlessness as he asserted that "with unification... we are done with the sanctity of the principle of nationality that bans [the Germans] from ruling over other races."¹⁸⁰ It is important to note though that at this stage of German unification, Bismarck was totally disinterested in overseas imperialism, even remarking in 1873 to the British ambassador that Germany had no desire for further expansion in Europe or to

¹⁷⁷ Craig, *Germany*, 5-7.

¹⁷⁸ Arthur J Knoll, 'Introduction' in *The German Colonial Experience: Select Documents on German Rule in Africa, China and the Pacific 1884-1914*, et al Arthur J Knoll (Lanham and Plymouth: University Press of America, 2010), xii-xiii.

¹⁷⁹ German customs union that is regarded as one of the reasons for Prussia's success in uniting Germany

¹⁸⁰ Friedrich List, 'The North German Federation and the Colonial Question' in *The German Colonial Experience: Select Documents on German Rule in Africa, China and the Pacific, 1884-1914*, et al. Arthur J. Knoll (Lanham and Plymouth: University Press of America, 2010), 5-6.

engage in the global imperialism that was quickly coming to define the foreign policies of the other European great powers.¹⁸¹

These dueling desires soon resulted in various voluntary associations being formed to advocate and lobby for the acquisition of colonies by Germany. One of the most active as well as most vocal of these groups was the *Society for German Colonization* founded by the German adventurer and avid colonialist Karl Peters which demanded that a “colonial policy be pursued in order to [demonstrate] the power of the new German empire.” To do this, the society began using race and racialized representations of othered non-Europeans to justify the supposed economic advantages of colonization to raise awareness amongst a German public that up until 1879-1884 had shown little interest in colonies or colonialization. This desire to use concepts of race to raise awareness is seen in the founding manifesto which lamented that:

as soon as the German emigrant has left the borders of the Reich behind him, he is a stranger on foreign territory. The German empire, mighty and strong through a unity won by blood, has become the leading power on the European continent but everywhere her sons have to adapt to nations that are either indifferent or even hostile to ours. For centuries, the great stream of German emigres has become assimilated into foreign races and disappears within them....Germandom outside Europe is constantly in [a state] of national decline.

The society argued that colonization was the next step in reforming German identity by declaring that a new German “global” imperialism was needed with three main priorities at its core.¹⁸² These three priorities included 1) the acquisition of appropriate colonial capital, 2) the finding or purchasing of suitable territories for colonization and 3) the directing of German

¹⁸¹ "Bismarck Tells the British Ambassador", 1, (Accessed on November 17, 2017).

¹⁸² Society for German Colonization, *Founding Manifesto* (March 28, 1885), (Accessed on November 17, 2017). http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=667

emigration to these areas.¹⁸³ As such, this manifesto reveals an important aspect of the functioning of German imperialism and the place of racialized othering within it. It reveals how the use of othering slowly became a prominent component of imperial German society by revealing how the use of the developing advertising industry was used by groups such as the above-mentioned colonial society to draw awareness to their cause. It reveals how the imagery of the other was transformed by these groups to facilitate “the means by which representation and commodity could be and would be more tightly bound together,” demonstrating how the colonial society used advertising to craft a visual representation of their main priorities listed above by the construction of a “visual experience” that looked to distant shores for its main protagonists.¹⁸⁴

The manifesto, which was published and advertised across Germany, was meant to showcase to the German people the perceived need to reverse the “centuries of oversight and to prove to the world that the German [race] ha[d] inherited not only ancient imperial glory from [their] forefathers but also their old national spirit.” The use of advertising used the visuality of race and empire to broaden the appeal of imperialism and the establishment of colonies to a perceived disinterested German public as well as sceptical senior officials through the placing of othered “dark” figures in precarious positions promoting colonial merchandise.¹⁸⁵ These associations further entrenched the use of racialized othering as a political tool by relying on these othered figures to present theories of overseas exploration and conquest, the German

¹⁸³ *Founding Manifesto, 2*, (Accessed on November 17, 2017).

¹⁸⁴ Ciarlo, *Advertising Empire*, 26.

¹⁸⁵ Ciarlo, *Advertising Empire*, 2.

obsession with the imperial successes of Britain, a fascination with primitiveness and the exaggeration of racial differences as the markers of empire.¹⁸⁶

However, this increased reliance on these criteria by German colonialists to win support for their cause reveals another important aspect of the functioning of German imperialism during the Bismarckian period, the lack of an official doctrine of empire which continued throughout both the Bismarckian and Wilhelmine periods of German imperialism.¹⁸⁷ The main reason for this was Bismarck himself, as he had expressed disinterest in acquiring colonies for the new German state. As he explained to the British ambassador, he believed that colonies represented a “cause of weakness because colonies could only be defended by powerful [battle]fleets,” which the newly united Germany could not politically afford to build in the increasingly hostile environment of great power politics after 1870. Instead, Bismarck argued that Germany’s global presence could remain small by relying on the British fleet to protect German shipping and economic interests outside Europe.¹⁸⁸ Bismarck’s view on imperialism was also shared by key members of the German Reichstag (national parliament). This included Ludwig Bamberger, a leftist liberal who was a personal opponent of Bismarck. When Bismarck attempted to soften his opposition on global imperialism due to the efforts of the colonialists, Bamberger orchestrated a majority vote against the acquisition of colonies. In doing so, he attacked the colonial ambitions of the society mentioned above as a “temptation,” declaring that the costs were “too high” and that “colonial policy is replete with blood, rubble and casualties [through which]... the individual

¹⁸⁶ Ciarlo, *Advertising Empire*, 11.

¹⁸⁷ John Lowe, *The Great Powers, Imperialism and the German Problem, 1865-1925* (London and New York: Routledge, 1994), 74-75.

¹⁸⁸ “British Tells the British Ambassador”, 1, (Accessed on November 17, 2017).

enterprises would reveal much more harm than good” for both the colonizers and the colonized.¹⁸⁹

As a result, from the early 1860’s until 1884, Prussia/Germany did not participate in the early rush by the other major European states as well as the United States to establish colonies beyond the maintenance and advancement of exploitive trade agreements with China and the various Pacific islands.¹⁹⁰ However, this began to change with Bismarck’s adaption of what he termed a “pragmatic imperialism” in 1884.¹⁹¹ This imperialism was organized around the basis of an economic nationalism in which “the protection of the flag” was given to German companies who possessed exclusive trading rights, mainly in Africa and the Pacific. Bismarck combined this economic nationalism with his diplomatic web of balanced antagonisms to ensure that if any imperial action was to be taken by one of the other major European powers, they had to seek the opinion of the German government first. As a result, this “pragmatic imperialism” was centered around two key points, the geographic location of Germany between Russia in the east and Britain in the west as well as the need for Germany to ensure that both powers remained on peaceful terms. It was therefore designed to prevent a coalition between Britain and Russia or any of the other major powers that could threaten Germany’s position in Europe.¹⁹²

¹⁸⁹ Ludwig Bamberger, “The Reichstag Rejects any Colonial Engagement, 1880” in *The German Colonial Experience: Select Documents on German Rule in Africa, China, and the Pacific, 1884-1914, et al*, Arthur J. Knoll (Lanham: University Press of America, 2010), 12-13.

¹⁹⁰ Helmuth Stoecker, “The Historical Background,” 14-16.

¹⁹¹ “Bismarck on “Pragmatic” Colonialization” (June 26, 1884), (Accessed on November 20, 2017), 1. http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=1868

¹⁹² “The Nightmare of Coalitions”: *Bismarck on the Other Great Powers*, (1879/1898), (Accessed on November 20, 2017), 1. http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=1855

Unfortunately for Bismarck though, while Russia was already ensnared within his alliance system, Britain refused to engage in European affairs as it was not focused on European political issues but on the continuing development of its empire.¹⁹³ On top of this, with the other major powers following Britain's lead in the development of their own empires, Bismarck was forced to reverse his previous dismissal of imperialism to begin establishing German colonies. To do this, Bismarck incorporated a subtle form of political othering into German foreign policy that would have a lasting effect on German imperialism by adding an othered component to *die Grosse Politik*.¹⁹⁴ It was designed to secure Germany's perceived dominance within this conceptualization of great power politics while also protecting the specific form of German identity established in 1866 by Bismarck's use of "blood and iron."¹⁹⁵

One of the best examples of this subtle use of political othering by Bismarck is the events that led to the establishment of German protectorates over modern day Cameroon, Togo and South West Africa (Namibia). To achieve his goals of drawing Britain into his system of diplomatic imperialism, Bismarck had started in 1885 to cautiously define his actions as the protecting of German commercial interests through the declaration of German protectorates over large areas of coastal West Africa. Bismarck appointed General-Consul Gustav Nachtigal to oversee the establishment of German protectorates over the region.¹⁹⁶ To help Nachtigal in his task, Bismarck

¹⁹³ William Stearns Davis, *Europe Since Waterloo: A Non-Technical History of Europe From The Exile Of Napoleon to the Treaty Of Versailles, 1815-1919* (London: Leonard Parsons, 1927), 11-14.

¹⁹⁴ A German term translated as great power politics. Influenced by social Darwinism, it refers to a concept of great power politics in which the major powers are thought to be in a struggle for survival.

¹⁹⁵ Fritz Stern, *Gold and Iron: Bismarck, Bleichröder and the Building of the German Empire* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977), 306.

¹⁹⁶ "Bismarck's Appointment of General-Consul Gustav Nachtigal to Place Certain Coastal Areas under German Protection, May 19, 1884," in *The German Colonial Experience: Select Documents on German Rule in Africa, China and the Pacific, 1884-1914*, et al. Arthur J. Knoll (Lanham: University Press of America, 2010), 29.

also authorized a small number of troops as well as gun boats to assert German control in the region. However, Bismarck resorted to using othering to achieve his goals after Nachtigal reported violence against German traders in the region which he claimed were caused by ambitious British colonial officials attempting to cause hostility between Germany and Britain in order to further their careers.¹⁹⁷

On February 22, 1884, after hearing reports that various chiefs in the Little Popo region of Togo were revolting after being encouraged by British colonial officials operating from Britain's colonies on the Gold coast, Bismarck sent a German commander, Captain Slubenrauch, to assert German military control over the region. Slubenrauch soon reported that he had sent a force of 100 men to the region where they had crushed the unrest, arrested all chiefs that were determined to have been supporting the British claim to the region and concluded a treaty of protection with the remaining chiefs against Britain. Bismarck justified these actions by using othering to portray the aggressive behaviour of the British colonial officials operating from the Gold Coast as an act of subversion meant to confine Germany's economic development to the European continent and to deny it the prestige of the colonialization of the region.¹⁹⁸

A similar policy was also used against the British in Southwest Africa (Namibia). This is seen in the official telegrams between Bismarck and the British government as well as colonial officials in South Africa. Until Bismarck's actions, the British had discouraged the colonialization of this region by other European powers due to its location near Britain's Cape Colony but it was

¹⁹⁷ "Request of the Kings and Chiefs of Togo" in *The German Colonial Experience*, 31.

¹⁹⁸ "Request by the Kings and Chiefs of Togo for a Treaty of Protection" in *The German Colonial Experience: Select Documents on German Rule in Africa, China and the Pacific, 1884-1914*, et al. Arthur J Knoll (Lanham: University Press of America, 2010),31.

forced to admit by Bismarck that “England exercise[d] no jurisdiction [north of the Orange River] and is also not in the position, in the area in question, to guarantee anyone protection.”¹⁹⁹ To achieve this result, British colonial officials were portrayed as feared colonial overlords, a threat to not only German commercial interests but also as a threat to the continued existence of the sovereignty of the “primitive negros.”

Bismarck attempted to justify Germany’s emergence as a colonial rival to Britain by portraying the struggle with Britain as an action meant to ensure a competitive colonial market through the granting of German “protection.” The actions of Britain’s colonial officials and the supposed inability of the British government to control these actions were represented as a serious threat to Germany’s position as a global power, allowing Bismarck to reverse his earlier position on colonies by claiming that they were necessary as a bargaining chip against British indifference towards Germany by forcing Britain to engage with it on the acquisition of colonies.²⁰⁰ The problem with this system however, was that it antagonized Britain by bringing Germany’s imperial ambitions into conflict with Britain’s own colonial interests with little political or economic benefit to Germany. Bismarck regarded Germany’s new colonies as nothing more than diplomatic bargaining chips that could be discarded if it forced Britain into some sort of diplomatic agreement.²⁰¹ As a result, this system and its use of othering reveals Bismarck’s general lack of interest in the acquisition of empire and that as long as Bismarck controlled

¹⁹⁹ “Bismarck to the German Consul in Cape Town” in *The German Colonial Experience: Select Documents On German Rule in Africa, China and the Pacific, 1884-1914*, et al. Arthur J. Knoll (Lanham: University Press of America, 2010), 28. Also see Bismarck to the German Embassy in London, April 24, 1884.

²⁰⁰ Xu Qiyu, *Fragile Rise: Grand Strategy and the Fate of Imperial Germany, 1871-1914*, Trans. Joshua Hill (Cambridge: Belfer Center Studies in International Security, 2017), 11-12.

²⁰¹ Xu, Qiyu, *Fragile Rise*, 12.

Germany's imperial policies, the supremacy of the racialized other within German imperialism was not assured.²⁰²

Bismarck had only introduced the use of othering into German imperialism in order to achieve the *Klein Deutschland* argument of German unification. He saw it as a political tool that could be used to strengthen the position of the Prussian crown through the manipulation of the fraying politics of the *Concert of Europe* and the Russian dominated Holy Alliance. It allowed him to isolate Austria and defeat it while also defining German identity. As such, the Prussian victory at Königgrätz became a defining moment in German imperialism as the Prussian army was used to define Germanness, allowing Bismarck to assert that Austria was non-German, an obstructionist force standing in the way of German unification.

As has been seen in this chapter, the consequences of this use of othering to define German identity were quickly exposed following final German unification in 1871 with the start of the *KulturKampf*. Seen by Bismarck as a means of dissolving south German identity, Bismarck assumed that he could continue to use othering to consolidate Prussian control over Germany. However, it quickly backfired as the *KulturKampf* splintered into regional representations of the "foreign," shifting away from its original intent of the absorption of south German identity into the Prussian dominated north German identity and questions surrounding the secular nature of the state to questions of empire, expansion and national identity.²⁰³

²⁰² Xu Qiyu, *Fragile Rise*, 10-13.

²⁰³ Birthe Kundrus, "From the Periphery to the Center: On the Significance of Colonialism for the German Empire" in *Imperial Germany Revisited: Continuing Debates and New Perspectives*, et al. Sven Oliver Müller (New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2011), 258-259.

As a result, the *KulturKampf* exceeded even Bismarck's ability to control it as it splintered into several smaller regional *KulturKampfs*, resulting in a growing obsession with the othering of the internal and the slow dehumanization of Germany's eastern minority populations. From this perspective then, the *KulturKampf* resulted in an internal imperialism aimed at achieving the national cohesion that was deemed to be lacking after the military victories of 1866 and 1871. This led to a gradual racialization of the representation of the other by local Prussian officials in Germany's eastern provinces and thereby revealing the early manifestation of the later Nazi efforts to dehumanize and eliminate the perceived racial enemies of Germany in the East. These themes soon influenced Germany's external ambitions as Bismarck sought to use them as an outlet for the imperial ambitions of Germany's political and industrial classes that had arisen as a result of the splintering of the *KulturKampf*, revealing the extent to which the use of othering was influencing the formation of German imperial society. It is important to note though that during the Bismarckian and to some extent the Wilhelmine periods of German imperialism, no official doctrine of empire existed. This was mostly a result of Bismarck himself, however as will be seen in the following chapters, this created the conditions necessary for the foundation of the Nazis' ideological imperialism as it inspired increasingly complex models of social order based on hierarchy and race amongst Germany's ruling classes.²⁰⁴ Bismarck's imperialism marks the beginning of the racialization of German imperialism as the use of othering became a defining characteristic of his regime's understanding of the scramble of empire. It created a structure which provided the new German state with a show of force on the outside but which on the inside remained unstable with a tendency to disintegrate when confronted with the toxic mix of

²⁰⁴ Kundrus, "From the Periphery to the Center," 258-259.

the wild desires of Germany's rising bourgeois classes combined with claims of absolute power over the supposed "other".²⁰⁵

²⁰⁵ Kundrus, "From the Periphery to the Center," 258-259.

Chapter 2: “We Demand Our Place in the Sun”: Wilhelm II, *Weltpolitik* and the Politics of Symbolism

The death of Wilhelm I in 1888 marked the beginning of the end of an era for both German imperialism as well as Germany itself. Under Bismarck’s leadership and his targeted use of othering, Prussia/Germany had achieved at least a fledging unity based on Bismarck’s imposed form of political, cultural and colonial identity. Although this unity came at the cost of the loss of Austria as a German entity, Prussian imperialism under Bismarck had, for the most part, achieved its objectives in Europe as well as internationally. The Prussian crown now presided over one of the 3 to 4 greatest world powers. The German army was recognized as one of the finest (if not the finest) in Europe. On top of this, rapid German industrial and population growth had created one of the fastest growing industrialized economies in Europe.²⁰⁶

This growth had resulted from the rapid expansion of German society as the population grew from 41 million in 1871 to 49.7 by 1891 and 65.3 million by 1911 based on a massive rise in live births and a dramatic reduction in the number of deaths during this period.²⁰⁷ This resulted in a major population redistribution change from a majority of the population living in rural, agricultural areas to a majority of the population living in urban industrial centers, which is seen in the explosion of the population of the city of Berlin, as it grew 150.7% between 1871 and 1910.²⁰⁸ These societal changes were matched by a massive increase in industrial production as

²⁰⁶ S.E. Ayling, *Nineteenth-Century Gallery: Portraits of Power and Rebellion* (London and Toronto: George G. Harrap & CO. LTD, 1970), 406.

²⁰⁷ “Population Growth in Large Cities” (1875-1910), (Accessed on February 17/ 2018,) 1. http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=644.

²⁰⁸ “Population Redistribution” (1871-1910), (Accessed on February 17, 2018), 1, http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=632.

it increased fivefold in the years 1870-1914.²⁰⁹ The combined result of this was that by the end of Bismarck's reign, new working and industrial classes had quickly begun to transform German society.²¹⁰ The ambitions of these new groups began to affect German imperialism and its use of othering as large portions of these new social classes increasingly demanded that Germany demonstrate its new economic and military power. Despite these increasing social challenges however, from 1871 until 1890, Bismarck's dominating influence over German imperialism constrained the imperial ambitions of these new classes, creating the illusion of stability within German imperialism and its use of othering.²¹¹

The result of this was that with Bismarck's dismissal in 1890, the use of othering was expanded as attempts were made by Bismarck's successors to strengthen the unity of the new "German" nation state through imperial conquest. However, instead of strengthening the process of nation building, these renewed attempts at imperial expansion further divided German society due to the proliferation of competing, overlapping but also mutually exclusive national ambitions along with an increasing racialization of representations of the other during the Wilhelmine period.²¹² It created a society based on a volatile mix of ambition and dread within the German public sphere, resulting in German imperialism being viewed as a means to create domestic stability through foreign conquest.²¹³ This led to a radicalization of Bismarckian imperialism's goals and objectives as an "imperial ideology" became the basis of a new German

²⁰⁹ "Industrial Growth" (1870-1914), (Accessed on February 17, 2018), 1. http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=638.

²¹⁰ "Census Figures" (1882-1907), (Accessed on February 17, 2018), 1. http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=653.

²¹¹ Ayling, *Nineteenth-Century Gallery*, 406

²¹² Stefan Berger, *Germany* (London: Hodder Arnold, 2004), 96-97.

²¹³ Baranowski, *Nazi Empire*, 4.

imperialism in response to the social and political challenges caused by the development of the new and dynamic society discussed above.²¹⁴

This process intensified further in 1890 with the dismissal of Bismarck and the creation of a “national” monarchy and empire by Wilhelm II, who sought to portray the monarchy as a national symbol that represented the interests of the whole German nation.²¹⁵ This development was the result of a combination of the changing society discussed above and Wilhelm’s desire to use the monarchy as a national unifying symbol. As a result, German imperialism began to lurch between the desires for the construction of a colonial empire, the accumulation of global power and a racialized concept of great power politics in which there could only be one winner.²¹⁶ The monarchy under Wilhelm became envisioned as the personification of the “imperial idea, an unceasing effort to create an image of the imperial throne as a political and symbolic [representation of the empire] in the minds of the German people.”²¹⁷ The German monarchy was therefore envisioned as a political as well as a spiritual entity, a framer of policy as well as a spiritual personification of the power of the German race.²¹⁸

Bismarck’s system of diplomatic imperialism based on collective self-interest and the targeted use of othering slowly gave way to the politics of symbolism and personal ambition, submerging the “rational” politics of self-interest beneath the politics of emotion, impulsive

²¹⁴ Thomas A. Kohut, *Wilhelm II and the Germans: A Study in Leadership* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 3.

²¹⁵ Berger, *Germany*, 98.

²¹⁶ John Breuilly, “Introduction” in *Nineteenth Century Germany: Politics, Culture and Society, 1780-1918* edited by John Breuilly, (London: Arnold, A member of the Hodder Headline Group, 1997), 10-11.

²¹⁷ Clark, *Iron Kingdom*, 595.

²¹⁸ Kohut, *Wilhelm II and the Germans*, 3.

reaction and publicly consumed political imagery.²¹⁹ Thus, the transformation of German imperialism in the late 1880's shifted from the targeted use of othering under the umbrella of Bismarck's diplomatic imperialism to the politics of symbolism. This transformation was dramatically represented in the shift in the style of leadership from the chancellery and Bismarck to the crown and Wilhelm II.²²⁰ Constantly at the mercy of the German public's perception of him, Wilhelm began adapting the use of othering to a global form of German imperialism under the label of *Weltpolitik*. This resulted in a shift in the world view of German imperialism as it increasingly interpreted the global competition for empire within the context of a racial struggle for survival. It became increasingly influenced by the personal whims of Wilhelm and his desire to ensure that the imperial policies of the monarchy remained "sensitive and responsive to the needs of [its] subjects."²²¹

Therefore, the use of othering was transformed under Wilhelm from a mere political tool of pragmatic politics to a symbolic representation of both Wilhelm's own personal power as well as the duelling desires of Germany's bourgeois and industrial classes for a colonial empire and the accumulation of global power.²²² As a result, under Wilhelmine imperialism, racialized representations of the othering became a spectre of violent struggle designed to "racialize the symbols of military, economic and social power within as well as outside the borders of Germany."²²³ What had been the improvisation and targeted unofficial use of othering by

²¹⁹ Kohut, *Wilhelm II and the Germans*, 128.

²²⁰ Kohut, *Wilhelm II and the Germans*, 128.

²²¹ Kohut, *Wilhelm II and the Germans*, 131-132.

²²² Breuilly, "Preface," x.

²²³ James Retallack, *Imperial Germany, 1871-1918: The Short Oxford History of Germany* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 202.

Bismarck in the 1880's became official public policy in the 1890s under Wilhelm. The tone of German imperialism changed as theories were advanced which proposed that the earth was divided between a few great imperial races leading to a worldview which held that those who did not participate in the imperial process would soon be eliminated.²²⁴ Consequently, Wilhelm attempted to place himself as well as Germany at the front of the emerging colonial movement. He sought to turn German imperialism and the use of othering from a targeted, European centered focus to a global imperialism seeking to turn Germany's colonies acquired by Bismarck into stepping stones towards a world empire highlighting the prestige and power of the German race.²²⁵

Due to this shift in imperial policy as well as outlook, the origins of the Nazis' ideological imperialism and the use of targeted violence against othered populations did not begin in Africa as commonly assumed by historians but in China. This "new course" of German imperialism began with the "triple intervention" in 1895 as Wilhelm insisted that Germany demonstrate its new aggressive foreign policy goals by joining with Russia and France in a joint intervention against Japanese military and economic gains in China, forcing Japan to give up the Liaotung Peninsula as well as territorial gains in Korea.²²⁶ Germany's intervention against Japan underscores the new political position of the German monarchy as Wilhelm directly intervened in German foreign policy, using highly racialized images of the other to realign German imperial policy in the Far East. Using the growing unease amongst the European great powers at Japan's

²²⁴ Golo Mann, *The History of Germany since 1789*, trans. Marian Jackson (New York and Washington: Praeger Publishers, 1968),

²²⁵ Mary Evelyn Townsend, *The Rise and Fall of Germany's Colonial Empire* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1930), 178-180.

²²⁶ Lowe, *The Great Powers, Imperialism and the German Problem 1865-1925*, 112-113.

rapid rise as a non-European great power, Wilhelm manipulated this unease, as well as the rising anti-Japanese and Chinese sentiment in Europe, to create an aggressive and racialized form of imperialism. He portrayed this manipulation as a crusade against the perceived barbarism and savagery of the Asian races to showcase the global military and economic power of Germany.²²⁷

This shift towards a racialized form of othering is clearly seen in letters sent from Wilhelm to the Russian Tsar (Nicholas II) discussing the triple intervention against Japan. In the first letter, Wilhelm states:

I thank you sincerely for the excellent way in which you have initiated the combined action of Europe for the sake of its interests against Japan... I shall certainly do all in my power to keep Europe quiet and also guard the rear of Russia so that nobody shall hamper your actions towards the Far East! For that is clearly the great task of the future of Russia to cultivate the Asian continent and to defend Europe from the inroads of the Great Yellow Race.²²⁸

He then continued to develop this theme in another letter to the Tsar:

Europe had to be thankful to you that you so quickly had perceived the great future for Russia in the cultivation of Asia and in the defense of the Cross and... Christian European culture against the inroads of the Mongol [race] and Buddhism, it is natural that if Russia was engaged in this tremendous work, you wish to have Europe quiet... you [are] fulfilling the great mission which heaven has shaped for you.²²⁹

For the Kaiser then, the focus on a racialized form of othering within German imperial policy was central to transforming Germany from a European into a world empire.²³⁰ These

²²⁷ Ayling, *Nineteenth Century Gallery*, 414.

²²⁸ Kaiser Wilhelm II, "Kaltenbronn Schwarzwald 16/IV 95" in *Letters From The Kaiser To The Czar: Copied From Government Archives In Petrograd Unpublished Before 1920*. Copied And Brought From Russia by Isaac Don Levine (New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company, 1920), 10.

²²⁹ Kaiser Wilhelm II, "Stora Sunday 10/VII 95" in *Letters From The Kaiser To The Czar: Copied From Government Archives In Petrograd Unpublished Before 1920*. Copied And Brought From Russia by Isaac Don Levine (New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company, 1920), 13.

²³⁰ George Steinmetz, *The Devils Handwriting: Precoloniality and the German Colonial State in Qingdao, Samoa and Southwest Africa* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2007), 426.

letters reveal how the Kaiser planned to revolutionize relations between the great powers in the Far East through a mixing of the symbolism of his perceived divine right to personal rule with the symbolism of race.²³¹ They demonstrate Wilhelm's desire to use the triple intervention to showcase to the other great powers that Germany was not only a European empire but a global power to be reckoned with.²³² As a result, Wilhelm infused German foreign policy in the Far East with a racialized conception of great power politics through which German imperialism in China became seen as a larger struggle between the "enlightened Christian civilization [of Europe] and the savage, outdated civilizations of China and Japan," notwithstanding that Japan was becoming increasingly westernized, engaging foreign powers in a European imperialist manner.²³³

These statements reveal how Wilhelm's conception of personal rule could influence German foreign policy and how they damaged Germany's position as Wilhelm often made statements directly contradicting his own government's official policy, damaging Germany's global position as it became seen as an aggressor ready and willing to occupy its place on the global stage at the expense of the existing international balance of power.²³⁴ This aggressive symbolism and the racialization of the other became even more apparent in 1897 with Wilhelm's ordering of the German navy's Far East Squadron to seize the Chinese port of Kiaochow and to establish a German economic and military protectorate over the city and the surrounding area. From the start, this action was completely about Wilhelm's desire to project the military and

²³¹ Lanxin Xiang, *The Origins of the Boxer War: A Multinational Study* (London and New York: Routledge Curzon, 2003), 53-54.

²³² Annika Mombauer, "Wilhelm, Waldersee and the Boxer Rebellion" in *The Kaiser: New Research on Wilhelm's Role in Imperial Germany*, et al. Annika Mombauer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 92.

²³³ Steinmetz, *The Devils Handwriting*, 429

²³⁴ Xiang, *The Origins of the Boxer War*, 55.

economic power of Germany on the world stage through the establishing of a beachhead at Kiaochow that was meant to be the beginning of a German conquest of the whole of China. It reveals a worldview completely and totally influenced by Wilhelm's own conception of the use of othering as Germany's ability to demonstrate this power was now seen through the lenses of *die Grosse Politik*, a racialized concept of great power politics.²³⁵ The increasing domination of this viewpoint is clearly seen in Wilhelm's comments in a telegram to the German Foreign Office sent on November 6, 1897. In it, Wilhelm expressed his determination to end what he declared to be the "hyper-cautious [Bismarckian] policy in East Asia and to demonstrate to the Chinese with the most brutal ruthlessness that {Germany} was not to be toyed with."²³⁶

As a result, after the murder of two German missionaries by a Chinese mob which was used as a call for action by Wilhelm and those closest to him, German battleships arrived in the Bay of Kiaochow outside the city with 500 troops being sent ashore the next morning.²³⁷ In the ensuing treaty that followed, China was forced to provide Germany with a 99 year lease over the Bay of Kiaochow and the surrounding entrances to the bay as well as governmental control over the city and 50 kilometers around it. Kiaochow became a military colony, a naval station dedicated to maintaining and strengthening Germany's growing influence in Asia as the lease forced the Chinese imperial government to surrender to Germany all "sovereign rights" in the leased area for the duration of the lease.²³⁸

²³⁵ Steinmetz, *The Devils Handwriting*, 430-431.

²³⁶ Kaiser Wilhelm II, Telegram from Kaiser to Foreign Office, Nov 6, 1897 in Lepsius, Mendelsohn, Bartholdy and Thime 1922-27, Vol.14, pg 1, pg 67.

²³⁷ Steinmetz, *The Devils Handwriting*, 434.

²³⁸ "An Unequal Treaty: The Lease Agreement between China and the German Empire" (March 6, 1898), (Accessed on February 12, 2018). http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=785

In terms of Wilhelm's personal use of othering, the treaty explicitly states that "his majesty, the German Kaiser, who wants Germany, like other powers, to have a place on the Chinese coast to repair and fit out ships, to store materials and supplies and to maintain other related facilities, [as such] his majesty the emperor of China shall lease both sides of the entrance to Kiaochow bay to Germany."²³⁹ This passage is significant in that it reveals how Wilhelm injected his own personal imperial objectives and his racialized view of the other into German imperial foreign policy by showcasing how Wilhelm's personal desire for the expansion of the German navy was portrayed as a matter of imperial survival in the Far East.²⁴⁰ It was a classic example of *Weltpolitik*, marking the adaption of an aggressive form of global expansion designed to conceptualize for a perceived skeptical German public a racialized world struggle that Germany had to participate in.²⁴¹

As German foreign minister and later chancellor, Prince Bernhard von Bülow, declared in his speech to the Reichstag²⁴² defining how the seizure of Kiaochow factored into the Kaisers foreign policy:

The strong states... grow ever stronger and the weak ones ever weaker... we have no desire to tread on the toes of any foreign power but by the same token, we do not want our toes trodden on either. And we do not want to be shunted aside by any foreign power in political or economic matters. Its time, high time for us... to consider the position we must adopt to the processes that are unfolding all around us, processes that bear the seeds of future power relations... to remain immobile on the sidelines, as we have done so often in the past, either from an inbred modesty or because we have been entirely absorbed by our own inner disputes or even because of doctrinarism (Bismarckian imperialism) to day dream on the sidelines while others take a slice of the pie. This we

²³⁹ "An Unequal Treaty," (Accessed on February 12, 2018).

²⁴⁰ Xiang, *The Origins of the Boxer War*, 65.

²⁴¹ Lowe, *The Great Powers, Imperialism and the German Problem 1865-1925*, 114-115.

²⁴² Defined as national parliament

cannot and will not permit. It is out of the question for the simple reason that we now have interests in all parts of the world. The rapid growth of our population, the unprecedented expansion of our industry... the phenomenal vitality of the German people have integrated us into international politics. If the British speak of Greater Britain, if the French speak of Nouvelle France, if the Russians move into Asia, we too have the right to a greater German [empire]... we cannot and will not tolerate a return to the status quo at the expense of the German [race].²⁴³

Bülow's speech reveals how Wilhelm's focus on personal rule and symbolic politics had transformed the use of othering from a targeted political tool into a loosely defined imperial ideology centered around a re-interpretation of Bismarck's use of othering combined with the Kaiser's racialized conception of global politics.²⁴⁴

The seizure of Kiaochow as well as the content of Bülow's speech demonstrate how *Weltpolitik* was transforming German imperial policy from its strictly controlled Bismarckian interpretation that used othering to slowly achieve specific objectives to a system that while still based on the same model, disregarded the cautious planning and execution of Bismarckian othering to a form of mass racialized othering. It highlights that imperial policy was now concentrated on achieving the symbolic benefits of a particular imperial action.²⁴⁵ As Stefan Berger has demonstrated, the seizure of Kiaochow and its representation of *der neue Kurs* of Wilhelmine imperialism, signify the moment when German imperialism was represented as a national calling. This marks the moment when the use of othering became an awareness of the categorization of different peoples according to race and culture, the moment when the

²⁴³ "Bernard von Bülow's "Dynamic" Foreign Policy" (December, 1899), (Accessed on February 15, 2018). http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=779.

²⁴⁴ Xiang, *The Origins of the Boxer War*, 64-65.

²⁴⁵ John E. Schrecker, *Imperialism and Chinese Nationalism: Germany in Shantung* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971), 26-27.

biological concept of the nation and racial hegemony became the central focus of German imperialism.²⁴⁶

This trend would continue in the immediate years following the seizure of Kiaochow, becoming the central focus of German imperialism in Asia which is seen in Germany's participation in the international effort to crush the Boxer rebellion in 1900. This focus on race as a marker of empire is clearly seen in Wilhelm II's speech at Bremerhaven on July 27, 1900. Commonly known as the "Hun Speech," the speech underscores how *Weltpolitik* became a mixture of Wilhelm's focus on symbolic politics, the use of othering and the increasing hegemony of the biological concept of the nation among German imperialists as a differentiator between the colonizers and the colonized.²⁴⁷ In it, Wilhelm declares to the departing troops that:

Great overseas tasks have fallen to the new German empire, tasks far greater than our countrymen expected. The German empire has, by its very character, the obligation to assist its citizens if they are being set upon in foreign lands. The tasks that the old Roman empire of the German nation was unable to accomplish, the new German empire is in a position to fulfill. The means that make this possible is our army... A great task awaits you: you are to avenge the grievous injustice that has been done. The Chinese have overturned the law of nations, they have mocked the sacredness of the envoy, the duties of hospitality in a way unheard of in world history. It is all the more outrageous that this crime has been committed by a nation that takes pride in its ancient culture. Show the old Prussian virtue. Present yourself as Christians in the cheerful endurance of suffering. May honour and glory follow your banners and arms. Give the whole world an example of manliness and discipline. Should you encounter the enemy, he will be defeated! No quarter will be given! Prisoners will not be taken! Whoever falls into your hands is forfeited. Just as a thousand years ago the Huns under their king Attila made a name for themselves, one that even today makes them seem mighty in history and legend, may the

²⁴⁶ Berger, *Germany*, 99.

²⁴⁷ Berger, *Germany*, 99.

name German be affirmed by you in such a way in China that no Chinamen, no matter whether his eyes be slit or not, will ever again dare to look cross-eyed at a German.²⁴⁸

Wilhelm's speech reveals how his use of fiery and chauvinistic rhetoric was used to clearly express his vision of German imperial power. It underscores that the use of racialized representations of the other to achieve imperial goals had been transformed by Wilhelm and his use of the symbolism of his exercising of his right to personal rule to express a new conception of imperial power based on race through which global politics became viewed through the lens of a relationship between the colonizers and the colonized.²⁴⁹ It reflects a world view in which colonial rule is "justified by reference to the racial [and moral] superiority" of the conquering race.²⁵⁰ Wilhelm's remarks reflect a reorientation of German imperialism in which violent militarism and the targeted use of violence became a stern symbol of the superiority of the white German race and culture. It exposes how Wilhelm's mixing of symbolic politics and the use of othering became an expression of Germany's increasing desire for the accumulation and demonstration of imperial power, a providing of an outward expression of Germanness while also reflecting the lingering anxieties surrounding Bismarck's imposed form of German identity.²⁵¹

However, another impact of Germany's seizure of Kiaochow was it revealed the growing reliance on demonstrations of military power to showcase the growing economic and military might of the German race. This increasing reliance is seen in the increasing importance of naval

²⁴⁸ Kaiser Wilhelm II, "The Hun Speech" (1900). http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=755. Also see Röhl, 69.

²⁴⁹ Suzanne Zantop, *Colonialism Fantasies: Conquest, Family and Nation in Precolonial Germany, 1770-1870* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997), 99.

²⁵⁰ Berger, *Germany*, 99.

²⁵¹ Arne Perras, *Carl Peters and German Imperialism 1856-1918* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004), 168.

power as a marker of global power and prestige within German imperial policy.²⁵² This shift in priorities is clearly seen in the correspondence of Rear Admiral Alfred von Tirpitz, the architect of the German High Seas Fleet, and a letter he wrote to the then senior commander of the German Navy, Admiral von Stosch, on the eve of Germany's seizure of Kiaochow. In it, Tirpitz laments Germany's lack of any substantial naval power, declaring that "our policies... build on the army as a genuine foundation [of world power], but the army only has a direct impact on our national [frontiers]. Beyond these [frontiers], it only has an indirect impact through the pressure exerted from here. Our politicians do not understand that in many cases the value of an alliance with Germany, even for the states of Europe, does not rest on our army but on our navy.... [England is] well aware of this. Up until now, our policies have completely overlooked the political significance of naval power... naval power is the only political versatile type of power there is."²⁵³

This letter reveals two significant developments within German imperialism, the gradual racialization of the other as well as Wilhelm's influence over both. Firstly, as mentioned above, this statement reveals how Wilhelm's infusion of symbolic politics influenced official policy as well as how it shaped the German public's changing attitude of what constituted imperial power. Tirpitz and the navy's other supporters clearly saw the battlefleet as a symbolic representation of Germany's global military and industrial power over an actual tool of war. For Tirpitz, the fleet's mission was to not only serve as a protector of Germany's global interests but also as a symbol

²⁵² A.G. Hopkins, "Overseas Expansion, Imperialism, and Empire, 1815-1914" in T.C.W. Blanning's, *The Short Oxford History of Europe: The Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford university Press, 2000), 216-217.

²⁵³ Rear Admiral Alfred von Tirpitz, "The Fleet and Anglo-German Relations: Rear Admiral Alfred von Tirpitz to Admiral von Stosch" (February 13, 1896), (Accessed on February 25, 2017). http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=791.

of Germany's global power and its ability to project its military and economic might on the world stage.²⁵⁴

However, this also leads into the second point revealed by the letter as the fleet was seen by Tirpitz but also Wilhelm as a symbolic means of breaking out of the perceived vise-like grip of Germany's main imperial rivals, Britain in the west and Russia in the east.²⁵⁵ As von Bülow asserted in a speech given before the Reichstag shortly after the seizure of Kiaochow, "The days when Germans granted one neighbor the earth, the other the sea, and reserved for themselves the sky, where pure doctrine reigns, those days are over."²⁵⁶ The imperial navy was therefore viewed as a bargaining chip that was two sided. As Tirpitz states in the letter, "If Russia and France were to oppose England on a matter, the support of our fleet is of little significance... we must bear in mind that England probably no longer believes we will send our army into battle against Russia for her benefit. On the other hand, if Germany is the one paying the price, England can make Russia considerable concessions, in East Asia, for instance."²⁵⁷

The use of othering was seen by both Wilhelm and Tirpitz as a means of justifying the costs associated with the construction of the German fleet. It was used to represent the fleet as a tool for breaking the vice-like grip discussed above which was now portrayed as a struggle for German imperial survival against British attempts to maintain their perceived dominance over global imperialism and what was seen as Russia's insatiable desire for conquest threatening

²⁵⁴ Scheck, *Alfred von Tirpitz and German Right-Wing Politics, 1914-1930*, 21.

²⁵⁵ Röhl, *Kaiser Wilhelm II*, 79.

²⁵⁶ "Bernard von Bülow on Germany's Place in the Sun" (1897), (Accessed on March 6, 2018.)
http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=783.

²⁵⁷ Tirpitz, "The Fleet and Anglo-German Relations", (Accessed on February 25, 2017).

Germany's eastern frontiers.²⁵⁸ This identification of Russia as a great threat to German civilization was part of a wider shift within Wilhelm's conception of the "yellow peril" that occurred over the period of 1890 to 1905. Over this period, the yellow peril's racialized conception of China and Japan as barbaric conquerors poised to swipe across the Asiatic steppes and destroy Europe's perceived advanced Christian civilization began to change, moving from a strictly Asian representation of the East to include an increasingly racialized fear of Russia and its empire.²⁵⁹

This process started shortly after Wilhelm dismissed Bismarck in 1890 with Wilhelm's support of the new chancellor's (General von Caprivi) decision to terminate the 1887 Reinsurance Treaty with Russia, which had been devised by Bismarck as a means of binding Russian imperial policy to Germany.²⁶⁰ The treaty had been designed to "strengthen the general peace [between the two great powers] by an understanding destined to assure the defensive position of their respective states." It did this by securing the neutrality of the other state should one of the signing powers be attacked by a third party, except if the attack involved military aggression against the other state's main ally, in this case France or Austria.²⁶¹ However, as many details of the treaty was secret, the full text of the treaty was not discovered by Wilhelm and the rest of the German government until after Bismarck's departure. The treaty's termination not only

²⁵⁸ Tirpitz, "The Fleet and Anglo-German Relations," (Accessed on February 25, 2017).

²⁵⁹ Alan Palmer, *The Kaiser: Warlord of the Second Reich* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1974), 57.

²⁶⁰ Palmer, *The Kaiser*, 57.

²⁶¹ "Secret Reinsurance Treaty with Russia" (June 18, 1887), (Accessed on February 26, 2017).
http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=1862.

reflects Wilhelm's own growing animosity towards Russia but also a growing general mistrust of Russia within the German government.²⁶²

This growing mistrust is seen in a memorandum sent by the undersecretary of the German Foreign Office, Count von Berchem, to von Caprivi on March 25, 1890. Declaring that the "treaty [was] extremely difficult to reconcile with the German-Austrian alliance," von Berchem displayed this mistrust of Russia by asserting that "the treaty allow[ed] the Russian [government] to determine when a future European war would begin. Given the present signs, it appears... likely that Russia, covered by Germany, will...strike soon."²⁶³ The termination of the treaty is significant to this thesis as it reveals how even early in Wilhelm's reign, Russia was already beginning to be seen as a racialized existential threat to German interests in Europe. It reveals how a racialized conception of the other was steadily becoming a structural feature of German imperial discourse. The treaty's termination therefore marks a generational shift within German imperialism towards the development of a "culture of empire."²⁶⁴

Thus, the use of othering within German imperialism became far less centralized as it had been under Bismarck, becoming prone to indirection as it became influenced by the constantly shifting priorities of Wilhelm as well as the ambitions of those around him. Russia was no longer seen as controllable or even an ally but a treacherous adversary and rival for global power. However, this shift also reflected the changing and dynamic society mentioned at the beginning of the chapter. Germany's growing middle and industrial classes were increasingly willing to

²⁶² Count von Berchem, "Terminating the Reinsurance Treaty with Russia" (1890), (Accessed on February 26, 2018). http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=778.

²⁶³ Von Berchem, *Terminating the Reinsurance Treaty with Russia*, (Accessed on February 26, 2018).

²⁶⁴ Geoffrey Wawro, *Warfare and Society in Europe, 1792-1914* (London: Routledge, 2000), 176.

express their enthusiasm for empire as the subjects of subjecthood and nationality became popular amongst these social classes. This popularity influenced German policy as various groups within the public sphere competed for the domestic political support of these classes. The increasing use of the politics of symbolism with its connections to Russia reveals how the use of othering within German foreign policy gained popularity within these new classes as they demanded that the German nation state demonstrate its new found military and economic power on the world stage.²⁶⁵

Evidence for this is clearly seen in the redefining of German conservatism following Bismarck's dismissal as it slowly embraced Wilhelm's harsh racialized conception of Russia and its empire. German conservatism had until this point maintained the view that Russia represented Germany's traditional ally since the defeat of Napoleon in 1815. However, it now increasingly embraced Wilhelm's belief that the Russians "were not faithful...[nor] monarchical,...[but] Republican at heart,... disguise[ing] their sentiments, ... lying, everyone of them, all the time"²⁶⁶ as German conservatism looked to defend its privileged position within German society from the growing domestic and international influence of the groups listed above. This is a key moment within the development of German imperialism as with the Kaiser's lack of a clear political agenda, German conservatism was forced to protect its privileged position within German society by embracing a racialized form of identity politics, providing the seeds for the future development of the Nazis' ideological imperialism.²⁶⁷

²⁶⁵ Clark, *Iron Kingdom*, 577.

²⁶⁶ Wilhelm II, *The Kaiser's Memoirs*, 63

²⁶⁷ Liulevicius, *The German Myth of the East*, 99

In the face of Germany's limited success in acquiring a global empire (mostly in China), the use of othering and its increasingly racialized conception of the other became a means of expressing the frustrations of not only Germany's imperialists but all of its political classes. It became the means of explaining to an ever-increasing domestic audience Germany's increasingly hostile attitude towards its powerful eastern neighbor.²⁶⁸ The new culture of empire and its use of othering represented an attempt at redefining Germany's historical relationship with the East, particularly Russia, in the face of a polarized domestic sphere. This attempt is clearly seen in the article, *Deutscher Kolonial Atlas. 30 Karten mit 300 Nebenkarten*, which was published in 1897 by Paul Langhaus. Seen in his second map, Langhaus attempts to portray Germany's historical interaction with the East as a colonial history in which human success on the Russian Steppes became a result of successive waves of German migrations into Eurasia.²⁶⁹ The term "German" therefore became a symbol of empire unto itself, turning Eastern Europe into a German colonial space.²⁷⁰

The use of othering was completely reshaped during the Wilhelmine period as "Germany's primary referent ceased to be [strictly] spatial." Langhaus's work reveals how the racialization of the other within German imperialism completely "[reshaped] the concepts of the "cultural nation," *die Kulturnation*,... [into a] internationalization of Deutschland [as] a spiritual entity for which all territorial if not spatial definitions [were] suspended."²⁷¹ The use of othering completely changed Germany's relationship with Eastern Europe from simply a place of

²⁶⁸ Clark, *Iron Kingdom*, 582.

²⁶⁹ Paul Langhaus, "Map 2" in *Deutscher Kolonial Atlas. 30 Karten mit 300 Nebenkarten* (Gotha: Justus Perthes, 1897), Nr 2.

²⁷⁰ Kopp, *Germany's Wild East*, 5.

²⁷¹ Kopp, *Germany's Wild East*, 17.

interaction between the German and Russian states to a racial struggle for supremacy in the East in which the Teutonic race was portrayed as being in a struggle for survival against a perceived “mongolization” by the Slavic race.²⁷²

The end result of this reshaping of the use of othering under *Weltpolitik* was about exposing the perceived deficiencies of Bismarck’s imposed form of German identity and redefining it as a global identity no longer limited by the national borders of 1871 in which one’s racial and cultural membership granted access to imperial power.²⁷³ However, the termination of the treaty mentioned above also had another important impact on German imperialism and the place of the use of othering within it. It demonstrated the new position of the monarchy as a national over Prussian symbol of unity and imperial power as well as its increasing ability to influence official policy. Under Bismarck and Wilhelm I, the position of the monarchy within the political system had been more symbolic than concrete with the actual political power to direct policy being in the hands of the chancellor, i.e. Bismarck. Wilhelm I had served as a “spectator,” a figurehead content to allow Bismarck to determine Germany’s imperial priorities. This was not the case with Wilhelm II who was determined to exercise his perceived divine right as the German Kaiser, to rule personally as well as personally influence German imperial policy. “He was the all-highest and in theory at least he was also the all powerful, [the] king of Prussia, [the] Emperor of Germany by divine right.”²⁷⁴

²⁷² Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire*, 319.

²⁷³ Hermann Schreiber, *Teuton And Slav: The Struggle for Central Europe*, trans. James Cleugh (London: Constable and Co. Ltd, 1961), 292-301.

²⁷⁴ Ayling, *Nineteenth Century Gallery*, 409-410.

As a result, Wilhelm increasingly began to assert his perceived authority over the use of othering, crafting his own foreign policy completely separate from that of the German Foreign Office, creating a dualism within German imperial foreign policy and ultimately undermining Germany's imperial policy towards Russia. Wilhelm's sporadic interventions injected a racialized conception of the other into German foreign policy, leading to the creation of increasingly racialized policies regarding Russia and Germany's relationship with it. This dualism was made worse by Wilhelm's personality, particularly his inability to form strong opinions of his own, which became a problem as Wilhelm surrounded himself with individuals who argued that the competing Russo-German imperial objectives represented a racial struggle for survival between the Slavic and German races. Wilhelm's conception of Germany's relationship with Russia was increasingly influenced by those advocating for a racialized, aggressive policy against Russian imperial objectives.²⁷⁵ As the Baron von Holstein²⁷⁶ declared, "It all depends on our Kaiser... everything depends on how [any given] plan is presented to him."²⁷⁷

Race became a marker of empire within German imperialism as Wilhelm infused his use of othering with his use of symbolic politics to define his own understanding of imperialism. This is clearly seen in Wilhelm's memoirs, where he links Russia to his conception of the Yellow Peril mentioned earlier in the chapter, describing it as a treacherous harbinger of warlike barbarism which is seen in his comment mentioned above which states that "the Slavs are not faithful, they

²⁷⁵ Liulevicius, *The German Myth of the East*, 88.

²⁷⁶ Head of the political department within the German Foreign Office as well as one of Germany's longest serving foreign policy experts.

²⁷⁷ Baron von Holstein, "Holstein to Paul von Hatzfeldt, Berlin, 12 April 1897" in *The Holstein Papers: The Memoirs, Diaries and Correspondence of Friedrich von Holstein: Correspondence, Vol 4.*, et al. Norman Rich (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 24.

are republicans at heart [and] disguise their sentiments [towards Germany] ... they lie, every one of them.”²⁷⁸ Wilhelm continues by attacking his government’s own foreign policy objectives regarding Russia, lamenting its inability “to meet... the cunning of Russia... with an equal decree of diplomatic skill.”²⁷⁹ Placing Russia within his conception of the Yellow Peril, he continues by declaring that Germany needed to prepare for a coming war to determine the fate of “Europe’s existence and culture,” a war in which he argued that Russia would forsake its imposed veneer of European civilization and side with the Asiatic “yellow man” and assault the defences of Europe.²⁸⁰

Wilhelm justified his growing interference in German foreign policy by asserting that an anti-German sentiment within Russian society was planning the destruction of Germany, dismissing the policies of his own foreign office as failing to see the coolness within elements of Russian society towards Germany.²⁸¹ For Wilhelm then, German imperial foreign policy was defined by the personal relationship between monarchs, a combination of symbolism and personal relationships through which Germany could gain dominance over Russia through the Tsar’s perceived weakness of character and his “worry” of war.²⁸² Within German foreign imperial policy, Wilhelm saw the use of othering as an instrument of propaganda meant to reveal Russia’s true objectives and its perceived racial inferiority.²⁸³

²⁷⁸ Wilhelm II, *The Kaiser’s Memoirs: Wilhelm II, Emperor of Germany, 1888-1918*, trans. Thomas R. Ybarra (New York and London: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1922), 63.

²⁷⁹ Wilhelm, *The Kaiser’s Memoirs*, 75.

²⁸⁰ Wilhelm, *The Kaiser’s Memoirs*, 80.

²⁸¹ Wilhelm, *The Kaiser’s Memoirs*, 16,80.

²⁸² Wilhelm, *The Kaiser’s Memoirs*, 80.

²⁸³ Kaiser Wilhelm II, “Dear Nicky: Jagdhaus Rominten, 26/ix 95” in *Letters From the Kaiser to the Tsar: Copied From Government Archives in Petrograd, Unpublished Before 1920*, et al. Isaac Don Levine (New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company, 1920), 17.

One of the best representations of this attitude is a painting commissioned by Wilhelm in 1898 entitled the *Yellow Peril*. It depicts the major states of Europe as ancient gods led by the archangel Michael on a ledge²⁸⁴ overlooking the plains of Russia watching as a great cloud with a giant flaming Buddha atop it sweeps across the Russian steppes.²⁸⁵ More important to this discussion though, is the position of the figure representing Russia in the painting as it is positioned looking towards the other powers while also being off to the side and at the back of the group of figures. The significance of this representation of Russia is that it was meant to be a representation of Wilhelm's view of Russia discussed above and how it was used to cement this view within the minds of the German public. It was meant to be a visual representation of Wilhelm's claim that Russia would forsake its superimposed European culture and society in favor of its Asiatic roots and would seek to destroy Germany as it was the gateway to Europe.²⁸⁶ The painting can be regarded as an expression of the increasingly racial aspects of German imperialism as well as Wilhelm's increasing influence over it.

The problem with this painting for the German government, as well as more indirectly Wilhelm, is that it also reveals the increasing lack of direction and leadership at the very top of German politics and imperialism. The painting does this by revealing how the defining of the use of othering and its place within German imperialism became a battle for influence over Wilhelm's thoughts between the more moderate elements of the German government and those arguing for a racialized and aggressively expansionist form of German imperialism. An example of this is

²⁸⁴ A representation of the "edge of Europe"

²⁸⁵ Niall Ferguson, *The War of the World: Twentieth Century Conflict and the Descent of the West* (New York: Penguin Books, 2006), 152.

²⁸⁶ Wilhelm, *The Kaiser's Memoirs*, 79.

provided by Wilhelm himself in another letter to the Tsar in which he directly contradicts his own form of foreign policy discussed above. In it, Wilhelm sides with the friendlier attitude of official German policy towards Russia, encouraging the Tsar to expand Russia's imperial actions in Asia against the Yellow Peril by stating that the archangel Michael was not sent to warn of Russian treachery but was "sent from Heaven to unite [the states of Europe] in resisting the inroads of Buddhism, heathenism and barbarism for the defense of the Cross. Stress is especially laid on the united resistance of all European powers, which [are] just as necessary...against our common internal foes, anarchism, republicanism [and] nihilism."²⁸⁷ As James E Casteel has shown, the painting became a visual showcase of how the use of othering had reshaped German identity as well as the concept of the monarchy within it through an increasing interaction with a global environment in which German imperial survival was seen through the lens of the accumulation of world power.²⁸⁸ It reveals how the concepts of the nation, empire and imperial prestige had become the central focus of German imperialism under Wilhelm. Russia and the East were seen by Wilhelm as well as his advisors as not only an imperial rival but also an enigma, a continental space with great possibilities for exploitation and conquest by an ever-expanding German empire.²⁸⁹

The painting reveals a key aspect of German imperialism of the Wilhelmine period. Wilhelm's exercising of his personal rule had infused German imperial policy with an "othered" perspective of global power as well as the creation of a toxic competition between the more traditional proponents of Bismarckian imperialism of the German Foreign Office and the

²⁸⁷ Wilhelm, "Dear Nicky, Jagdhaus, 26/ix 95," 17.

²⁸⁸ Casteel, *Russia in the German Global Imaginary*, 48.

²⁸⁹ Casteel, *Russia in the German Global Imaginary*, 56-57.

racialized conceptions of world power favoured by Wilhelm and his supporters in the German army and intelligentsia.²⁹⁰ The result of this competition within German imperialism and the increasing reliance on racialized representations of the other created a chaotic imperial policy as German foreign policy was dragged between the racialized conception of empire favoured by Wilhelm and the “diplomacy of alternatives” of the Bismarckian influenced foreign office. However, as Paul Kennedy has observed, “Bismarck’s dismissal in 1890 signified that [Wilhelm] would not tolerate such a concentration of decision-making power outside of the monarchy,” demonstrating how the political system of the German empire prevented any form of intervention.²⁹¹

The conflict over who controlled the use of othering became a defining aspect of German imperialism under Wilhelm as control was shifted from the chancellery to the monarchy, becoming the sole purview of the monarch as Wilhelm and his closest imperialist supporters used the top down precedent set by Bismarck to assert Wilhelm’s right to complete control over the use of othering and its representation of the other. None of the chancellors who followed Bismarck were ever able to completely form their own imperial policies nor were they ever able to fully utilize the use of othering to achieve the imperial goals of Germany or their imperial master. Von Bülow even pronounced that it was simply better to follow the Kaisers whims, steering him away from his greatest excesses and never taking his day to day pronouncements as “lasting principles.”²⁹²

²⁹⁰ Casteel, *Russia in the German Global Imaginary*, 48.

²⁹¹ Paul Kennedy, “The Kaiser and German *Weltpolitik*: Reflections on Wilhelm II’s place in the making of German foreign policy” in *Kaiser Wilhelm II: New Interpretations, The Corfu Papers*, et al. John C.G. Röhl (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 143.

²⁹² Kennedy, “The Kaiser and German *Weltpolitik*,” 154-155.

This struggle for control over the use of othering, its colouring of the Kaiser's political interference in German imperial policy and the resulting concentration of power at the top of the political system is clearly seen in an exchange between Wilhelm and his longest serving chancellor, von Bülow, which is presented as part of his memoirs. In it, Bülow relates how on February 14 1904, "[Wilhelm] appeared at a very early hour in the morning in my room. He seemed worried, almost unnerved." The dialogue between the two was then noted down by Bülow the same day and kept within his personal archive. It begins with the Kaiser stating that:

I hoped the worth of my letters would have persuaded the Tsar to proceed with [his] full strength against Japan. Instead...his attitude is as spineless as ever. He does not want to seem to fight. He is capable even of letting Japan have Manchuria without one blow of the sword... Such a turn of events must be avoided á tout prix.

Bülow then replies that "the surest way to make Russia conclude a premature and bad peace with Japan would be careless German encouragement to the Tsar..."

The Kaiser continues his argument by countering:

From the statesmen's standpoint you may be right. But my sentiments are those of a sovereign and as such, I feel the cowardly bearing of Tsar Nicholas [is] a disgrace to all [nations]. The Tsar compromises all great rulers with it.... The Tsar is damaging the [national] principle through his shilly-shattering. He must go to Moscow, call Holy Russia to war [and] mobilize his whole army, bearing the [sign of] the Cross at the head of it!

Bülow than states that Germany could not push Russia towards war too eagerly or it risked raising the suspicions of the Tsar as well as the other major European powers. Bülow then relates that Wilhelm brushed this advice aside and declared that:

Your arguments may be correct from the political point of view. But you overlook one enormous danger. I, as a sovereign, understand this better than diplomats, who usually consider only the present. This is the Yellow Peril, the greatest danger threatening the

white race, Christianity and our entire culture. If the Russians run away from the Japanese now, the yellow race will be in Moscow and Posen within 20 years.²⁹³

This exchange not only encapsulates themes discussed above but it also demonstrates the longer-term institutional weaknesses of Bismarck's imposed form of German identity and its connections to the use of othering, the development of German imperialism, and the racialization of the other. It reveals how these weaknesses became more acute during the Wilhelmine period as racial representations of the other were adapted to a new global form of German imperialism under the banner of *Weltpolitik*. This exchange reveals how the shift towards highly racialized representations of the other resulted in a reorientation of the world view of German imperialism. The Wilhelmine period marks the period where the global struggle for power became viewed as a racial struggle for survival as well as the period where this viewpoint created a crisis of the executive as Wilhelm ensured that the power and prestige associated with Bismarck's chancellorship now resided with the crown.²⁹⁴

The exchange underscores the new position of the monarchy as Wilhelm repeatedly interfered with and contradicted his own government's foreign policy positions. As such, during the Wilhelmine period, the use of othering and its use of increasingly racialized representations of the other became a means of legitimizing Wilhelm's semi-absolutist rule. The widespread use of othering enabled the creation of an imperial system in which the former Bismarckian system of imperialism gave way to a system constructed around one of arbitrary rule, sycophantic favouritism, strutting militarism and the politics of symbolism.²⁹⁵

²⁹³ Prince Bernhard von Bülow, *Memoirs: 1903-1909*, Trans. F.A. Voigt (London and New York: Putnam, 1931), 60-61.

²⁹⁴ Kennedy, "The Kaiser and German *Weltpolitik*," 104.

²⁹⁵ Röhl, *Kaiser Wilhelm II*, 41.

Instead of providing a new sense of purpose and direction to German imperial diplomacy, which Wilhelm and his closest advisors deemed to be lacking during the Bismarckian period of German imperialism, it only created more insecurity and confusion.²⁹⁶ Ironically, as has been seen in this chapter, far from enabling this increased sense of purpose and direction, it only served to further escalate this lost sense of direction as the Kaiser engaged in his own form of foreign policy completely independent of the official actions of his own foreign office.²⁹⁷ His arbitrary use of othering combined with his inability to form strong opinions of his own meant that in the years leading up to 1914, German imperialism increasingly lacked direction or a core set of objectives as it had under Bismarck. The use of othering within German imperialism became increasingly defined by Wilhelm himself as he united in his person the divided and often competing desires of Germany's imperialist classes. He was the youthful emperor seeking new global markets for German industry, the militarist glorifying in Germany's medieval past, desperately wanting to be a conquering as well as a wise, peaceful leader. To achieve these goals, Wilhelm adapted to and espoused a new racialized imperialism. Wilhelm's "personal" rule became centered around race as the determining factor of both the individuals as well as the nation's success. As such, during the Wilhelmine period of German imperialism, the use of othering and its growing reliance on racialized conceptions of the other became a justification for which nations became the colonizers and who became the colonized.²⁹⁸

Taken as a whole then, German imperialism under the influences of Wilhelm's "personal rule" became a toxic mixture of Junker conservatism and the increasing desire of Germany's new

²⁹⁶ Lowe, *The Great Powers, Imperialism and the German Problem 1865-1925*, 141-142.

²⁹⁷ Ayling, *Nineteenth Century Gallery*, 411-412.

²⁹⁸ Berger, *Germany*, 106-107.

imperialist classes to demonstrate its growing economic, cultural and military power on the world stage, creating the conditions necessary for the later acceptance of the Nazi concept of the *Führerprinzip*. As a result, this period is the stage in the development of German imperialism where the key characteristics of German self identity were established in opposition to the racialized other. Although the othered and racialized enemy beyond the enemy of the Nazi period had not yet been established, an imperial German identity was now clearly being presented by Wilhelm and his allies in opposition to an ill-defined othered enemy that had to be resisted at all costs.²⁹⁹

As a result of this development, the Wilhelmine period of German imperialism clearly marks the period where the most significant seeds of Nazism were developed as Wilhelm as well as his major allies' arbitrary use of racialized othering created the precedents needed for the later acceptance of Nazi imperialism. Starting with Wilhelm's othering of the Chinese and the subsequent actions of German troops in the seizure of Kiaochow and the suppression of the Boxer rebellion, the domination and repression of othered populations was increasingly linked by Germany's imperialists to conceptions of racial hierarchy as well as demonstrations of the military power of the nation state. This linkage therefore led to the construction of an imperial system based around a racialized conceptualization of Germany's membership as a world power, a growing fascination with the East as a German colonial space and demonstrations of the personal power of the executive as Germany's supreme leader through extreme acts of targeted violence. As a result, with the commencement and resulting bloodshed of the First World War,

²⁹⁹ Brons, "Othering, An Analysis," 71-72.

German imperialism would enter its final stage, the destructive ideological imperialism of the Nazis and its leader Adolf Hitler.³⁰⁰

³⁰⁰ Ayling, *Nineteenth Century Gallery*, 335-339.

Chapter 3: The Politics of Empire: Hitler, Ideological Imperialism and the Development of a German Continental Empire

If the Wilhelmine period of German imperialism marked the period when the most significant seeds of Nazi imperialism were developed, then the First World War and Germany's resulting defeat was the period where these seeds were planted. However, this development did not happen on the western front as is commonly assumed by historians but on the eastern front. The First World War marked a watershed moment for Germany's imperial ambitions in Eastern Europe, becoming marked by wild fluctuations between anxieties about the East and hopes of imperial glory through the conquest of large areas of Eastern Europe which were deemed to hold vast possibilities for exploitation.³⁰¹ While the western front became a brutal and bloody stalemate between the German and Entente armies of France and Britain, the eastern front became one of sweeping grand campaigns of conquest, occupation and domination between the perceived bearers of *Kultur* (Austria-Hungary and Germany) and the perceived barbaric, Asiatic empire of Russia.³⁰²

The war began as a result of the assassination of the Austro-Hungarian heir to the throne, Franz Ferdinand, in the Austrian administered Bosnian city of Sarajevo on July 28, 1914 by a Serbian nationalist. The assassination quickly set off a diplomatic chain reaction as Serbia requested Russia's assistance against Austria-Hungary, triggering the two major alliance systems that dominated European great power politics, the Triple Alliance and the Entente. This process

³⁰¹ Liulevicius, *The German Myth of the East*, 130-131.

³⁰² Troy R.E. Paddock, *Creating the Russian Peril: Education, the Public Sphere and the National Identity in Imperial Germany, 1890-1914* (New York: Camden House, 2010), 202.

began with the Russian Tsar's decision to order the mobilization of the Russian army on July 31, 1914 in response to Austria-Hungary's diplomatic and military threats against Serbia, one of Russia's few remaining allies in the Balkans. Russian mobilization was considered a redline for Germany since the enactment of the Schlieffen Plan in 1905 as the German General Staff became convinced that Germany could only achieve victory if it defeated France before the Russian army could fully mobilize. The result of the Russian mobilization was that on August 1, 1914, Germany felt compelled to declare war on both Russia and France.³⁰³

This decision was heavily based on the mechanics of Germany's plan to win the war. Dubbed the Schlieffen Plan after its creator, General von Schlieffen, the plan called for the majority of the German army to quickly attack and defeat the western members of the Entente (Britain and France) through an invasion of Belgium before turning east to fight against what was assumed to be a slowly mobilizing Russian army.³⁰⁴ The plan assumed that the vast distances of the Russian empire, particularly between population centers where reservists had to mobilize, combined with the scarcity of rail connections between these centers and the European frontier of the empire meant that plans for mobilization, measured in days by the German and Austrian armies, would take weeks for their Russian equivalent.³⁰⁵

As a result, the psychological mobilization of the home front was considered critical to Germany's ability to meet the plan's objectives to achieve victory. The use of othering through symbolic politics was therefore expanded from a symbol of the personal power of the Kaiser into

³⁰³ Baranowski, *Nazi Empire*, 69.

³⁰⁴ Alfred von Schlieffen, "The Schlieffen Plan" (1905), (Accessed on May 30, 2018).
http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=796

³⁰⁵ John Keegan, *The First World War* (Toronto: Vintage Canada, 1998), 138.

a tool of war designed to showcase to the German public that Germany was under attack.³⁰⁶ As Shelley Baranowski has asserted, the war became portrayed by the German high command as a defensive war against a artificial alliance of “the eastern despotism of Russia and the materialism of the western Entente powers of Britain and France.”³⁰⁷ The mobilization of the home front became seen as an opportunity for national regeneration through a renewed idealism, community solidary and individual sacrifice for the greater good.³⁰⁸

The war was portrayed by Germany’s political and military leaders as Russia’s fault. Russian mobilization was presented as a “dangerous playing with fire” in which a localized conflict was transformed into a global struggle for power.³⁰⁹ As historian Troy R.E. Paddock has shown, the prevailing perception within Germany was the “idea that Germany {had to} conduct the war as a *Kulturvolk*... because it was in direct alignment of the German conception of Russia” which was that a “war fought on behalf of Russia [was] a war against civilization.”³¹⁰ This perception was contrasted against French and Russian attempts to portray the war as a result of Germany and Austria-Hungary’s desire to create a “world conflagration.”³¹¹ A hatred of all things German was portrayed as an integral part of French and Russian imperial ambitions in Central and Eastern Europe.³¹² As such, events on Germany’s eastern front in the first weeks of August 1914 proved to be pivotal to German war propaganda’s representation of the other and its attempt to mobilize

³⁰⁶ Anna von der Goltz, *Hindenburg: Power, Myth, And The Rise Of The Nazis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 15.

³⁰⁷ Baranowski, *Nazi Empire*, 69.

³⁰⁸ Roger Chickering, *The Great War and Urban Life in Germany: Freiburg, 1914-1918* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge, 2007), 72-73.

³⁰⁹ “Rußland eröffnet den Krieg,” *Kölnische Zeitung*. (August, 1914)

³¹⁰ Paddock, *Creating the Russian Peril*, 188.

³¹¹ W.E Mosse, *The Crisis of German Identity: Intellectual Origins of the Third Reich* (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1981), 231.

³¹² Paddock, *Creating the Russian Peril*, 190.

the population by portraying the war on the eastern front as a defensive war against the perceived barbarism of Russia.³¹³

The reason for this is that while German armies numbering one and a half million men swept into Belgium and northern France to achieve the fatal blow envisioned in the Schlieffen plan, Germany's frontiers with Russia were left lightly defended in a calculated risk. Unfortunately for Germany though, Russia mobilized much faster than Schlieffen and the other members of the German General Staff expected, launching an invasion of East Prussia with two armies totalling 650,000 men in support of the beleaguered French army facing the massive German attack on the western front.³¹⁴ The Russian invasion was based off the strategic plan of the Russian High Command, The *Starvka*, which envisioned a scenario through which one army would hold the German forces in place while the other army maneuvered and attacked the German flanks. Should the Germans stand and fight, the plan envisioned an encirclement given the Russian armies numerical advantage. If the German forces retreated towards the Vistula River, the *Starvka* assumed that the numerically superior Russian army would ensure that the retreat turned into a disorganized rout.³¹⁵

Even so, they had probably not planned on ordering the attack so early in the war but the German advance on the western front resulted in the *Starvka* feeling compelled to launch its planned attack early. As a result, on August 14, 1914, Russian forces crossed the German frontier, encountering limited resistance as they advanced further into German territory. Germany's

³¹³ Van der Goltz, *Hindenburg*, 17.

³¹⁴ Liulevicius, *The German Myth of the East*, 131.

³¹⁵ Dennis E. Showalter, *Tannenberg: The Clash of Empires* (Dulles: Potomac Books Inc, 2004, originally published, 1991), 133.

forces on the eastern front had been relying on a promised Austro-Hungarian offensive in Galicia as a key component of the defense of Germany's eastern provinces. However, as the Russian attack began, it became clear to Germany's commanders that this planned offensive had to be abandoned.

The German war plan on the eastern front was very similar to the Russian war plan as the German plan called for the invading Russian armies to be drawn into East Prussia while the Austrian main army attacked from the south toward Warsaw.³¹⁶ The problem with this plan was that it did not take into account the fact that most of Germany's armies were concentrated in the west against France, so Germany was unable to assist the planned Austrian offensive nor did it contain any alternative plans should Austria's war effort not align with Germany's. The result was that with the Russian offensives into East Prussia and another into Galicia against Austria, the German prewar plan collapsed. Adding to the Germans mounting difficulties, Germany's armies were forced to retreat after undergoing a brutal baptism of fire as deficiencies within German military culture were exposed. One of the biggest problems at the start of the Russian offensive was the culture within the German Officer Corp as regional commanders engaged in a tradition of ignoring orders from their superiors and /or issuing their own orders if they felt their commanders' objectives were not appropriate for a given situation. The result of this tradition was that German forces were strung out like a string of pearls along the border as each officer attempted to be the first to stop the Russian advance.³¹⁷

³¹⁶ Showalter, *Tannenberg*, 143-144.

³¹⁷ Showalter, *Tannenberg*, 162-169.

As such, the German commander in charge of Germany's eastern front at the start of the war, General von Prittwitz, was unsure as to the exact locations and deployments of most of his forces as his subordinates ignored his orders to retreat and regroup in the face of large and coordinated Russian attacks.³¹⁸ Some generals, in the belief that they were only facing orientalist barbarians even attempted to counterattack despite being outnumbered and were quickly defeated by Russian artillery barrages and massed bayonet charges.³¹⁹ This lack of control combined with disagreements between the general staff soon led to Prittwitz being replaced by Paul von Hindenburg and Erik Ludendorff. These two figures became very important over the course of the war and early Weimar period due to their subsequent victory at the Battle of Tannenberg which halted the Russian offensive. They were also the architects of the German offensives that would allow the German army to conquer most of European Russia by early 1918.³²⁰

The reason why this early stage of the war is significant to this thesis, besides the emergence of Hindenburg and Ludendorff, is that several important German imperialist officers with later connections to the Nazi party and Hitler took part in these early battles. This included August von Mackenson, a decorated cavalry officer, who would become an important figure in the transition from the "personal" imperialism of the Wilhelmine period to the racialized ideological imperialism of the Nazis. He became a bridge between the older Prussian and newer German nationalist forms of imperialism that would develop into the Nazis' ideological imperialism. This imagery surrounding Mackenson was encouraged by both German imperialists

³¹⁸ Showalter, *Tannenberg*, 162-165.

³¹⁹ Showalter, *Tannenberg*, 172-175.

³²⁰ Showalter, *Tannenberg*, 175-179.

during the war as well as the Nazis as his experiences on the Eastern front provided German imperialists and their hostility towards Russia and the East in general with a sense of legitimacy, as this imagery strengthened the argument that Germany was fighting a defensive war. Key to this imagery was Mackenson's account of the war in the German press which presented a narrative of roads crowded with refugees fleeing the Russian advance and having to avoid the main routes leading away from the frontiers due to this congestion.³²¹

The refugee columns, combined with the experiences of the soldiers on the frontlines facing the fierce and brutal Russian bayonet charges as well as increasing reports of Cossack violence across the border regions of East Prussia, created an internalization of the racialized other.³²² This led to an increasingly othered and racialized image of the Russian army as a barbaric horde bent on the destruction of German *Kultur*. Mixed with the realities of modern warfare including massive clouds of dust, smoke and campaigning in the summer heat, solidified for Germany's imperialists the image of the East as a barbaric, wild place that needed to be guarded against and tamed by the German sabre at all costs.³²³

This theme continued as the Russian offensive intensified. By August 20, 1914, German commanders had forced the German Eighth Army to fight three separate inconclusive battles that resulted in at best stalemates for the exhausted German forces. The scale of the Russian resistance to these failed counterattacks along with the Russian attacks and the size of the invading armies contributed to the impression that the Russian invasions were not just invasions

³²¹ Showalter, *Tannenberg*, 179.

³²² Brons, "Othering, An Analysis," 69-72.

³²³ Showalter, *Tannenberg*, 189.

by a foreign power but instead an ethnic migration by barbarian hordes bent on conquest and slaughter, a breaking through the gates by an entirely different world.³²⁴ The intensification of the fighting by Germany's commanders cemented the impression that Germany was fighting in defense of the cultural heartland of German *Kultur*,³²⁵ as Germany's imperialist press proclaimed that "[in] the East, the soil [was] soaked with the blood of [German men], women and children slaughtered by the [barbaric] Russian hordes".³²⁶

This perception was further strengthened after Tannenberg with the so called Great German Advance in the spring of 1915. During this advance, the German army along with elements of the Austrian army launched a sweeping offensive along the Eastern Front. German forces smashed through the Russian lines at Gorlice–Tarnów in Galicia where they recaptured the Austrian fortresses at Przemyśl and Lemberg (now Lvov) in June 1915 before expanding the offensive into a grand campaign of conquest, capturing Warsaw, Krakow, Brest-Litovsk and Vilnius by August 1915. By the time the offensive stopped close to Riga in September 1915, the Russian army had been thrown back 500 kilometres, with about 15% of Russia's European empire now under German occupation³²⁷

In terms of this thesis, what was most significant about this campaign, besides the German conquest of so much Russian territory, was that for many German soldiers taking part in the campaign this was their first experience of Russia and of the East more generally. As a result,

³²⁴ Liulevicius, *The German Myth of the East*, 133.

³²⁵ The homeland of Germany's imperial elite, the Junkers, was East Prussia, the main target of the Russian offensives.

³²⁶ Klaus Blöhme, *Aufrufe und Reden Deutscher Professoren im Ersten Weltkrieg*, (Stuttgart, Philip Reden Tau, 1975), 48.

³²⁷ Liulevicius, *The German Myth of the East*, 135.

their first impression was one of confirmation of the racialized othering of the Wilhelmine period, a confirmation of Russian barbarism and the supposed savagery of the East which coloured their understanding of Russia and Eastern Europe in general. The key to this understanding was the fact “that the territories [the Germans] now occupied were in disarray and disorder after a Russian scorched earth campaign, which meant that [German soldiers] were now in possession of little more than ruined infrastructure. The overlay of wartime damage combined with [the] earlier perceived underdevelopment of these regions, marked by primeval forests, swamps and open country yielded a vision of a land essentially disordered and chaotic.”³²⁸

As one German soldier remarked in his journal describing his impressions of the various lands of the Russian empire:

We wind our way forward and then finally glimpse the first Russian village...rising up dirty grey (schmutziggrau) before us, above the dirty grey region, above it stares the dirty grey sky as if hung with sackcloth and dirty grey is the huge mass of thousands of Russian prisoners that rolls towards us through the village, grey is the whole picture which unfolds itself before us today, grey is the new impression that Russia has given us, grey and obscured is the fate of the next days—all grey—dirty grey.³²⁹

The German experience on the eastern front therefore became the dominant influence on late Wilhelmine imperialism and its use of othering. It covered the future development of German imperialism under the cloud of the language of conquest and violence, marking the beginning of the Nazis’ dehumanization of the populations of Eastern Europe. As a result of this experience, the last stage of Wilhelmine imperialism marked a shift away from a desire to compete with other colonial powers for world power on a global scale to a focus on continental

³²⁸ Liulevicius, *The German Myth of the East*, 135.

³²⁹ Josef Wenzel, *Mit Draht und Kabel im Osten: Aus dem Tagebuch eines Telegraphisten* (Karlsruhe: Akt. G.E. Badenia, 1918), 22.

empire as an alternative for achieving global power through the accumulation of colonies. This shift was the result of the realities of occupation on the eastern front.³³⁰

The ill-defined imperialist desires of the Wilhelmine period of German imperialism were transformed into a harsh and exploitive form of continental imperialism. The German army's victories and conquests in Eastern Europe became increasingly described as part of the *Kulturarbeit* (cultural work) of removing Russian barbarism from Eastern Europe and replacing it with the perceived pure, organic and idealistic form of German *Kultur*.³³¹ The result of this conceptualization of the German occupation of Eastern Europe was that for Germany's imperialists, German identity was finally given the coherence that was deemed to be lacking during the earlier phases of Bismarckian and Wilhelmine imperialism. The occupation of Eastern Europe became viewed as the unifying element needed to enable the German race to become the imperial bearers of *Kultur* to the supposedly wild and chaotic East.³³²

This in turn led to a further radicalization of German imperialism and its increasingly racialized conceptions of Europe as the region was turned into an othered colonial space, condemned as a half Asiatic, barbaric wasteland. The occupied East became seen as an area of exploitation meant to supply Germany's ever conquering armies. This viewpoint of Germany's imperialists is clearly seen in David Hamlin's source, *Germany's Empire in the East: Germans and Romanians in an Era of Globalization and Total War* which documents Romania's role in the war as well as the Austro-German defeat and occupation of Romania. Romania had entered the war

³³⁰ Liulevicius, *The German Myth of the East*, 136.

³³¹ Liulevicius, *The German Myth of the East*, 131-138.

³³² Liulevicius, *The German Myth of the East*, 140.

in 1915 to conquer Transylvania (then under Austro-Hungarian rule) with promised support from the Russian army. However, after some initial successes, German and Austro-Hungarian forces quickly overwhelmed Romania's armies, resulting in the occupation of most of the Romanian province of Wallachia including the capital of Bucharest, although the front itself would not stabilize until January 1917 on the borders of the province of Moldavia.³³³

Tellingly, with regards to this thesis, Hamlin reveals the exploitative qualities of Germany's new continental empire. This is revealed in Hamlin's examination of German actions in the occupied provinces which were not placed under civilian administration but instead under the administration of the occupation forces themselves. In particular, Hamlin reveals how "the occupation was something planned, responding to the demands of the home fronts [and] shaped by ideas about who the Romanians were and what Romanians, Germans and Habsburgs owed one another." The conquest of Romania was driven by the ever increasing needs of modern warfare, particularly food provisions, reserve human resources and petroleum, ensuring that the extraction of raw resources became central to the German occupation in Eastern Europe.³³⁴ The occupation of Romania was seen exclusively through the lens of supply as the colonial administration was tasked with maximizing the extraction of raw materials for the Central Power's war effort.³³⁵ Similar colonial policies were also enacted in the so called *Ober Ost*, the German area of direct occupation in Eastern Europe, mainly the regions captured during the spring 1915 offensive mentioned earlier.³³⁶

³³³ David Hamlin, *Germany's Empire in the East: Germans and Romania in an Era of Globalization and Total War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 174.

³³⁴ Hamlin, *Germany's Empire in the East*, 180-182.

³³⁵ Hamlin, *Germany's Empire in the East*, 184.

³³⁶ Liulevicius, *The German Myth of the East*, 134.

This focus on exploitive colonial policies in the occupied East became even more intensive following the collapse of the Tsarist regime and the subsequent Bolshevik Revolution in Russia as the German Supreme Command became a major advocate of the permanent construction of an exploitive continental colonial empire in Eastern Europe. This advocacy focused on the direct annexation of the occupied *Ober Ost* which became seen as a formalization of the German occupation against the chaos of the Russian revolution and the rise of Bolshevism.³³⁷ It also directly influenced Germany's opening of peace talks between itself, Russia and Austria-Hungary at the occupied fortress of Brest-Litovsk in late 1917 as Germany was now the dominant power on the eastern front and able to dictate terms to the new Russian government.³³⁸

The imperial ambitions of the German Supreme Command became the driving force behind Germany's objectives during the negotiations at Brest-Litovsk which were increasingly influenced by the principles of *die Grosse Politik* that was discussed in the previous chapter. As a result, images of the othered East were combined with the experiences of the war and the revolution in Russia to form an imperialism of self-preservation. German annexations in the East were designed to ensure that Germany had access to the materials needed for an envisioned second war against Russia through the supplanting of perceived Russian barbarism and savagery with German *Kultur*.³³⁹

This othered form of strategic military planning had a significant impact on the resulting Treaty of Brest-Litovsk as the *Ober Ost* (consisting of the Baltic states, Poland, Ukraine, the Crimea

³³⁷ Baranowski, *Nazi Empire*, 100.

³³⁸ Gerald Freund, *Unholy Alliance: Russian-German Relations from the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk to the Treaty of Berlin* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1957), 1.

³³⁹ Andreas Hillgruber, *Germany and the Two World War*, trans. William C. Kirby (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981), 45

and Belarus) was declared to be no longer under the hegemony of Russian rulership and now subject to German economic and military administration. Russia was forced to demobilize the remains of the former Tsarist army as well as to pay a large indemnity for all damages caused to German and Austro-Hungarian property in the 1914 and early 1915 Russian campaigns against East Prussia and Austrian Galicia.³⁴⁰ The treaty also included supplemental treaties with Russia's eastern allies, mainly Romania, which could not continue to resist German occupation without the support of the Russian army.³⁴¹ The end result of this treaty was that the new Soviet government lost one-third of the population of the former Tsarist empire through which more than 56 million people and 780,000km of territorial space were transferred from Russian to German colonial rule.³⁴²

The treaty therefore marked the beginning of a dangerous militarization of German imperialism. The negotiations were not directed by the civilian government of the Kaiser in Berlin but by the army's supreme command. More importantly though, the treaty is significant in that with its signing, it represented a fulfillment of the desires of many of Germany's imperialists as Germany was now in possession of a massive continental empire stretching from the North Sea in the west to the Narva in the east. It gave Germany's imperialists a taste of empire in the East, while fulfilling their goal to weaken Russia for as long as possible. It also ensured that Germany's increasingly exhausted allies were able to continue to fight the war.³⁴³

³⁴⁰ "The Treat of Brest Litovsk" (April 2, 1918), (Accessed on June 3, 2018).

http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/blmenu.asp

³⁴¹ Stephan M. Horak, *The First Treaty of World War I: Ukraine's Treaty with the Central Powers of February 9, 1918* (Boulder: Eastern European Monographs, 1988), 45.

³⁴² David R. Marples, *Motherland: Russia in the 20th Century* (London: Pearson Education Limited, 2002), 42.

³⁴³ Horak, *The First Treaty of World War I*, 45-47.

The treaty is extremely significant as it created the illusion of a total German victory in the war, producing a juxtaposition of defeat in the west and triumph in the east. It allowed the German army to claim that the war had not been lost on the battlefield but on the streets of Germany's major cities. This in turn allowed the army to avoid any damage to its prestige and influence within imperial German society while also beginning the process of radicalization within German imperialism that would lead to the Nazis' ideological imperialism. This process began on October 1st, 1918, with the supreme command of the German army demanding peace as soon as possible to avoid the collapse of Germany's armies on the western front. This demand was pushed forward by Ludendorff, who was now the chief of staff to the chair of the general staff, Paul von Hindenburg.³⁴⁴

This developing viewpoint is clearly seen in comments made by Arnold Brecht:

On October 1st, a series of telegrams and telephone conversations issued from general headquarters [arrived]: Troops held the line today, what will happen tomorrow [is] not foreseeable. The offer of peace should be sent off at once and not wait until the formation of [a] government. Ludendorff emphasized that the offer must be in the hands of the Entente [powers] at the latest by Wednesday evening or Thursday morning

Brecht then relates that the newly appointed Chancellor:

Prince Max von Baden objected that in this form and at the moment of a hard-pressed military position, the peace move would clearly have a very unfavorable influence on the German situation in the negotiations... he opposed this and wanted to wait at least one week, in order to consolidate the new government and avoid the impression that we were making our request for mediation mainly because of a military collapse.³⁴⁵

³⁴⁴ "Arnold Brecht on the Final Weeks of the War" (Retrospective Account, 1966), (Accessed on June 5, 2018). http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=3820

³⁴⁵ "Arnold Brecht on the Final Weeks of the War," (Accessed on June 5, 2018).

This account reveals how the army in the last months of the war in 1918 were attempting to use Bismarck's othering of internal opponents as a means of avoiding blame for the army's failure to achieve victory on the western front. It also reveals the power struggle that emerged between Germany's civilian and military imperialists as the political position of the crown weakened due to the Kaisers increasing reliance on Ludendorff and Hindenburg to win the war. It showcases the disconnect between Germany's various imperialist groups as a result of the differing circumstances of Germany's war effort on the western and eastern fronts. As such, this episode reveals the level of control Hindenburg and Ludendorff had over Germany's imperial foreign policy objectives.³⁴⁶

This process would continue after the signing of the Treaty of Versailles and the formation of the Weimar Republic. During this transition of power, Hindenburg and other senior army commanders used this power vacuum to their advantage, discrediting the newly formed republican institutions of the new Weimar republic as well as its new political leaders through the testimonies that Hindenburg and other senior commanders gave at the public inquiry into the reasons for the defeat. The testimony is important in the context of this thesis due to Hindenburg's acceptance of the *Stabbed in the Back* myth, thus legitimizing what had been a fringe political myth before his acceptance. This myth had been put forward by right wing nationalist groups in the German army and intelligentsia but gained national prominence

³⁴⁶ Van der Goltz, *Hindenburg*, 57-59.

following its use by Hindenburg, Ludendorff and Karl Helfferich throughout their testimony before the inquiry, placing the myth at the center of German political discourse.³⁴⁷

In his testimony, Hindenburg attacked the legitimacy of the parliamentary parties by declaring that:

...At the time, we still hoped that the will to [achieve] victory would dominate everything else. When we assumed our part, we made a series of proposals to the Reich leadership which aimed at combining all forces at the nation's disposal for a quick and favourable conclusion to the war... What finally became of our proposals...partially because of the influence of the parties, is known. I wanted forceful and cheerful cooperation and instead encountered failure and weakness... At this time, the secret intentional mutilation of the fleet and the army began as a continuation of similar occurrences in peace time... The obedient troops who remained immune to revolutionary attrition suffered greatly from the behaviours, in violation of duty, of their revolutionary comrades; they had to carry the battle the whole time... An English general said with justice: the German army was stabbed in the back. No guilt applies to the good core of the army. Its achievements are just as admirable as those of the officer corps. Where the guilt lies has clearly been demonstrated. If it needed more proof, then it would be found in the quoted statement of the English general and in the boundless astonishment of our enemies at their victory...³⁴⁸

The result of this testimony was that it allowed the Hindenburg myth, which had been created after the Battle of Tannenberg to survive the end of the war, providing a link between the political institutions of the *Kaiserreich* and its political symbols with those of the new republic, providing a source of legitimacy to both the von Baden and Ebert governments. However, as Hindenburg's testimony reveals, the new republican elite's reliance on the link provided by the myth also reveals one of the major weaknesses of the Weimar Republic, its reliance on

³⁴⁷ "Paul von Hindenburg's Testimony before the Parliamentary Investigatory Committee: "The Stab in the Back" (November 18, 1919), (Accessed on June 6, 2018). http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=3829

³⁴⁸ "Von Hindenburg's Testimony before the Parliamentary Investigatory Committee," (Accessed on June 6, 2018)

Hindenburg's reputation in 1918/1919. In effect, with Hindenburg's embracing of the "stabbed in the back" myth, the Weimar elite was transformed into agents of the enemy beyond the enemy by Hindenburg and the German right, leading to their self-elimination as credible critics of the increasingly racialized imperial desires of the German right, which promoted its agenda by emphasizing the Hindenburg myth's connections to the racial symbolism of the Battle of Tannenberg.³⁴⁹

For the German right, the myth survived as a link between the Kaiser's concept of the personal monarchy and the developing concept of the *Führerprinzip*. Unfortunately for Germany, this reliance of both sides of the political spectrum on the myth coincided with the emergence of a new and dangerous form of political ideology and imperialism. This process started in 1919 with the formation of a new extreme right-wing political movement, the National Socialist German Workers Party (Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei) which slowly evolved into its more commonly known nomenclature, the Nazi party, following Adolf Hitler's joining of the party in 1920.³⁵⁰ As part of this evolution, the party manipulated the liberal principles and language of US President Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points to develop an imperial program focused on reorienting German imperialism away from the Bismarckian model discussed in chapter 2. This new imperial program included:

1. The union of all Germans to form a Greater Germany
2. The overthrow of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and its sister treaties
3. [A] demand [for] land and territory (colonies) to feed [the population] and to settle our excess population.

³⁴⁹ Van der Goltz, *Hindenburg*, 53-63.

³⁵⁰ "Program of the German Workers' Party" (1920), (Accessed on June 7, 2018).
http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=3910

These three points formed the basis of the new party's imperialism. Due to this development, the use of racialized representations of the other soon became a prominent feature of the party's understanding of imperialism, particularly its understanding of membership in the German state and which individuals had access to the benefits of empire.³⁵¹ As a result, the party soon embraced race as a marker of empire as it declared that:

None but members of the nation may be citizens of the state. None but those of German blood, regardless of their creed, may be members of the nation, no Jew [or Slav] may be a member of the nation. The right to vote on the leadership and legislation of the state is to be enjoyed by citizens alone. We demand therefore that all official appointments, of whatever kind, whether in the Reich...the country or in the smaller localities, shall be granted to citizens of the state alone. We oppose the corrupting of the parliamentary custom of filling posts merely with a view to party considerations, and reference to character or ability. All further immigration by non-Germans must be prevented. We demand that all non-Germans who have immigrated to Germany since August 2, 1914 [must be] made to leave the Reich immediately...Perpetrators of common crimes against the nation....must be punished by death, regardless of their race, creed or platform.³⁵²

The platform marked a return to the obsession with the foreign, the search for the subversive internal enemy of the *KulturKampf* and Bismarckian imperialism. As revealed by this platform, othering was increasingly seen by the German right during the early Weimar period as a weapon to gain political power and prestige in the face of the power vacuum caused by the collapse of Wilhelm II's concept of the personal monarchy and the rise of the perceived pluralistic Weimar Republic.³⁵³

From this perspective, the party's platform was an attempt at claiming ownership of the vacuum. The racialized othering seen within the party's platform was an attempt to acquire

³⁵¹ Brons, "Othering, An Analysis," 69-70

³⁵² "Program of the German Workers' Party", (Accessed on June 7, 2018).

³⁵³ Van der Goltz, *Hindenburg*, 72.

leadership over the rising hostility of the German right to Weimar republican institutions. It was aimed at creating a basic ideological framework that became the basis of the Nazis' radical anti-Semitism, establishing the racial politics of Nazi imperialism. This is particularly important as only two months later, Hitler began his rise through the ranks of the party, becoming a full member soon after his discharge from the army in 1920.³⁵⁴

His rise through the party's ranks also coincided with an upsurge in radical nationalist and monarchist violence in the early 1920s caused by the occupation of the Ruhr valley by the French army and a collapse of the value of Germany's currency, the *Papiermark*. These events along with Hitler's rapid rise to the top of the party's leadership soon convinced Hitler to attempt an armed takeover of the Bavarian government in the early 1920s.³⁵⁵ This process started as a result of the rampant nationalism expressed in Germany's political discourse following the French invasion and occupation of the Ruhr during the period 1923-1925, as the German right sparked violent riots in most major German cities, particularly in Munich, the main stronghold of the early Nazi party.³⁵⁶ These riots quickly led to armed rebellion by these groups due to the power struggle that existed in Bavaria as a result of the ambiguous relationship between these groups and senior government officials over control of the mechanisms of the state government's power.³⁵⁷

As such, the riots represent the period where the early objectives of Nazi imperialism were established. This trend is examined in Harold J. Gordon, JR's text, *Hitler and the Beer Hall Putsch* as he states "the various theoretical and practical plans of the putschists [were] few,

³⁵⁴ C.E. Black and E.C. Helmreich, *Twentieth Century Europe* (New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1950), 231-232.

³⁵⁵ Black and Helmreich, *Twentieth Century Europe*, 232.

³⁵⁶ Harold J. Gordon, *Hitler and the Beer Hall Putsch* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), 186.

³⁵⁷ Gordon, *Hitler and the Beer Hall Putsch*, 204-205.

simple and drastic.” Their goal was “the elimination from office of [all] active political opponents, men suspected of a lack of patriotism or of profit[ing] [from the recent conflict], [and] the assumption of their positions.... [by] men drawn from the party[’s ranks] and its allied organizations.” Gordon’s examination reveals an important aspect of the origins of the Nazis’ ideological imperialism, its obsession with the elimination of the internal foe, which resulted in a pathological desire to seek out the enemy beyond the enemy and to eliminate it.³⁵⁸ It reveals that the heavy use of othering and the reliance on racialized representations of the other during the Wilhelmine and early Weimar periods had resulted in early Nazi imperialism’s desire to first conquer German society through a complete domination and assumption of the mechanisms of the state by the party. The Putsch represents the first instance where the party attempted a militaristic uprising to replace the institutions of the state with those of the party.³⁵⁹

The Putsch should not be considered a return to a Bismarckian style of imperialism however, as it also represented the beginning of a complete reorientation of German imperialism. It laid the foundations of early Nazi imperial ambitions, particularly the desire to reverse the imposed form of Bismarckian German identity and its focus on maintaining a form of *Klein Deutschland*. Instead, Nazi imperialism embraced and demanded the creation of a *Gross Deutschland*, a united empire encompassing all German-speaking populations in Europe.³⁶⁰ The Putsch quickly collapsed under the weight of poor leadership and planning which failed to convince the leaders of the *Reichswehr*,³⁶¹ auxiliary and paramilitary forces or the police to join

³⁵⁸ Gordon, *Hitler and the Beer Hall Putsch*, 124.

³⁵⁹ Gordon, *Hitler and the Beer Hall Putsch*, 264-266.

³⁶⁰ Gordon, *Hitler and the Beer Hall Putsch*, 264.

³⁶¹ Official name of the German army from 1919 until the early 1930’s

the revolt. These forces remained loyal to the government, resulting in a swift and well-planned counterattack that quickly overwhelmed the revolutionaries as battle hardened and well-trained regular troops from across Germany converged on Munich to crush the revolt.³⁶²

The Bavarian government was able to achieve this through its control over all information systems throughout the Putsch. This control proved vital as it allowed the government to announce its opposition to the Putsch by quickly spreading propaganda against it while also reinforcing the perception that the government was in firm control of all state mechanisms of power. Most importantly though, it allowed the government time to regroup after the initial shock of the Putsche's start, allowing the government to maneuver its troops into position for a large pincer movement that quickly overran the SA's and its allies' positions.³⁶³ After some small skirmishes with the army and various police movements, the revolt collapsed after a short fire fight with army and police units as most of the leaders of the Putsch were either killed or arrested, including Hitler who was wounded and subsequently arrested.³⁶⁴

In the Putsche's aftermath however, far from discrediting the Nazi form of ideological imperialism, the use of racialized representations of the other were embraced as a mass propaganda tool of the party and its leader.³⁶⁵ This process of using racialized othering to vilify the Bavarian authorities accelerated with the subsequent trial and sentencing of Hitler as it allowed him to present the basic elements of Nazi imperialism to the German public. It began with Hitler's testimony at his trial where he gave a speech attacking the institutions of the

³⁶² Gorden, *Hitler and the Beer Hall Putsch*, 322.

³⁶³ Gorden, *Hitler and the Beer Hall Putsch*, 323-335.

³⁶⁴ Gorden, *Hitler and the Beer Hall Putsch*, 356-365.

³⁶⁵ Gorden, *Hitler and the Beer Hall Putsch*, 356-365.

Weimar state while also vaguely defining the internal enemies as the political elite of Wilhelmine and Weimar Germany secretly aligned with the perceived Jewish Marxism of the Soviet Union.³⁶⁶

In the speech Hitler declares that:

From the first, I have aimed at something more than becoming a minister. I have resolved to be the destroyer of Marxism. This I shall achieve and once I achieved that, I should find the title of minister ridiculous. The fate of Germany does not lie in the choice between a republic or a monarchy but in the content of the republic and the monarchy. What I am contending against is not the form of a state as such, but its ignominious content. We wanted to create in Germany the precondition which alone will make it possible for the iron grip of our enemies to be removed from us. We wanted to create order in the state, throw out the drones, take up the fight against international stock exchange slavery.... against the politicizing of the trade unions [by the Marxists] and above all for the highest honourable duty which we as Germans know, should once more be introduced- the duty of bearing arms.³⁶⁷

Even with these statements however, it was not until the publishing of *Mein Kampf*³⁶⁸ that Hitler more comprehensively defined the goals of Nazi imperialism, particularly how the internal conquest of the German state and society were to be accomplished. He did this by clearly defining for the first-time what Nazism considered to be the internal enemies of Germany by presenting it as the veiled internal threats of Marxism and what was defined as international Jewry's dominance over world affairs. More importantly in relation to this thesis, in defining this internal enemy, Hitler called for a reorientation of German imperial policy and laid out how racialized othering was to be used to achieve this. As a result, *Mein Kampf* became the

³⁶⁶ "Hitler's Speech at the Putsch Trial" (February 1924), (Accessed on June 10, 2018).
http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=3913

³⁶⁷ "Hitler's Speech at the Putsch Trial," (Accessed on June 10, 2018).

³⁶⁸ Translated as *My Struggle*.

foundational text of the party's philosophy, establishing how the use of racialized othering was to be used as the basis of an extremely racialized form of politics and empire.³⁶⁹

This highly racialized view of empire is seen in Hitler's comments on the relationship between racialized othering and Nazi political propaganda as well as his views on how the Wilhelmine forms of racialized representations of the other failed in their objective of creating enthusiasm for global conquest and empire:

Everything that actually was done in this field was so inadequate and wrong from the very start that it certainly did no good and sometimes did actual harm [to the German cause.] The form was inadequate, the substance was psychologically wrong. [The question becomes] is propaganda a means or an end! It is a means and must therefore be judged with regard to its end. It must consequently take a form calculated to support the aim which it serves. It is also obvious that its aim may vary in importance from the standpoint of general need and that the winner value of the propaganda will vary accordingly... The German nation was engaged in a struggle for existence, [therefore] the purpose of propaganda should have been to support this struggle; its aim [is to] help bring about [the desired result].³⁷⁰

This statement reveals how Nazi imperialism and its use of othering contained elements of both Bismarckian and Wilhelmine imperialism as it combined the targeted political othering of the Bismarckian period with the Wilhelmine portrayal of armed racial struggle as a fight for existence. Nazi imperialism therefore sought to portray the events of the First World War as a struggle for the survival of German *Kultur*. The western democracies (Britain and France) were portrayed as enablers of Russian barbarism and blood lust as well as the emergence of what Hitler declared to be the conquest of the Russian empire and the East by Jewish Bolshevism.³⁷¹

³⁶⁹ Black and Helmreich, *Twentieth Century Europe*, 233-234.

³⁷⁰ Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 177.

³⁷¹ Black and Helmreich, *Twentieth Century Europe*, 233.

Racialized representations of the other were therefore used to define the hero and the villain, explicitly explaining to its intended audience why certain races ruled and others served, which is clearly seen in comments made by Hitler in *Mein Kampf*:

Humanitarianism and aesthetics would vanish even from a world inhabited by man if this world were to lose the races that have created and upheld the concepts... [Imperial] propaganda [is] a means to an end and the end was the struggle for the existence of the German people. Consequently propaganda [can only] be considered in accordance with the principles that were valid for this struggle.

For Hitler, the failure of Wilhelmine imperialism was its focus on producing propaganda for Germany's imperialist "scientifically trained intelligentsia" as he asserted that in order for propaganda involving the racialized othered to be successful, it had to be "addressed always and exclusively to the masses."³⁷² The use of racialized othering within propaganda was meant to clearly define for its audience who the other was and why the other needed to be sought out and removed from all expressions of German self-identity.³⁷³

Due to this desired characteristic, the use of racialized othering in propaganda was meant to be simple and understandable, a means of engaging the interest of Germany's perceived non-imperialist working classes who, as has been seen in the previous chapters, were thought to have little interest in the construction of empire. For Hitler then, the function of racialized othering within propaganda:

d[id] not lie in the scientific training of the individual, but in calling the masses attention to certain facts, processes, necessities, etc., whose significance is thus for the first time placed within their field of vision. The whole art [of othering] consists in doing this so skillfully that everyone will be convinced that the fact is real, the process necessary, the

³⁷² Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 177-179.

³⁷³ Brons, "Othering, An Analysis," 70-74

necessary correct, etc.... The art of propaganda lies in understanding the emotional ideas of the great masses and finding through a psychologically correct form, the way to the attention and thence to the heart of the broad masses... the function of propaganda is not to weigh and ponder the rights of different people but exclusively to emphasize the one right which it has set out to argue for. Its task is not to make an objective study of the truth, in so far as it favours the enemy and then set it before the masses with academic fairness; its task is to serve our own right, always and unflinchingly.³⁷⁴

As this quote reveals, the use of racialized othering within Nazi political propaganda was a means of exaggerating difference between the German self and the other.³⁷⁵ It served as a medium for expressing perceived German superiority or victimization as well as a mechanism to exploit racial prejudice and political stereotypes for the accumulation of imperial and political power.³⁷⁶ From this perspective, the purpose of early Nazi othering was the elevation of the Nazi party as well as Hitler's political prestige through the creation of a physical representation of Germany's supposedly hidden internal enemies. Up until this point, these representations were only hinted at in Bismarckian and Wilhelmine imperialism, but with the portrayal of the party and Hitler as the protectors of the German people's perceived position as a *Kulturvolk*, these clear representations of the internal foe became identified for the first time.³⁷⁷

This attempt is clearly seen in *Mein Kampf* as Hitler explicitly labels the Jewish population, both in Germany as well as internationally, in league with Soviet Russia as Germany's hidden internal enemy. He does this through his comments on the home front during the First World War:

³⁷⁴ Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 179-182.

³⁷⁵ Brons, "Othering, An Analysis," 70.

³⁷⁶ Baranowski, *Nazi Empire*, 154.

³⁷⁷ Baranowski, *Nazi Empire*, 154.

The offices were filled with Jews. Nearly every clerk was a Jew and every Jew was a clerk. I was amazed at this plethora of warriors of the chosen people and could not help but compare them with their rare representations at the front. As regards economic life, things were even worse. Here the Jewish people had become indispensable. The spider was slowly beginning to suck the blood out of the people's pores. Through the war corporations, they had found an instrument with which, little by little, to finish off the national free economy.³⁷⁸

This comment represents a fusion of the "stabbed in a back" myth with the racialized imperialism of the Wilhelmine period. It shows an attempt to provide a solid image of the enemy beyond the enemy, an attempt to replace the vague representations of the other of the *Kulturkampf* in the East and the Bismarckian period with a visible representation of the enemy, artificially made up of many perceived enemies.³⁷⁹

As a result, with the publication of *Mein Kampf*, the use of othering became the centerpiece of a new German imperial world view in which the concept of the racial state became the chief objective of German imperialism. The German desire for a racialized conquest of empire was justified according to *Mein Kampf* through a broad categorization of race through othering in which the world's population was divided up between so called culture founding races followed by culture bearing races, meaning those who were able to carry elements of a founding culture but never create one. At the bottom were the cultural imitators who Hitler unceremoniously labeled the Jewish people. Because of this worldview, racial hatred was mixed with the obsession of German imperialism to hunt out the internal enemies supposedly hidden within German society to create an extremely potent form of imperial othering.³⁸⁰

³⁷⁸ Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 193.

³⁷⁹ Konrad Heiden, *A History of National Socialism* (London: Octagon Books, 1974), 30.

³⁸⁰ Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 285-300.

This new form of imperial othering is clearly seen in Hitler's comments within *Mein Kampf*:

In hardly any people in the world is the instinct of self-preservation developed more strongly than in the so called 'chosen'... since the Jew... was never in possession of a culture of his own, the foundations of his intellectual work were always provided by others. His intellect at all times developed through the cultural world surrounding him... For if the Jewish people's instinct of self-preservation is not smaller but larger than that of other peoples, if his intellectual faculties can easily arouse the impression that they are equal to the intellectual gifts of other races, he lacks explicitly the most essential requirement for a cultural people, the idealistic attitude. In the Jewish peoples, the will to self-sacrifice does not go beyond the individual's naked instinct of self-preservation. Their apparently great sense of solidarity is based on the very primitive herd instinct that is seen in no other living creatures in this world.... The Jew is only united when a common danger forces him to be or a common body entices him; if these two grounds are lacking, the qualities of the crassest egoism comes into their own and in the twinkling of an eye, the united people turns into a horde of rats, fighting bloodily among themselves.³⁸¹

This statement reveals how Hitler used racialized othering to remake German imperialism through the dehumanization of Germany's Jewish population, providing a physical form of the enemy beyond the enemy while also producing the missing component of the earlier forms of German imperialism. The Nazis used othering to explain the German surrender in 1918 and the resulting harsh terms of the Treaty of Versailles as part of a racial struggle for survival in which supposed subversive Jewish elements of the German population attempted to destroy Germany as the natural homeland of Germanic (Aryan) *Kultur*, who Hitler identified as one of the few culture founding races in existence.³⁸² As a result, under the Nazis the goals of German imperialism were shifted from a general desire to compete with the other great powers for the acquisition of colonies to the conquest of a continental empire meant to ensure the survival of

³⁸¹ Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 301-302.

³⁸² Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 214.

the German race. This perspective is clearly seen in Hitler's statements in *Mein Kampf* on the goals of the Nazi form of German imperialism:

What we must fight for is to safeguard the existence and reproduction of our race and our people, the substance of our children and the purity of our blood, the freedom and independence of the fatherland, so that our people may mature for the fulfillment of the mission allotted it by the creator of the universe... Race... does not lie in the language, but exclusively in the blood, which no one knows better than the Jew who attaches very little importance to the preservation of his language but all importance to keeping his blood pure...³⁸³

The pursuit of this goal therefore led Nazi imperial propaganda to proclaim the Jewish people to be parasites, slowly eating away at the body of Germanic *Kultur*, allowing the Nazis to claim that their imperialism was designed to safeguard Germanic civilization. It created a focus on the protection of Germanic culture as a justification for the Nazi party's slow conquest of the public sphere in Germany as well as their extremely aggressive and brutal form of imperial conquest.³⁸⁴

The imperialistic propaganda of the Nazis and its connections to the use of the extreme form of racialized othering seen in these quotes had only a limited appeal in the aftermath of the failed Putsch mentioned earlier. This problem had developed due to the fact that although *Mein Kampf* proved to be moderately popular, the party was unable to capitalize on this popularity as it was banned from competing in Weimar elections and Hitler, as well as most of the rest of the Putsch's leadership, were imprisoned. As a result, responsibility for rebuilding the party following the lifting of the ban on its existence fell to Alfred Rosenberg, the editor of the Nazi party's flagship newspaper, *Völkischer Beobachter*.³⁸⁵ Rosenberg had been born in Revel, Russia (Tallinn,

³⁸³ Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 214, also see 310-312.

³⁸⁴ Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 304-305.

³⁸⁵ Liulevicius, *The German Myth of the East*, 177.

Estonia) and was chosen to lead the party based on his family's emigration to Germany in 1918 to avoid the growing bloodshed of the Russian revolution, his perceived knowledge of the violence of Russian/Jewish Bolshevism, his theories of the East as a German colonial space and his ruthless commitment to fighting the spread of Russian Bolshevism which he perceived as a Jewish attempt at seizing and accumulating global power.³⁸⁶

Under Rosenberg's leadership, the Nazi party and ideology underwent a complete reorganization through which the extremely racist rambling othering of *Mein Kampf* was turned into a disciplined and well-organized form of imperial ideology. He was able to accomplish this reorganization through a combining of the Wilhelmine racialized images of the barbarism of Russia with the extreme othering found in *Mein Kampf*. Rosenberg argued that all Eastern European cultures owed their existence to various forms of German colonialization, marking an advancement of the revisionism seen in Paul Langhaus' work that was examined in the previous chapter.³⁸⁷

This use of othering to reorganize the party and its ideological imperialism is clearly seen in Rosenberg's source, *Die Spur des Juden im Wandel der Zeiten*:

It is vital nowadays to take a stand, to come out for or against what is German, less we bury forever the hope that the German Reich someday after a long, long time will once again at last be Deutschland³⁸⁸ and not a hotbed of alien, Jewish cravings for power.... Less avid pursuit of extortion and usury and less emphatic religious and national arrogance would have spared him many sufferings all together but the underlying Jewish

³⁸⁶ Jürgen Matthäus and Frank Bajohr, "Introduction to Alfred Rosenberg and His Diary," in *Documenting Life and Destruction, Holocaust Sources In Context: The Political Diary of Alfred Rosenberg and the Onset of the Holocaust*, et al. Joseph Jake (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), 3.

³⁸⁷ Robert Cecil, *The Myth of the Master Race: Alfred Rosenberg and Nazi Ideology* (New York: Dodd Mead & Company, 1972), 71.

³⁸⁸ Translated as German Land

idea of bleeding all the peoples white as perceived by Dostoevsky, Fichte, Goethe, and other great men.... has always made the seemingly cold and unemotional Jew a passionate hater in the end. This hatred is as old as Judaism itself and it comes to light everywhere, depending on the direction open to it. Our times are now a hotbed of scarcely controlled Jewish passions which have coalesced with a systematic global policy ... directed primarily against two peoples: the Russian and the German....There is arguably no nation in Europe that has pursued the inner secret of man and glorified in it to the same extent as the German nation. This nation, in its deepest essence is therefore the antithesis of the Jew....Therefore, from the earliest times, one has been able to observe that German Jews are the bitterest foes of the German idea and the more they snatch at it and feed on it, the more clearly their contagion manifests itself.³⁸⁹

Rosenberg linked the Wilhelmine othered concept of the “yellow peril” with an extreme form of anti-Semitism as a means of providing Nazi imperialism with a historical legitimacy by connecting it to older forms of German imperialism and the obsession with the “Wild East.” Previously vague theoretical notions of Russian savagery and barbarism were fused into a concrete image of a supposed Jewish empire seeking to conquer Europe through the perceived social anarchy of Marxism. This argument is clearly seen in Rosenberg’s statement:

This insurmountable opposition of the ethnic souls (Volksseelen) is the main cause of the Jew’s hatred, putting it into motion is only a secondary consideration. The Jew’s hatred triumphs unbridled, but its insatiable nature will lead to its collapse—that is the course of historical necessity, accounted for by national character. In Germany, the Jews have been able to make themselves at home for a long time now; they use every little means possible to obtain the warmest places for themselves and their fellows.... the corrosion of the German spirit of resistance being most avidly pursued by extolling the peaceable peoples of the Entente countries and denouncing “German militarism.” In no country on earth would people have been allowed, in the nation’s fateful hour, to use such infuriating and antinational language... Anxious about the success of his fellow Jew’s conspiracy in Moscow, Mr Hugo Haase once (in the summer of 1918) explained “should the German government undertake [a war] against the Soviet government, it is our sacred duty to call

³⁸⁹ Alfred Rosenberg, “The Jew and the German, excerpts from *Die Spur des Juden im Wandel der Zeiten*,” in *Documenting Life and Destruction, Holocaust Sources In Context: The Political Diary of Alfred Rosenberg and the Onset of the Holocaust*, et al. Jürgen Matthäus (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), 354-356.

the German workers to revolution.” These words of a demagogue who was ruthlessly betraying the German land and its interests were allowed to go unpunished!³⁹⁰

However, even with Rosenberg’s efforts to provide Nazism with a theoretical, ideological and political legitimacy, the Nazi party remained small until the 1930 elections and the deteriorating economic conditions that heralded the beginning of the Great Depression. Even so, Rosenberg’s rambling theoretical arguments combined with his stewardship of the Nazi party allowed it to recover from the failed Putsch in Munich and Hitler’s imprisonment. Rosenberg was aided in this endeavor by Hitler’s release from prison in 1925, allowing the Nazi party to win 12 seats in the Reichstag only three years after Hitler’s release and by 1930, the party was easily able to win 107 seats. The Nazi party was able to achieve this due to the relentless campaigning of the party’s leadership, who used their newly enlarged numbers to exploit the language and politics of violent struggle for electoral success.³⁹¹

This use of the language of violence for electoral success is clearly seen in Joseph Goebbels’s reference to the violence of the SA in Berlin during the 1930 elections as a “Battle for Berlin.” This is clearly seen in his comment from his article, *Kampf um Berlin* which states that:

There are only two possibilities of alternating attention and furthering the aims of the [Nazi] party. One was the ever-new invention of stunts and tricks, the issuing of posters, addresses and slogans in a crisp, graphic and popular style, the other fights and brawls, provocative clashes with the Marxist enemies leading to the conquest of the streets... He who conquers the streets can also conquer the masses and he who has conquered the masses has by it conquered the state.³⁹²

³⁹⁰ Rosenberg, “The Jew and the German,” 356-357.

³⁹¹ Walter Consuelo Langsam, *The World Since 1919* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954), 220.

³⁹² Joseph Goebbels, “Kampf um Berlin: Der Anfang,” (1934), (Accessed on June 18/2018).

<https://archive.org/details/Goebbels-Joseph-Kampf-um-Berlin>

This quote shows the effort of Goebbels and other senior officials within the party to portray the violence of the SA, not as political violence, but as part of an attempt to ensure German racial survival against what was perceived to be the Jewish designed social toxin of Marxism.

This impression is further cemented by comments made in Goebbels's account of the 1932 campaign in his diary:

Thousands of people awaiting us at the station in Chemnitz. We have entirely conquered this city. A marvelous parade of the SA. And that in what used to be "Red Chemnitz!".... During a riotous meeting at the Marmorpalast we had one dead and one hundred and fifty seriously injured. The Communists had occupied three quarters of the hall, and we were in a hopeless minority. That was the beginning, today these "Red Fortresses" are at our feet. Our SA men are assaulted with heavy casualties and even fatalities and the press mendaciously treats them as having attacked a peaceful suburban garden settlement. The fact that SA men are being accompanied home by their comrades since they would be shot if they went alone, is represented in the press as an armed attack on the part of our men. The communists are the innocent victims, and we are accused as the aggressors. That the Jews are such liars is not surprising, as they hang together from the *Berliner Tageblatt* to the *Rote Fahne* (Red Flag).³⁹³

The goal of Goebbel's racist depictions of the other were combined with the language of violence to undermine the German public's confidence in Weimar republican institutions such as a free press and democratic party politics. As Goebbels states "they are making splendid propaganda for us, which costs us nothing and is extraordinarily effective."³⁹⁴ His emphasis on racist depictions of the Jew, mixed with the language of violence as well as war were meant to instill a sense of faith in an imperial future that would resurrect the German nation, saving it from the perceived chaos of Jewish Bolshevism by slowly subordinating the German state, society and

³⁹³ Joseph Goebbels, *My Part in Germany's Fight*, trans. Kurt Fiedler (London: Hurst & Blackett, 1935), 23.

³⁹⁴ Goebbels, *My Part in Germany's Fight*, 23.

culture to the whims of the Nazi leadership's racialized imperialism.³⁹⁵ As Manfred Pechau declares in his 1935 doctoral dissertation on the language of Nazism: "The use of violent language entirely matches the war like character of the movement and the stormy desires of its young supporters" (Diese Anwendung von Gewaltformen entspricht ganz dem Wesen des Kampfes der Bewegung und dem stürmischen Wollen seiner jungen Förderer).³⁹⁶

Following the Nazi seizure of power in 1933, this slow conquest of the German state accelerated as Hitler and the Nazi party now turned to external conquest to sustain and deepen Nazi imperialism's growing control over state policy. Hitler did this by using othering to subvert the liberal democratic principle of the right of racial minorities to self-determination. This shift represented a monumental change within German imperialism as Hitler demanded a reorientation away from the *Klein Deutschland* form of German identity and empire discussed in chapter 1 to a focus on creating an enlarged German empire based on an identity of *gross Deutschland*³⁹⁷. This marked a significant shift within German imperialism from the Wilhelmine focus on global expansion through the acquisition of colonies as a marker of the power of the German race towards the establishment of a continental racialized empire incorporating every ethnic German population in Europe.³⁹⁸

This shift is first seen in the 1936 Rhineland Crisis, which marked one of the boldest and most successful ventures of Hitler's external imperialism. It was an action aimed at improving

³⁹⁵ Barannowski, *Nazi Empire*, 157-158.

³⁹⁶ Manfred Pechau, *Nationalsozialismus und deutsche Sprache* (Greifswald: Buchdruckerei Hans Adler, 1935), 96.

³⁹⁷ Sven Oliver Müller, "Nationalismus in der deutschen Kriegsgesellschaft 1939 bis 1945" in *Zweiter Halband, Ausbeutung, Deutungen, Ausgrenzung*, edited by Jörg Echternkamp (Munich: Deutsch Verlagsanstalt, 2005), 23-24.: A union of all German speaking peoples in Europe into a single united empire.

³⁹⁸ Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 644

Germany's ability to rearm as the Rhineland was the location of Germany's main industrial base. However, this is only part of the reason for this action as Hitler quickly realized the propaganda potential of the remilitarization of the Rhineland. This was due to its potential to weaken France's perceived military dominance in Europe by showcasing its inability to use its alliances with the successor states of the Austrian empire as well as Poland and Romania to enforce the demilitarization of the Rhineland that had been established by the Treaty of Versailles in 1919.³⁹⁹

As German military strength was still recovering in 1936 from the restrictions of the Treaty of Versailles, Hitler used the language of self-determination and othering to undermine the French government's arguments for the continued enforcement of the demilitarization of the Rhineland. As a result, Hitler himself set the tone of Nazi demands for remilitarization.⁴⁰⁰ In a series of speeches given on March 25/26, 1936, at various locations throughout Germany, Hitler claimed to be defending the sovereignty of the German race by rearming the Rhineland. He argued that rearmament was necessary for the reinstating of Germany to a status of equal with regards to French military power and attacked the "secret diplomacy" of the allied powers, which he claimed had enabled the allies to engage in an imperialist action against Germany:

I do not intend to draw up any secret documents or conclude any secret alliances. I assure you my fellow countrymen, I will never pledge Germany to anything without informing the whole German people... I [will] be judged by the whole German people alone!

This theme is continued and elaborated on in another speech given on March 27, 1936:

Now they say that we are down on our knees again. What is the world thinking of? We are not a tribe of Negroes but a highly civilized people of sixty-seven million Germans... We

³⁹⁹ James Thomas Emmerson, *The Rhineland Crisis, 7 March 1936: A study in multilateral diplomacy* (London: Maurice Temple Smith Ltd, 1977), 20.

⁴⁰⁰ Ernest K. Bramsted, *Goebbels and National Socialist Propaganda, 1925-1945* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1965), 169.

are standing at a decisive historical moment. The liquidation [of the demilitarization of the Rhineland] made by me... cannot be withdrawn...⁴⁰¹

Hitler then expanded on this theme in another speech given on the same day in Essen:

We have no interest in France. We have no interest in Belgium and we do not wish to have any interests in any other state. But in precisely the same way, we cannot allow others to maintain that they must have interests in Germany. [Germany] ha[s] not set a foot on the territory of others! [It] ha[s] not robbed any people of anything! [It] ha[s] not broken into another's ho[me]. [We] have stolen nothing from anybody! No one has the right to set himself up as a judge in a matter which concerns [the] German [race] alone.⁴⁰²

The racialized representation of the other was therefore turned on its head as the Germans themselves were not portrayed as the other. However, instead of this representation being used to highlight the perceived inferiority of the other, it was now used by Hitler as well as the Nazi party to highlight the uniqueness of the German race and the need to protect that uniqueness. Othering was used to portray the rearming of the Rhineland as an action aimed at protecting the German population in the region from the dilution of their Aryan blood by the French army due to its use of colonial forces. The use of othering became a means of highlighting the perceived uniqueness of German blood and the need to protect that quality.⁴⁰³ The remilitarization of the Rhineland allowed Hitler to portray himself as the protector of national unity.⁴⁰⁴ It allowed him to strengthen the image of the *Führer* as the protector of German *Kultur*

⁴⁰¹ Adolf Hitler, 'Campaign Speech at Ludwigshafen, March 25, 1936' in *The Speeches of Adolf Hitler, April 1922-August 1939: An English Translation of Representation Passages Arranged Under Subjects*, edited by Norman H. Baynes (New York: Howard Fertig, 1969), 1316-1317.

⁴⁰² Adolf Hitler, "Speech in Essen to the Workmen of the Factories on March 27, 1936" in *The Speeches of Adolf Hitler, April 1922-August 1939: An English Translation of Representation Passages Arranged Under Subjects*, edited by Norman H. Baynes (New York: Howard Fertig, 1969), 1318.

⁴⁰³ Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 675

⁴⁰⁴ F. Lee Benness and Mary Elisabeth Seldon, *Europe, 1914-1939* (New York: Meredith Publishing Company, 1965), 343.

from French attempts to subjugate and replace it with the claimed decadent and artificial *Zivilisation* of France and its allies (especially Britain).⁴⁰⁵

As a result, the continued success of the Nazis' "ideological imperialism" was increasingly measured through foreign policy achievements in which Hitler's image as the supreme commander of the *Wehrmacht* became increasingly important to Nazi imperialism and its depictions of the racialized other. The first instance of this is seen in the 1938 *Anschluss* with Austria as the reoriented racialized othering discussed above was increasingly used to highlight Hitler's desire for a reorientation of German imperialism towards the forging of a new German imperial identity centered on the principle of *gross Deutschland*.⁴⁰⁶ To achieve this result, othering was used to showcase the Germanness of Austria's German population, culture and language, a complete reversal of the older Bismarckian form of othering that portrayed Austrian identity as non-German. Instead, the closeness and historical relationship of Austria and Germany was now emphasized with Bismarck's enforced separation of German and Austrian identity portrayed as a historical wrong that needed to be corrected.⁴⁰⁷ In effect, this was racialized othering in reverse, a distorting of the principles of self-determination to fulfill the imperial desires of its creator. As a result, when German troops marched unopposed across the border into Austria on March 12, 1938, they did so on the "legal" basis that they were acting on the Austrian Chancellor's request to restore law and order to the "German" region of Austria.

⁴⁰⁵ Liulevicius, *The German Myth of the East*, 231.

⁴⁰⁶ Bennis and Seldon, *Europe*, 343.

⁴⁰⁷ Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 120.

The next day, Hitler triumphantly returned to the Austrian city of Linz, the city of his youth and proclaimed that Austria had been reunited with the German Reich.⁴⁰⁸

Germany's annexation of Austria greatly improved its military and economic position in Central Europe, directly connecting Germany with Hungary and Yugoslavia and most importantly western Czechoslovakia, which was now surrounded on three sides by Germany. This situation quickly led to the event where the othering of Germans by the Nazi party and its allies in Europe to highlight the uniqueness of German populations living outside of Germany is most clearly seen, the 1938 Sudeten crisis and the subsequent invasion of Czechoslovakia.⁴⁰⁹ The Sudetenland was the German speaking region along the combined borders of Germany, Czechoslovakia as well as Austria and had been gifted to Czechoslovakia under the Treaty of Versailles. As a result, this event was seen by Germany's imperialist elite, particularly Hitler and other high ranking members of the Nazi government as a French attempt at maintaining German military, economic and cultural weakness after the conclusion of the First World War.⁴¹⁰ They saw it as being designed to guarantee France a two front war, putting Germany at a severe disadvantage as the German general staff argued that in order to easily defeat the Czech army, the bulk of Germany's forces would have to be concentrated against it. They argued that doing this would severely weaken Germany's defenses on the border with France and the German army's ability to repel a French offensive. This argument was based on the fact that the Czechoslovakian army, although small, was very well trained and equipped due to its access to a large industrial base including the famed

⁴⁰⁸ Jackson J. Spielvogel, *Hitler and Nazi Germany: A History* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1988), 204.

⁴⁰⁹ Spielvogel, *Hitler and Nazi Germany*, 205

⁴¹⁰ Keith Eubank, *Munich* (Norman: University of Oklahoma, 1963), 22.

Skoda works near Prague.⁴¹¹ Added to this, it appeared to many senior commanders that the German army would also have to contend with an unsupportive home front as the German public was considered to be adverse to the prospect of another two-front war.⁴¹²

The use of othering to highlight the uniqueness of German populations outside Germany's borders became a key component of a campaign designed to sell German aggression to a supposedly skeptical German public in order to create the internal stability in Germany that was perceived to be needed to conclude a successful war of aggression against Czechoslovakia, while also creating a sense of political and ethnic instability within Czechoslovakia. These dueling desires are seen in comments made by Hitler at a military conference in 1937 at the very beginning of the crisis and then broadcast across Germany by the Nazi controlled German media:

The aim of German policy [towards Czechoslovakia] was to make secure and to preserve the racial [German] community (Volksmasse) and to enlarge it. It is therefore a question of space. The German racial community comprises over 85 million people and because of their number and the narrow limits of habitable space in Europe, it constituted a tightly packed racial core such as was not to be met in any other country and such as implied the right to a greater living space than the case of other peoples. If territorially speaking there existed no political result corresponding to this German racial core that was a consequence of centuries of historical development and in the continuation of these political conditions lay the greatest danger to the preservation of the German race at its present peak. To arrest the decline of Germanism in Austria and Czechoslovakia was as little possible as to maintain the level in Germany itself. Instead of increase, sterility [is] setting in and in its train disorders of a social [and racial] character must arise in the course of time... Germany's future [is] therefore wholly conditioned upon the solving of the need for space... German policy had to reckon with hate inspired antagonists, Britain ... France [and Russia] to whom a German colossus in the center of Europe [is] a thorn in the flesh...

⁴¹¹ Keith Robins, *Munich 1938* (London: Cassell & Company LTD, 1968), 138.

⁴¹² Robbins, *Munich*, 138-139.

Today... Britain, France and Russia and the smaller states adjoining them must be included as factors in our political calculations.⁴¹³

After these comments were made, Hitler and the German general staff then outlined the various conflict scenarios and the steps needed to avoid them. In particular, the meeting soon turned to the renewed threat to German expansion caused by the rebirth of the Franco-Russian alliance of the First World War. As such, Hitler's manufacturing of hostilities between the Czech and German states was increasingly seen by Germany's military and political leadership as a useful technique to test the strength of the new Franco-Soviet pact.⁴¹⁴ The racialized representations of the other was combined with images expressing the uniqueness of German *Kultur* to reawaken the hostility and racial fear of Russia of the Wilhelmine period of German imperialism as the French government's efforts to renew the former alliance with Russia was portrayed as a dangerous playing with fire. The prospect of war with France and Czechoslovakia was portrayed by Hitler and the Nazi leadership as allowing Russian Bolshevism (Marxism) to infect the Germanic influenced *Kultur* of Europe, an attempt to reduce the cultural landscape of Europe to ashes.⁴¹⁵ It is important to note though that Hitler's brinkmanship diplomacy, combined with his obvious use of racialized othering and the threat of war to manufacture the Sudeten crisis also led to the first major challenge to Hitler's political popularity as well as the popularity of the Nazis' imperial program. For a short period, France and Russia and a still reluctant Britain appeared ready to risk war with Germany to assist Czechoslovakia in the event of a German attack. The danger for Hitler was that as the Czechoslovakian government was a

⁴¹³ "Summary of Hitler's Meeting with the Heads of the Armed Services on November 5, 1937" (Hossbach Protocol of November 10, 1937), (Accessed on June 21, 2018). http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=1540

⁴¹⁴ Robbins, *Munich*, 138.

⁴¹⁵ Ian Kershaw, *The Hitler Myth: Myth and Reality in the Third Reich* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 135.

formal ally of France, any attack on Czechoslovakia would have activated the French alliance which in turn would have triggered France's alliance pacts with Soviet Russia and Britain, which would have quickly led to the encirclement of Germany and a military scenario similar to that of the First World War.⁴¹⁶

Hitler was able to prevent this scenario by manipulating the British government's policy of appeasement to Germany's advantage. He did this due to his belief that France would not risk war with Germany unless its government was completely convinced of British support. To achieve this result, Hitler othered the German population in Czechoslovakia in order to distort the language of self-determination to undermine the French government's justification for its support of Czechoslovakia. Hitler's othering highlighted the perceived cultural uniqueness of the German population in the Sudetenland, making it appear as if by being within the borders of the Czech state, the German population within Czechoslovakia was being oppressed by the French and Czech governments. In doing this, Hitler was able to embarrass the French government, forcing it to hand over leadership of the allied response to the British government of Neville Chamberlain, who Hitler gambled would be more likely to side with Germany's position due to Chamberlain's support of the policy of appeasement.⁴¹⁷

The result of this manipulation was the Munich agreement which was signed by Germany, Italy, France and Britain and transferred all German speaking regions of Czechoslovakia to Germany. More importantly for Hitler however, the agreement also severely weakened France

⁴¹⁶ Robbins, *Munich*, 138-139.

⁴¹⁷ Jeremy Noakes and Geoffrey Pridham, ed., *Nazism 1919-1945: A History in Documents and Eyewitness Accounts*, Vol. 1 (New York: Schocken Books, 1983), 281-282.

as well as Czechoslovakia as French military dominance in Europe was shown to be a facade and Czechoslovakia lost all of its major fortifications along the German border.⁴¹⁸ On top of this, the level of Hitler's manipulation of the British leadership of the allies and its policy of appeasement was revealed six months later as Hitler resumed his policy of armed conquest with the annexation of the rest of Czechoslovakia by the German army on Hitler's orders.⁴¹⁹

Following the annexation of Czechoslovakia, Hitler turned his attention to the conquest of Poland. Despite a last minute diplomatic warning issued by Britain and France on September 1, 1939, German armies crossed the Polish-German border with ruthless efficiency, quickly overwhelming the Polish army before turning west to inflict severe military and political defeats on Britain and particularly France, who not only suffered the loss of its alliance with Soviet Russia following the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact but also a total military defeat and occupation in June 1940.⁴²⁰ However, with Britain's defeat of the German *Luftwaffe*⁴²¹ in late 1940/41, Nazi imperialism would again turn to its ideological roots, resulting in one of the most destructive wars of imperial conquest in the history of German imperialism, the invasion of the Soviet Union. Codenamed Operation Barbarossa, this campaign was envisioned from the start as a climactic struggle between the German (Aryan) form of imperial ideology and the supposed overlordship of the Russian (Jewish) dominated ideology of Leninist-Marxism.⁴²²

⁴¹⁸ "The Munich Agreement" (September 29, 1938), (Accessed on June 22, 2018).
http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=1542

⁴¹⁹ Craig, *Germany*, 708

⁴²⁰ Craig, *Germany*, 715.

⁴²¹ German Air Force

⁴²² Liulevicius, *The German Myth of the East*, 192.

The war in the east would be far different than the war in the west as the campaign quickly escalated into a ruthless war of extermination in which *Einsatzgruppen*⁴²³ were unleashed on the Russian and Jewish populations from August 1941 until the end of the war. Combined with the sweeping conquests of the *Wehrmacht* in 1941/42, it appeared to Germany's imperialists as if the awakened desires for empire in the East caused by the First World War had finally been fulfilled.⁴²⁴ With the Soviet Red Army's victory at the Battle of Stalingrad in 1943 combined with Goebbels call for total war in the East, the slow disintegration of the Nazi empire and of Nazism itself would begin, leading to the final collapse of German imperialism within the ruins of the Third Reich in 1945.

The defeat of the Third Reich marked the final phase of German imperialism. This process had started with the sweeping military campaigns of the eastern front during the First World War as Wilhelmine imperialism shifted from a desire to compete with the other European powers for colonies to showcase the personal power of the Kaiser to a harsh and exploitive form of continental imperialism. The experiences of the soldiers on the front lines combined with the need to mobilize the home front for a long and protracted war resulted in a transformation of the racialized representation of the other. This combination created the fertile ground needed for the development of the Nazis' ideological imperialism as the populations of Eastern Europe became increasingly dehumanized due to the harsh and brutal conditions of the war on the eastern front. This development was accelerated by the inconclusive end to the First World War (defeat in the west, triumph in the east) which combined with the collapse of the personal

⁴²³ Extermination Squads

⁴²⁴ Liulevicius, *The German Myth of the East*, 197-199.

monarchy of Wilhelm II, the legitimization of the “stabbed in the back myth” and the Weimar elites dependence on the Hindenburg myth to provide legitimacy for their rule resulted in a power vacuum at the very top of German society in the immediate years after the war.

This vacuum allowed Hitler and the Nazis to completely realign German imperialism and its representation of the other. As has been shown in this chapter, this process had started with Hitler’s repurposing of the themes of the *KulturKampf* discussed in chapter 1. Whereas Bismarckian and Wilhelmine imperialism had only vaguely defined the internal enemies of the *KulturKampf* through various forms of othering, the Nazis’ ideological imperialism used racialized representations of the other to concretely identify the internal other in relation to the Nazis’ form of German self-identity.⁴²⁵ This reveals an important aspect of early ideological imperialism, its obsession with the elimination of the foreign as well as the desire to eliminate this foe through the conquest of German society and the domination and absorption of the mechanisms of the state by the Nazi party. This obsession led the Nazis to attempt an armed takeover of the Bavarian government. While this attempted Putsch was successfully defeated by forces loyal to the government, it still reveals an important aspect of early Nazi imperialism, its reliance on othering to elevate the party’s as well as Hitler’s prestige through the creation of a physical representation of Germany’s perceived internal enemies.

With the publication of *Mein Kampf* following Hitler’s release from prison in 1925, racialized representations of the other became the center piece of a new German world view as the creation of a racial empire and the elimination of the enemy beyond the enemy⁴²⁶ became

⁴²⁵ Brons, “Othering, An Analysis,” 69-70.

⁴²⁶ Identified by Hitler as the Jewish people and Marxism

the chief principles of ideological imperialism. As a result, the uprising as well as Nazi violence were portrayed as part of a racial struggle for survival, which slowly desensitized the German population of any reluctance to use targeted forms of violence against othered populations. As the Nazis quickly expanded their political power, racialized representations of the other became a tool meant to legitimize the subordination of the German state, society and culture to the whims of the Nazi leadership's radicalized imperialism. This process would accelerate following the Nazi seizure of power in 1933 as Hitler and the party turned to foreign conquest to sustain and deepen Nazism's growing control of the state and society.

To do this, the othering of the Germans themselves became a powerful tool of Hitler and the Nazi government as it used this othering to subvert the liberal democratic principles of the right to self-determination. This resulted in a monumental shift within German imperialism as Hitler shifted it away from the Bismarckian concept of German imperialism based on the *Klein Deutschland* form of German identity to a focus on creating an enlarged German continental empire based on the identity of *gross Deutschland*. To do this, the Nazis' ideological imperialism increasingly relied on questions of citizenship and racial comradeship as markers of empire. As Mark Mazower has shown, after 1933, German foreign policy regarding minority German populations was turned on its head. Instead of emphasizing that these minority populations were ethnic German citizens of other countries as had been the case during the Weimar period, these minorities were now portrayed as having a "boundless and unalterable" loyalty to the German race which supposedly outweighed loyalty to the country of whose passport they carried. As such

these populations were now depicted as faithfully waiting for Germany to embrace them.⁴²⁷ This shift in German imperial policy is first seen in Hitler's remilitarization of the Rhineland in 1936 where Hitler used the language of self-determination to argue for an enlarged Germany encompassing every ethnic German population in Europe as he asserted that the Third Reich and by extension the *Führer*, were nothing more than the voice of the German *Volk*.⁴²⁸

Following the success of this policy during the Rhineland crisis, Hitler expanded it as a diplomatic tool to embarrass the allied powers (Britain and France) by making it appear as if they were oppressing ethnic German minority populations across Europe with their opposition to Hitler's annexation of the Rhineland, Austria and the Sudetenland. Othering became a tool that could be used to highlight the unique German character of these regions as the justification for the rapid annexations of these countries. The problem with this use of othering however was that it only exasperated the more extreme elements of the Nazis' ideological imperialism. With the German invasion of the Soviet Union in 1941, German imperialism's fascination with the East would finally reach its climax. Driven by the ideological doctrine of *Mein Kampf* and the obsession with finding the enemy beyond the enemy, the Nazi invasion quickly brought to reality the envisioned final struggle for survival between the Teutonic bearers of *Kultur* and the perceived Asiatic barbarism of Russia, resulting in one of the bloodiest campaigns of the Second World War.⁴²⁹

⁴²⁷ Mazower, *Hitler's Empire*, 45.

⁴²⁸ Mazower, *Hitler's Empire*, 44-45.

⁴²⁹ Mazower, *Hitler's Empire*, 5

Conclusion: The Ruins of Empire

The defeat of the Third Reich marked the end of a historical process that started with Bismarck's introduction of othering into German imperialism as a means of imposing not only his own personal domination over Prussian/German imperialism, but also his own interpretation of German identity.⁴³⁰ As has been argued in chapter 1, Bismarck sought to use othering as a political tool to manipulate the fraying politics of the *Concert of Europe* and the Russian dominated Holy Alliance to Prussia's benefit. This process had started with the 1864 war with Denmark, which Bismarck used to force Austria to acknowledge Prussia as an imperial equal in Germany by compelling Austria to support Prussia as the leading power in the campaign, thereby forcing the resource limited Habsburg regime to commit to a German strategy. The resulting diplomatic friction caused by this strategy quickly led to a confrontation between Austria and Prussia over who would define German identity by becoming the leading power in Germany.⁴³¹

The resulting war from this strategy therefore brought a new meaning to Bismarck's assertion that Germany was to be united through "blood and iron" as Bismarck used the Prussian army to define German identity. With the Treaty of Nickelsburg, Austria became non-German as German identity became defined as Prussian in origin, militaristic and most importantly, defined by the union of Germany excluding Austria. This style of targeted othering began the process of the Prussianization of Germany, resulting in the absorption of Germany into a greater Prussian empire over an incorporation of Prussia into a greater German empire.⁴³² As a result, the 1866

⁴³⁰ Klein Deutschland

⁴³¹ Pflanze, *Bismarck and the Development of Germany* Vol. 1, 292.

⁴³² "Preliminary Peace of Nikolsburg" (July 26, 1866), (Accessed on Oct 27, 2017).

war with Austria marks the first instance where othering was used by Prussian/German imperialism to achieve an imperial goal.

This led to lingering questions of what constituted a true German imperial as well as national identity, which resulted in the beginning of the *KulturKampf* in 1871. As has been seen in chapter 1, Bismarck assumed that he could continue to use othering to consolidate Prussia's position in Germany after the defeat of France in 1870 by unleashing the *KulturKampf* to strengthen the Prussian dominated German identity that had been established in 1866 through the othering of south German identity. Unfortunately for Bismarck however, it quickly backfired. He underestimated the impact of the *KulturKampf's* emphasis on Germans othering other Germans which combined with the inconsistent implementation of the laws that had begun the cultural struggle, ultimately undermined Bismarck's attempts to control its outcome.⁴³³ This is clearly seen in an examination of the impact of the *KulturKampf* in Prussia's eastern provinces where the its focus shifted away from the absorption of south German identity to questions of empire, expansion and national identity. This marked the beginning of the German obsession with the East and the supposedly veiled threats lurking just beyond Germany's eastern frontiers. As a result, the *KulturKampf* exceeded even Bismarck's ability to control it as it became obsessed with racialized representations of the internal other, turning it into an internal imperialism aimed at achieving the national cohesion that was deemed to be lacking after the military victories of 1866 and 1870.⁴³⁴

⁴³³ Pflanze, *Bismarck and the Development of Germany: Vol II*, 204.

⁴³⁴ Pflanze, *Bismarck and the Development of Germany: Vol II*, 204-205.

Othering also clearly touched Germany's external ambitions in the years following the official end of the *KulturKampf* as the acquisition of overseas colonies became seen as an outlet for the growing ambitions of Germany's political and industrial classes, revealing that othering was becoming a prominent component of the German elites attempts to maintain their traditional control over German society. It is important to note however, that no official doctrine of empire existed during the Bismarckian period of German imperialism, revealing that the use of othering was a political tool instead of being part of an official program of imperialism as racialized representations of the other remained on the fringes of Bismarckian imperialism until Bismarck's dismissal in 1890.⁴³⁵ As such, the representation of the other during the Bismarckian period was strictly political in nature, a means of easily identifying the opponents of the Bismarckian political system. Its purpose was therefore designed around the need to create favourable conditions for the achievement of Bismarck's political objectives.⁴³⁶

The consequences of this introduction of othering to identify political opponents however had a major impact on the development of German imperialism, the German understanding of national identity, and the representation of the other. As was seen in chapter 2, this resulted in a progression/intensification of the use of racialized representations of the other during the Wilhelmine period as the concept of race became a marker of empire for German imperialists and a key differentiator between the colonizers and the colonized. The Wilhelmine period saw the concept of racial struggle in the East develop as a result of these lingering questions and Wilhelm II's attempts to use othering to showcase the "personal" power of the German

⁴³⁵ Xu Qiyu, *Fragile Rise*, 10-13.

⁴³⁶ Pflanze, *Bismarck and the Development of Germany: Vol II*, 204-206.

monarchy. Under the banner of *Weltpolitik*, German imperialism's obsession with the East intensified as Wilhelm advocated for a more aggressive imperial policy in China that was designed to showcase the personal power of the German monarchy as well as the economic and military power of the German nation state. Racialized representations of the other became a means of transforming Germany from a European power into a world power as German imperialism in the Far East became portrayed as part of a larger struggle between the perceived enlightened Christian civilization of Europe and the savage outdated civilizations of China and Japan.⁴³⁷

These actions also reveal the extent to which Wilhelm's conceptions of personal rule damaged Germany's global position as it became seen by the other European great powers as an aggressor. They reveal how Wilhelm's own personal ambitions became official imperial policy. This led to the adaption of racialized representations of the other into an aggressive form of global expansionism designed to conceptualize for a perceived skeptical German public, a racialized global struggle that Germany had to participate in if it was to survive as a major power.⁴³⁸ This in turn slowly desensitized the German population as the targeted use of state violence against othered populations became official policy under Wilhelm and his ministers. As a result, German imperialism became seen as a national calling, marking the moment when the use of othering became a tool for the harnessing of symbolic politics as an expression of the characterization of different nationalities according to race and culture.

As a result, the Wilhelmine period of German imperialism marks the period when German conservatism adopted a harsh racialized imperialism as it sought to secure and maintain its

⁴³⁷ Steinmetz, *The Devils Handwriting*, 429.

⁴³⁸ Lowe, *The Great Powers, Imperialism and the German Problem 1865-1925*, 114.

privileged position within German society, resulting in the biological concept of the nation and racial hegemony becoming the central focus of German imperialism.⁴³⁹ This is the period where German conservatism began to view Russia and its empire as a treacherous competitor for global power over a trusted ally and comrade in arms, revealing a generational shift within German imperialism towards a “culture of empire.”⁴⁴⁰

This generational shift reveals the effects of the increasing decentralization within German imperialism that resulted from the shifting priorities of Wilhelm and the changing society mentioned at the beginning of chapter 2. During the Wilhelmine period the question of who controlled the use of othering became the defining aspect of German imperialism under Wilhelm as Germany’s rising middle and industrial classes increasingly began to express their enthusiasm for empire, resulting in a power struggle at the top of German politics as the politics of symbolism became a popular tool to harness the political support of these groups. The term “German” became a symbol of empire unto itself as the concept of *Deutschland* was re-imagined as a spiritual entity, transforming Germany’s relationship with the East. Human development in Eastern Europe was now portrayed as being due to successive waves of German migration into Eurasia. Germany’s relationship with Russia became seen through a lens of racial struggle for imperial supremacy over the simple interactions of two states with shared borders. The East was re-imagined by Germany’s imperialists as a continental space with great possibilities for exploitation and conquest.⁴⁴¹ During the Wilhelmine period then, the other became a visual

⁴³⁹ Berger, *Germany*, 99.

⁴⁴⁰ Liulevicius, *The German Myth of the East*, 99

⁴⁴¹ Casteel, *Russia in the German Global Imaginary*, 56-57.

representation of this envisioned racial struggle, a means of providing legitimacy for Germany's increasingly militaristic actions on the global stage.

This process would intensify with the start of the First World War as the seeds of the Nazis' ideological imperialism were planted on the eastern front, which became defined by experiences of sweeping military campaigns, conquest, occupation and domination. Racialized representations of the other became common place in order to mobilize the home front as the politics of symbolism were expanded from an expression of the personal power of the Kaiser into a tool of war meant to showcase to the German public that Germany was fighting a defensive war against an artificial alliance of the "eastern despotism" of Russia and the "materialism" of the western Entente powers (Britain and France).⁴⁴² This propaganda was soon reinforced by the events of the war. While Germany's armies invaded France through Belgium, Russia's armies invaded from the East resulting in Germany's prewar plans to win the war collapsing, reinforcing the perception that Germany was fighting for its survival.

As has been shown in chapter 3, this perception was strengthened further following the Russian defeat at Tannenberg and the so called Great German Advance in the spring of 1915. In a sharp contrast to the stalemate on the western front, German armies swept into European Russia, quickly capturing 15% of Russia's European territory.⁴⁴³ The war on the eastern front created a taste for empire in the East which fed the imperial ambitions of the Nazis' ideological imperialism. It created the conditions necessary for the development of an imperial viewpoint of statecraft as a representation of a racial struggle for survival between the major race groups in

⁴⁴² Baranowski, *Nazi Empire*, 69

⁴⁴³ Marples, *Motherland*, 42.

Europe, becoming the driving force behind the adaption of the concept of *Lebensraum*.⁴⁴⁴ This new taste for empire combined with the legitimization of the “stabbed in the back” theory provided fertile ground for the growth of the Nazis’ highly racialized form of imperialism. As such, ideological imperialism became the climax of the development of German imperialism as it combined the new desire for a German continental empire in Eastern Europe and Russia of the late Wilhelmine period with the obsessive search for the enemy beyond the enemy of the Bismarckian period.⁴⁴⁵

The first instance where this combination revealed itself was the Munich Putsch where the Nazis and their allies attempted to seize control of the Bavarian government. This Putsch is significant as it reveals that the ideological imperialism of the Nazis was not only concerned with enabling foreign conquest for internal political gain but also with a return to the internal imperialism of the *KulturKampf*. It demonstrated that the imperialism of Hitler and the Nazi party was not only concerned with the removal of the republican Weimar government but also the conquest and domination of German society. This process was accelerated following the collapse of the Putsch and Hitler’s publishing of *Mein Kampf*.

The significance of *Mein Kampf*’s publication was that, for the first time, a clear doctrine of empire was established within German imperialism, providing a clear racialized image of who the enemy beyond the enemy was as well as the steps that needed to be taken to eliminate this foe through the conquest and retention of a continental empire.⁴⁴⁶ This process accelerated

⁴⁴⁴ Living Space

⁴⁴⁵ Horak, *The First Treaty of World War I*, 45-47.

⁴⁴⁶ Langsam, *The World Since 1919*, 220

following the Nazis' seizure of power in 1933 as the party turned to foreign conquest and racialized conceptions of the other to justify Hitler's and the party's increasing domination of the German state and society. By 1943, the Nazi empire stretched from the Atlantic coast of France in the west to the gates of Leningrad and the Caucasus Mountains in the east. To Germany's imperialists, victory seemed inevitable, causing Hitler to proclaim that "what India was for England, the territories of Russia will be for us."⁴⁴⁷ This triumph however, was short lived as by 1945 the Nazi empire had disintegrated as Germany's armies were driven back by the allied armies, resulting in the collapse of German imperialism and its use of othering under the weight of the ashes of Nazism and the Third Reich.⁴⁴⁸

As such, the significance of this thesis is that it reveals the role that racialized representations of the other played in the development of the Nazis' ideological imperialism and the acceptance of its annihilationist policies. As this thesis has shown, by examining the evolution of the role of othering within German imperialism, a deeper understanding of the historical development of Nazi imperialism can be achieved as it exposes not only how the introduction of the other during the Bismarckian period affected the develop of German imperialism but also the formation of German national identity. By examining the history of the representation of the other within German culture, the development of the Nazis' ideological imperialism can be seen as a long-term process, allowing for the placement of Nazism within the wider history of modern Germany.⁴⁴⁹

⁴⁴⁷ Adolf Hitler, "Hitler's monologue of August 8-11, 1941" in *Hitler's Table Talk: His Private Conversations*, Trans. Norman Cameron and R.H. Stevens (London: Phoenix Press, 2000), 24.

⁴⁴⁸ Baranowski, *Nazi Empire*, 157.

⁴⁴⁹ Wendy Lower, *Nazi Empire Building and the Holocaust in Ukraine* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 206-207.

Bibliography

Primary:

Abeken, Heinrich. 'Letter to his wife, July 1 1866' in *Bismarck's Pen: The Life of Heinrich Abeken, edited From His Letters and Journals by his Wife*. Translated by Charles Edward Barrett Lennard and M.W. Hoper. London: George Allen & Company Ltd, 1911.

"An Unequal Treaty": The Lease Agreement between China and the German Empire, (March 6, 1898)." http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=785. Accessed on February 12, 2018.

"Anti Jesuit Law, (July 4, 1872)." http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=1837. Accessed on 16/11/2017.

"Arnold Brecht on the Final Weeks of the War (Retrospective Account, 1966)." http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=3820. Accessed on June 5, 2018.

Bamberger, Ludwig. 'The Reichstag Rejects any Colonial Engagement, 1880' in *The German Colonial Experience: Select Documents on German Rule in Africa, China, and the Pacific, 1884-1914*. Edited by Arthur J. Knoll and Hermann J. Hiery. Lanham: University Press of America, 2010: 12-13.

Holstein, Baron von. "Holstein to Paul von Haztfedt, Berlin, 12 April 1897" in *The Holstein Papers: The Memoirs, Diaries and Correspondence of Friedrich von Holstein: Correspondence, Vol 4*. Edited by Norman Rich and M.H. Fisher. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.

'Bismarck to the German Consul in Cape Town' in *The German Colonial Experience: Select Documents On German Rule in Africa, China and the Pacific, 1884-1914*. Edited by Arthur J. Knoll and Hermann J. Hiery. Lanham: University Press of America, 2010: 28.

'Bismarck's Appointment of General Consul Gustav Nachtigal to Place Certain Coastal Areas under German Protection, May 19, 1884,' in *The German Colonial Experience: Select Documents on German Rule in Africa, China and the Pacific, 1884-1914*. Edited by Arthur J. Knoll and Hermann J. Hiery. Lanham: University Press of America, 2010: 29-30.

Bismarck, Otto Von. *Bismarck: The Man And The Statesman, Being The Reflections And Reminiscences of Otto Prince Von Bismarck*, Vol 1. Translated by A.J. Butler. London: Smith, Elder, &CO, 1898.

Bismarck, Otto Von. *Bismarck: The Man And The Statesman, Being The Reflections And Reminiscences of Otto Prince Von Bismarck*, Vol 2. Translated by A.J. Butler. London: Smith, Elder, &CO, 1898.

- “Bismarck Tells the British Ambassador that Germany has Achieved its Legitimate Objectives, (February 11, 1873).” http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=1853. Accessed on 16/11/2017.
- “Bismarck’s Speech to the Prussian House of Deputies on the “Polish Question,” (January 28, 1886).” http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/docpage.cfm?docpage_id=2888. Accessed on 17/11/2017
- “Bernard von Bülow’s “Dynamic” Foreign Policy (December, 1899).” http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=779. Accessed on February 15, 2018.
- “Bernard von Bülow on Germany’s “Place in the Sun” (1897).” http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=783. Accessed on March 06/2018.
- Bülow, Prince Bernhard von. *Memoirs: 1903-1909*. Translated by F.A. Voigt. London and New York: Putnam, 1931.
- “Census Figures, (1882-1907).” Accessed on February 17, 2018. http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=653.
- Count von Berchem. “Terminating the Reinsurance Treaty with Russia, (1890).” http://germanhistorydocs.ghidc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=778. Accessed on February 26, 2018.
- “Eisenach Declaration of the National Association, (1859).” http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=240. Accessed on 16/10/2017.
- Fichte, Johann Gottlieb. *Addresses to the German Nation, (1807/08)*. http://germanhistorydocs.ghidc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=3596. Accessed on 16/10/2017.
- Goebbels, Joseph. “Kampf um Berlin: Der Anfang, (1934).” <https://archive.org/details/Goebbels-Joseph-Kampf-um-Berlin>. Accessed on June 18/2018.
- Goebbels, Joseph. *My Part in Germany’s Fight*. Translated by Kurt Fiedler. London: Hurst & Blackett, 1935.
- Hitler, Adolf. *Mein Kampf*. Translated By Ralph Manheim. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1971.
- “Hitler’s Speech at the Putsch Trial (February 1924).” http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=3913. Accessed on June 10, 2018.

- Hitler, Adolf. "Hitler's monologue of August 8-11, 1941" in *Hitler's Table Talk: His Private Conversations*. Translated by Norman Cameron and R.H. Stevens. London: Phoenix Press, 2000.
- Hitler, Adolf. 'Campaign Speech at Ludwigshafen, March 25, 1936' in *The Speeches of Adolf Hitler, April 1922-August 1939: An English Translation of Representation Passages Arranged Under Subjects*. Edited by Norman H. Baynes. New York: Howard Fertig, 1969.
- Hitler, Adolf. 'Speech in Essen to the Workmen of the Factories on March 27, 1936' in *The Speeches of Adolf Hitler, April 1922-August 1939: An English Translation of Representation Passages Arranged Under Subjects*. Edited by Norman H. Baynes. New York: Howard Fertig, 1969.
- "Industrial Growth (1870-1914)." Accessed on February 17, 2018.
http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=638.
- Kaiser Wilhelm II, "Kaltenbronn Schwarzwald 16/IV 95" in *Letters From The Kaiser To The Czar: Copied From Government Archives In Petrograd Unpublished Before 1920. Copied And Brought From Russia by Isaac Don Levine*. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company, 1920.
- Kaiser Wilhelm II, "Stora Sunday 10/VII 95" in *Letters From The Kaiser To The Czar: Copied From Government Archives In Petrograd Unpublished Before 1920. Copied And Brought From Russia by Isaac Don Levine*. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company, 1920.
- Kaiser Wilhelm II, "Telegram from Kaiser to Foreign Office, Nov 6, 1897" in *Lepsius, Mendelsohn, Bartholdy and Thime 1922-27*, Vol.14.-Pg 69 in essay
- Kaiser Wilhelm II, "The Hun Speech," (1900). http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=755. Accessed on March 1, 2018
- Kaiser Wilhelm II, "Dear Nicky: Jagdhaus Rominten, 26/ix 95" in *Letters From the Kaiser to the Tsar: Copied From Government Archives in Petrograd, Unpublished Before 1920 and brought from Russia by Isaac Don Levine*. Edited by N.F. Grant. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company, 1920.
- Kundrus, Birthe. 'From the Periphery to the Center: On the Significance of Colonialism for the German Empire in *Imperial Germany Revisited: Continuing Debates and New Perspectives*. Sven Oliver Müller. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2011: 253-267
- Langhaus, Paul. "Map 2" in *Deutscher Kolonialatlas. 30 Karten mit 300 Nebenkarten*. Gotha: Justus Perthes, 1897.
- Lenin, V.I. 'The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination,' in *V.I. Lenin: Selected Works, One Volume Edition*. New York, International Publishers Co, 1971.

- Lenin, V.I. 'Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism' in *V.I. Lenin: Selected Works, One Volume Edition*. New York, International Publishers Co, 1971.
- "Lord Clarence to British Ambassador Lord Augustus Loftus, (March 16, 1866)."
http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=1815. Accessed on 25/10/2017
- "Paul von Hindenburg's Testimony before the Parliamentary Investigatory Committee: "The Stab in the Back" (November 18, 1919)" http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=3829. Accessed on June 6, 2018.
- Pechau, Manfred. *Nationalsozialismus und deutsche Sprache*. Greifswald: Buchdruckerei Hans Adler, 1935.
- "Population Growth in Large Cities (1875-1910)". http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=644. Accessed on February 17, 2018
- "Population Redistribution (1871-1910)." http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=632. Accessed on February 17, 2018.
- "Preliminary Peace of Nikolsburg (July 26, 1866)." http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/docpage.cfm?docpage_id=2807. Accessed on Oct 27, 2017.
- "Program of the German Workers' Party (1920)", http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=3910. Accessed on June 7, 2018.
- "Pulpit Law, (December 10, 1871)." http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=669. Accessed on 16/11/2017.
- 'Request by the Kings and Chiefs of Togo for a Treaty of Protection' in *The German Colonial Experience: Select Documents on German Rule in Africa, China and the Pacific, 1884-1914*. Edited by Arthur J Knoll Hermann J. Hiery. Lanham: University Press of America, 2010: 31.
- Rear Admiral Alfred von Tirpitz, "The Fleet and Anglo-German Relations: Rear Admiral Alfred von Tirpitz to Admiral von Stosch, (February 13, 1896)." http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=791. Accessed on February 25/2017.
- Rosenberg, Alfred. 'The Jew and the German, excerpts from Die Spur des Juden im Wandel der Zeiten,' in *Documenting Life and Destruction, Holocaust Sources In Context: The Political Diary of Alfred Rosenberg and the Onset of the Holocaust*. Edited by Joseph Jake and Morten Mandel, (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015).
- "Rußland eröffnet den Krieg," *Kolnische Zeitung*. August, 1914.
- Schlieffen, Alfred von. "The Schlieffen Plan (1905,)." http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=796. Accessed on May 30/2018,

“Secret Reinsurance Treaty with Russia, (June 18, 1887).” http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=1862. Accessed on February 26, 2017.

“School Inspection Law, (March 11, 1872).” http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=670. Accessed on 16/11/2017.

Society for German Colonization, Founding Manifesto, (March 28, 1885).
http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=667. Accessed on 17/11/2017.

“School Inspection Law (March 11, 1872).” http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=670. Accessed on 16/11/2017.

“Summary of Hitler’s Meeting with the Heads of the Armed Services on November 5, 1937 (Hossbach Protocol of November 10, 1937).” http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=1540. Accessed on June 21, 2018.

Richard Wagner, “What is German?”, (1865/1878).http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/docpage.cfm?docpage_id=2537. Accessed on 16/11/2017.

“The Nightmare of Coalitions”: Bismarck on the Other Great Powers, (1879/1898)”
http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=1855. Accessed on 20/11/2017

“The Treat of Brest Litovsk, (April 2, 1918).”
http://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/blmenu.asp. Accessed on June 3, 2018.

“The Munich Agreement (September 29, 1938)”. http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=1542. Accessed on June 22, 2018.

Wilhelm II, *The Kaiser’s Memoirs: Wilhelm II, Emperor of Germany, 1888-1918*. Translated by Thomas R. Ybarra. New York and London: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1922.

Secondary:

Andrew, C.M. Andrew & A.S, Kanya-Forstner. “Centre and Periphery in the Making of the Second French Colonial Empire, 1815-1920.” *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*. Vol 16 No. 3, (1988), 9-34.

Ayling, S.E. *Nineteenth-Century Gallery: Portraits of Power and Rebellion*. London and Toronto: George G. Harrap & CO. LTD, 1970.

Baranowski, Shelley. *Nazi Empire: German Colonialism and Imperialism from Bismarck to Hitler*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Baranowski, Shelley. “Against “Human Diversity as Such”: Lebensraum and Genocide in the Third Reich” in *German Colonialism: Race, the Holocaust, and Postwar Germany*. Edited By Volker Langbehn and Mohammad Salama. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011.

- Barkan, Elazar and Ronald Bush. *Prehistories of the Future: The Primitivist Project and the Culture of Modernism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.
- Benns, F. Lee and Mary Elisabeth Seldon. *Europe, 1914-1939*. New York: Meredith Publishing Company, 1965
- Berger, Stefan. *Germany*. London: Hodder Arnold, 2004.
- Berman, Russel A. *Enlightenment or Empire: Colonial Discourse in German Culture*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.
- Black, C.E. and E.C. Helmreich. *Twentieth Century Europe*. New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1950.
- Blanke, Richard. "Vejas Gabriel Liulevicius: The German Myth of the East: 1800 to Present, a review" in *The American Historical Review*. Volume 116, Issue 5. (December 2011): 1585-1586.
- Blöhme, Klaus. *Aufrufe und Reden Deutscher Professoren in Ersten Weltkrieg*. Stuttgart, Philip Reden Tau, 1975.
- Bonnell Andrew G. "A Review of David Ciarlo. Advertising Empire: Race and Visual Culture in Imperial Germany", in *European History Quarterly*. Vol. 33, No. 3 (July, 2014): 517-518.
- Bramsted, Ernest K. *Goebbels and National Socialist Propaganda, 1925-1945*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1965.
- Breuilly, John. 'Preface' in *The State of Germany: The national idea in the making, unmaking and remaking of a modern nation-state*. Edited by John Breuilly. London and New York: Longman Group Ltd, 1992.
- Breuilly, John. "Introduction" in *Nineteenth Century Germany: Politics, Culture and Society, 1780-1918*. Edited by John Breuilly. London: Arnold, A member of the Hodder Headline Group, 1997.
- Brons, Lajos. "Othering, an Analysis" *Transcendence: A Journal of Global Studies*, Vol 6, No. 1 (2015): 69-87.
- Casteel, James E. *Russia in the German Global Imaginary: Imperial Visions & Utopian Desires, 1905-1941*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2016.
- Cecil, Robert. *The Myth of the Master Race: Alfred Rosenberg and Nazi Ideology*. New York: Dodd Mead & Company, 1972.
- Chickering, Roger. *The Great War and Urban Life in Germany: Freiburg, 1914-1918*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge, 2007.
- Chrisman, Laura. *Postcolonial Contraventions: Cultural Readings of Race, Imperialism and Transnationalism*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2003.

- Ciarlo, David. *Advertising Empire: Race and Visual Culture in Imperial Germany*. Cambridge MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2011.
- Clark, Christopher. *Iron Chancellor: The Rise and Downfall of Prussia, 1600-1947*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006.
- Conrad, Sebastian. *German Colonialism: A Short History*. Translated by Sorcha O'Hagan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Craig, Gordon A. *Germany: 1866-1945*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- Crankshaw, Edward. *Bismarck*. London: Macmillan London Limited, 1981.
- Cunliffe, Marcus. *The Age of Expansion 1848-1917*. Springfield: G&C. Merriam Company, 1976.
- Davis, William Stearns. *Europe Since Waterloo: A Non-Technical History of Europe From The Exile Of Napoleon to the Treaty Of Versailles, 1815-1919*. London: Leonard Parsons, 1927.
- Dervin, Fred. "Cultural Identity, Representation and Othering" in *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Intercultural Communication*. Edited by Jane Jackson. London and New York: Routledge, 2014.
- Emmerson, James Thomas. *The Rhineland Crisis, 7 March 1936: A study in multilateral diplomacy*. London: Maurice Temple Smith Ltd, 1977.
- Eubank, Keith. *Munich*. Norman: University Of Oklahoma, 1963.
- Eyck, Erich. *Bismarck And The German Empire*. New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1968.
- Farand, Chloe. "Anti-fascist protesters flood Berlin streets as far-right celebrates historic election result: Results mean anti-immigration party could win more than 80 seats in the Bundestag." *The Independent*, (September 24, 2017). <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/germany-elections-alternative-fur-deutschland-far-right-afd-bundestag-parliament-angela-merkel-a7965041.html>. Accessed on June 24, 2018.
- Farrar, L.L. *Arrogance and Anxiety: The Ambivalence of German Power. 1848-1914*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1981.
- Feuchtwanger, Edgar. *Bismarck: A Political History*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2002.
- Ferguson, Niall. *The War of the World: Twentieth Century Conflict and the Descent of the West*. New York: Penguin Books, 2006.
- Frej, Willa. "What Merkel's Win Means For Germany's 1 Million Refugees." *The Huffington Post*. October 27, 2017. https://www.huffingtonpost.ca/entry/merkel-win-refugees-us_59c23231e4b087fdf50931d9. Accessed on June 22, 2018.

- Freund, Gerald. *Unholy Alliance: Russian-German Relations from the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk to the Treaty of Berlin*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1957.
- Goltz, Anna von der. *Hindenburg: Power, Myth, And The Rise Of The Nazis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Gorden, Harold J. *Hitler and the Beer Hall Putsch*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972.
- Hagen, William W. *Germans, Poles and Jews: The Nationality Conflict in the Prussian East, 1772-1914*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Hamilton, Michael. "A review of Nazi Empire: German Colonialism and Imperialism From Bismarck to Hitler," *History: Reviews of New Books*, Vol 41, No. 1. (Nov 21, 2012), 37.
- Hamlin, David. *Germany's Empire in the East: Germans and Romania in an Era of Globalization and Total War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Heiden, Konrad. *A History of National Socialism*. London: Octagon Books, 1974.
- Hiddleston, Jane. *Understanding Postcolonialism*. Stocksfield: Acumen Publishing Limited, 2009.
- Hillgruber, Andreas. *Germany and the Two World War*. Translated by William C. Kirby. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- Hobson, J.A. *Imperialism: A Study*. New York: Cosimo Classics, 2005, originally published in 1902 by George Allen & Unwin LTD.
- Hoerder, Dirk. 'Transcultural Approaches to Gender Labour Migration: From the Nineteenth Century Proletarian to Twenty-First Century Caregiver Mass Migrations' in *Proletarian and Gendered Mass Migrations: A Global Perspective on Continuities and Discontinuities from the 19th to the 21st Centuries*. Edited by Dirk Hoerder. Boston: Brill Leiden, 2013: 19-65.
- Hopkins, A.G. 'Overseas Expansion, Imperialism, and Empire, 1815-1914' in T.C.W. Blanning's, *The Short Oxford History of Europe: The Nineteenth Century*. Oxford: Oxford university Press, 2000.
- Horak, Stephan M. *The First Treaty of World War I: Ukraine's Treaty with the Central Powers of February 9, 1918*. Boulder: Eastern European Monographs, 1988.
- Jensen, Sune Qvotrup. "Othering, identity formation and agency." *Qualitative studies* Vol 2, No. 2 (2011): 63-78.
- Keegan, John Keegan, *The First World War*. Toronto: Vintage Canada, 1998.
- Kennedy, Paul. "The Kaiser and German Weltpolitik: Reflections on Wilhelm II's place in the making of German foreign policy" in *Kaiser Wilhelm II: New Interpretations, The Corfu Papers*. Edited by John C.G. Röhl and Nicolaus Sombart. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 143.

- Kershaw, Ian. *The Hitler Myth: Myth and Reality in the Third Reich*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- Kopp, Kristin. *Germany's Wild East: Constructing Poland as Colonial Space*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2012.
- Kohut, Thomas A. *Wilhelm II and the Germans: A Study in Leadership*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Knoll, Arthur J. 'Introduction' in *The German Colonial Experience: Select Documents on German Rule in Africa, China and the Pacific 1884-1914*. Edited by Arthur J Knoll and Hermann J. Hiery. Lanham and Plymouth: University Press of America, 2010: viiii-xx.
- Kundrus, Birthe. "German Colonialism: Some Reflections on reassessments, Specificities and Constellations" in *German Colonialism: Race, the Holocaust, and Postwar Germany*. Translated by Volker Langbehn and Mohammad Salama. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011.
- Laffey, John. *Imperialism and Ideology: An Historical Perspective*. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 2000.
- Langbehn, Volker and Mohammad Salama. "Introduction: Reconfiguring German Colonialism" in *German Colonialism: Race, the Holocaust, and Post War Germany*. Edited by Volker Langbehn and Mohammad Salama. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011.
- Langsam, Walter Consuelo. *The World Since 1919*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954.
- Liulevicius, Vejas Gabriel. *The German Myth of the East: 1800 to the Present*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Liulevicius, Vejas Gabriel. 'The Language of Occupation: Vocabularies of German rule in Eastern Europe in the World Wars' in *Germans Poland and Colonial Expansion to the East: 1850 Through the Present*. Edited by Robert L Nelson. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Lord, Robert H. "Bismarck and Russia in 1863." *American Historical Review*, Vol. 29, No. 1. (Oct 1923): 24-48.
- Lowe, John. *The Great Powers, Imperialism and the German Problem 1865-1925*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Lower, Wendy. *Nazi Empire Building and the Holocaust in Ukraine*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005.
- MacDonough, Giles. *Frederick the Great: A Life In Deed And Letter*. New York: St Martin's Press, 1999.
- Madley, Benjamin. "From Africa to Auschwitz: How German South West Africa Incubated Ideas and Methods Adopted and Developed by the Nazis in Eastern Europe" *European History Quarterly*, Vol 35 No. 3 (July 1, 2005): 429-464

- Mann, Golo. *The History of Germany since 1789*. Translated by Marian Jackson. New York and Washington: Praeger Publishers, 1968.
- Matthäus, Jürgen and Frank Bajohr. 'Introduction to Alfred Rosenberg and His Diary,' in *Documenting Life and Destruction, Holocaust Sources In Context: The Political Diary of Alfred Rosenberg and the Onset of the Holocaust*, Edited by Joseph Jake and Morton Mandel. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015.
- Marchand, Suzanne L. *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire: Religion, Race and Scholarship*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Marples, David R. *Motherland: Russia in the 20th Century*. London: Pearson Education Limited, 2002.
- Mazower, Mark. *Hitler's Empire: How the Nazis Ruled Europe*. New York: The Penguin Press, 2008.
- Meyer, Henry Cord. *Mitteleuropa In German thought and Action 1815-1945*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1955.
- Mombauer, Annika. "Wilhelm, Waldersee and the Boxer Rebellion" in *The Kaiser: New Research on Wilhelm's Role in Imperial Germany*. Edited by Annika Mombauer and Wilhelm Deist. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Mosse, W.E. *The Crisis of German Identity: Intellectual Origins of the Third Reich*. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1981.
- Müller, Sven Oliver. 'Nationalismus in der deutschen Kriegsgesellschaft 1939 bis 1945' in *Zweiter Halbband, Ausbeutung, Deutungen, Ausgrenzung*. Edited by Jörg Echternkamp. Munich: Deutsch Verlags Anstalt, 2005.
- Nelson, Robert L. 'The Archive For Inner Colonization, The German East And World War 1' in *Germans, Poland And Colonial Expansion To The East: 1850 Through The Present*. Edited by Robert L. Nelson. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Noakes, Jeremy and Geoffrey Pridham, ed., *Nazism 1919-1945: A History in Documents and Eyewitness Accounts, Vol. 1*. New York: Schocken Books, 1983.
- Nye, Robert. 'Savage Crowds, Modernism and Modern Politics' in *Prehistories of the Future: The Primitivist Project and the Culture of Modernism*. Edited by Elazar Barken and Ronald Bush. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.
- Paddock, Troy R.E. *Creating the Russian Peril: Education, the Public Sphere and the National Identity in Imperial Germany, 1890-1914*. New York: Camden House, 2010.
- Palmer, Alan. *The Kaiser: Warlord of the Second Reich*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1974.
- Perras, Arne. 'Colonial Agitation and the Bismarckian State: The Case of Carl Peter' in *Wilhelminism and Its Legacies: German Modernities, Imperialism, and the Meanings of*

- Reform, 1890-1930: Essays for Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann.* Edited By Geoff Eley James Retallack. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2003.
- Perras, Arne. *Carl Peters and German Imperialism 1856-1918.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004.
- Pflanze, Otto. *Bismarck and the Development of Germany: Vol 1, The Period of Unification, 1815-1871.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Pflanze, Otto. *Bismarck and the Development of Germany: Vol II, The Period of Consolidation. 1871-1880.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Porter, Andrew. *European Imperialism, 1860-1914.* London: Macmillan, 1994.
- Prozorov, Sergei. "The other as past and present beyond the logic of "temporal othering" in IR theory" *Review of International Studies*, Vol 37, No. 3 (July 2011): 1273-1293.
- Qiyu, Xu. *Fragile Rise: Grand Strategy and the Fate of Imperial Germany, 1871-1914*, Translated by Joshua Hill. Cambridge: Belfer Center Studies in International Security, 2017.
- Retallack, James. *Imperial Germany, 1871-1918: The Short Oxford History of Germany.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Retallack, James. *The German Right, 1860-1920: Political Limits of the Authoritarian Imagination.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.
- Robins, Keith. *Munich 1938.* London: Cassell & Company LTD, 1968.
- Roger Louis, Wm. *Ends of British Imperialism: The Scramble for Empire, Suez and Decolonization: Collected Essays.* London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 2006.
- Röhl, John C.G. *Kaiser Wilhelm II, 1859-1941: A Concise Life.* Translated by Sheila de Bellaigue. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014
- Röhl, John C.G. 'Introduction' in *Kaiser Wilhelm II: New Interpretations, the Corfu Papers.* Edited by John C.G. Röhl and Nicolaus Sombart. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Ross, Ronald. *The Failure of Bismarck's Kulturkampf: Catholicism and State Power in Imperial Germany, 1871-1887.* Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1998.
- Robertson, C. Grant. *Bismarck.* London: Constable and Company, Ltd, 1918.
- Said, Edward. 'Knowing the Oriental' in *Orientalism.* New York: Vintage Books, 1979.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient.* Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1995.
- 2
- Saccarelli Emanuele and Latha Varadarajan, *Imperialism: Past and Present.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Scheck, Raffael. *Alfred von Tirpitz and German Right-Wing Politics, 1914-1930.* Boston: Humanities Press, Inc, 1998.

- Schreiber, Hermann. *Teuton And Slav: The Struggle for Central Europe*. Translated by James Cleugh. London: Constable and Co. Ltd, 1961.
- Schrecker, John E. *Imperialism and Chinese Nationalism: Germany in Shantung*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.
- Showalter, Dennis E. *Tannenberg: The Clash of Empires*. Dulles: Potomac Books Inc, 2004, originally published, 1991.
- Smith, Woodruff D. *The Ideological Origins of Nazi Imperialism*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Spivak, G. C. "The Rani of Sirmur: an essay in reading the archives." *History and Theory*, Vol 24 No. 3 (1985): 247-272.
- Steinberg Jonathan. *Bismarck: A Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Steinmetz, George. *The Devils Handwriting: Precoloniality and the German Colonial State in Qingdao, Samoa and Southwest Africa*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2007.
- Stern, Fritz. *Gold and Iron: Bismarck, Bleichröder and the Building of the German Empire*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977.
- Stoecker, Helmuth. "The Historical Background" in *German Imperialism in Africa: From the Beginnings until the Second World War*. Edited by Helmuth Stoecker., Translated by Bernd Zöllner. London: C. Hurst & Company, 1986.
- Thelen, Raphael. "The Chemnitz Riots: Right-Wing Mob Wreaks Havoc on German City," *Der Spiegel*. (August 28, 2018). <http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/chemnitz-right-wing-riots-enter-second-day-a-1225321.html>. Accessed on November 30, 2018.
- Townsend, Mary Evelyn. *The Rise and Fall of Germany's Colonial Empire*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1930.
- Tomlinson, John. *Cultural Imperialism: A Critical Introduction* (London: Continuum, 2002), 68.
- Ullrich, Volker. *Bismarck: The Iron Chancellor*. London: Haus Publishing, 2008, originally published 1998.
- Warraq, Ibn. *Defending the West: A Critique of Edward Said's Orientalism*. New York: Prometheus Books, 2007.
- Wawro, Geoffrey. *Warfare and Society in Europe, 1792-1914*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Weindling, Paul Julian. *Epidemics and Genocide in Eastern Europe, 1890-1945*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Weinberg, Gerhard L. *The Foreign Policy of Hitler's Germany: Diplomatic Revolution in Europe 1933-36*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Wenzel, Josef. *Mit Draht und Kabel im Osten: Aus dem Tagebuch eines Telegraphisten*.
Karlsruhe: Akt. G.E Badenia, 1918.

Xiang, Lanxin. *The Origins of the Boxer War: A Multinational Study*. London and New York:
Routledge Curzon, 2003.

Zantop, Suzanne. *Colonialism Fantasies: Conquest, Family and Nation in Precolonial Germany, 1770-1870*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1997.