

**Concerning the Study of *Kolonialdenkmäler* –
Notes in Reply to Joachim Zeller: *Kolonialdenkmäler und Geschichtsbewußtsein. Eine Untersuchung der kolonialdeutschen Erinnerungskultur*¹**

Michael Weiskopf

Moribus antiquis res stat Romana virisque
(Ennius)

In a collection of essays which highlighted new approaches in the study of the Kolonialreich – and those which had outlived their usefulness – Lewis H. Gann writes about German colonialism as “marginal colonialism”, one limited in significance and influence.² So it might seem upon consideration of the *Kolonialdenkmäler*, the subject of Joachim Zeller’s inquiry, a revised version of his 1998 dissertation. As his study makes clear, their small number does not diminish these monuments’ significance for the friends, relatives, and descendants of those honored, or seemingly dishonored. A word of caution: their inscriptions and iconography, to some, at first glance, oddly out of place in the twenty-first century, but inspiring strong emotions, do not justify vandalism and impiety.³

One may divide Zeller’s work into a theoretical section and a historical section. In the first, characteristic of the study’s origin as a dissertation, Zeller discusses the pairing of *Denkmal und Geschichtsbewußtsein*, introducing the role *Geschichtsdidaktik* plays in making inquiry into how an individual or society comes to perceive its history. Here he relies on the published works by Karl-Ernst Jeisman on *Geschichtsbewußtsein* and draws the conclusion that “*die Stiftung eines Denkmals [...] dient in erster Linie den politischen Funktionen des Geschichtsbewußtsein.*” To explicate the significance of a monument and its interpretation Zeller chooses as a *Parade-Beispiel* the now lost monument at the *Doeberitz-Truppenübungsplatz*, dedicated in 1931 and mourning the territorial losses inflicted at Versailles (pp. 21-28, Zeller nr. 24, the number in his catalogue at the end

¹ Frankfurt: IKO–Verlag für Interkulturelle Kommunikation, 2000.

² Lewis H. Gann “Marginal Colonialism: The German Case”, pp. 1-17 in Arthur J. Knoll and Lewis H. Gann, eds.: *Germans in the Tropics. Essays in German Colonial History*, New York 1987. Note well, on pp. 13-15, the key differences between “old-fashioned colonial and modern totalitarian regimes”.

³ Note the activities and individuals in Hendrik Resen: *Ein kolonialer Adler fliegt nach Namibia*, Namibia Magazin 1/2000, p. 23.

of his book, pp. 303-325). He offers a full description and analysis of the monument, its components (iconography, inscription, physical form), and its possible perception by visitors. Gaps in the historical records concerning the motivation for the monument's construction are pointed out. Then Zeller turns to the Kolonialdenkmäler as historical sources, outlining a series of questions which should be asked of the monuments (p. 46-47). This program seems to rely on the unpublished work by Frank Schimmelfennig, *Denkmal and Geschichtsbewußtsein* (1990), about which no data is provided, save that it is an *unveröffentl. Typoscript* (p.298). This is most unfortunate – Zeller has high regard for this study, which examines *bundesrepublikanische Denkmäler* commemorating the events of the period of the Second World War. He provides next an overview of the state of research into Kolonialdenkmäler, introducing Bodo v. Borries' four *Theoriekonzepte*, models, by which colonial events are interpreted (p. 52ff.): the *wechselseitige Fortschritts- und Modernisierungsthese*, the *Dependenz-Theorie* (which denies any advantage accrued to the colonized, hence a mirror image of the first model), third, a theory viewing colonial history as *Wahnsinn und Weltzerstörung*, and, finally, the *Irrelevanz- oder Nulleffekt-These*, arguing that colonialism diminished the locals, added nothing to the metropolis, and benefitted only a small select (European) group. It is the second model with which Zeller most identifies and by which he judges the work of others (p. 7, 236, 265-267). A definition of Kolonialdenkmal is offered: a monument commemorating a person or event in colonial history (thus the *Leutwein-Erinnerungstafel* at Strümpfelbrunn, Zeller nr. 93, is included, but not the Governor's gravesite). Then follow brief considerations of the artistic merits of the Denkmäler (minor in Zeller's view) and their themes.

Zeller organizes the historical section of his work along the common chronological delineation: Kaiserreich (until 1914), post-Versailles Weimar and NS-Herrschaft, post-1945. There is no discussion of the role the monuments played during the First World War or how perceptions of the monuments changed in wartime, although many who served in Schutzgebiete as military or administrative personnel defended their homeland in Europe (the hero's death of Julius Graf Zech auf Neuhofen, former Governor of Togo, comes to mind). Zeller is fortunate in having a wealth of material with which to work. In his discussion of monuments during the Kaiserreich he is able to outline the decision making-processes behind the selection of a design for the Reiterdenkmal, the placement of the Marinedenkmal at Swakopmund not Windhuk, and the plans for a central colonial monument. Although Zeller decides not to analyze the Denkmäler "*unter einer kunsthistorischen Fragestellung*" (p. 11) his comments on iconography appear only to criticize the inhabitants of the Kaiserreich for not thinking – to use the unfortunate American term – in a politically-correct fashion. He thus displays a tendency to anticipate

eagerly brown battalions, flags aloft, thus truncating his own analysis while trying to render ready the “path” – if one ever existed – from the national pride of the late 1800’s to the perversions of the mid-twentieth century. Adolf Bruett’s proposal for the Kolonialkriegerdenkmal planned for Berlin is discussed under the rubric “*Der ‘Herrenreiter’ oder die Weißen als die ‘Führerrasse’*” (pp. 98-99); the portrayal of Hermann v. Wissmann in his monument at Daressalam is that of a “Herrenmensch” lording over a child-like Askari (p. 122-123); the ‘dying Schutztruppler’ at Düsseldorf (Zeller nr. 29), a monument of imperial date, arouses Zeller’s interest as a model of *Heldentum* later acceptable to NS-Herrschaft (Zeller p. 121, 168).

Discussion of the period after the Versailles-debacle, for Zeller one of “*Politik mit der Erinnerung*”, begins with a summary treatment of *Kolonialrevisionismus*, one seemingly not cognizant of the narrowing of options left for a disappointed and exploited people as the gears of *Gleichschaltung* began to turn.⁴ Zeller traces the construction of those monuments mourning the loss both of life and the Schutzgebiete and of those celebrating Kolonialhelden. Now he examines the monuments and their iconography in light of their acceptability to NS-Herrschaft, as in the case of the *Ostafrikadenkmäler* planned for Potsdam (Zeller nr. 3, 87) and constructed at Hamburg (Zeller nr. 52). The fate of monuments in former colonies are outlined, most attention paid to events in Südwest, where the Reiterdenkmal served as a rallying point in efforts to maintain one’s German identity, occasionally, in times of pressure, with the unfortunate presence of European symbols serving a local, hyper-nationalistic purpose. Regrettably little attention is paid to the local non-European reactions to the remaining Kolonialdenkmäler during the Mandate-Zeit. One should note a Swahili inscription was added at the Sakarani Gravesite (Zeller nr. 155) in Tanga; the site of Hans Dominik’s Kribi statue (removed by the French, Zeller nr. 119, cf. nr. 39) was saluted by inhabitants of Kamerun critical of the Mandate.⁵

⁴ Zeller misses the important work by Woodruff D. Smith: *The Ideological Origins of Nazi Imperialism* (Oxford 1986). I cite only one example of the pain inflicted by Gleichschaltung: Julius Lips: *The Savage Hits Back* (New Haven 1937) xix-xxxi, cf. p. 6-10. Prof. Dr. Lips, Director of the Rautenstrauch-Joest Museum, will be familiar to the Traditionsverband as the contributor on Kamerun in E. Schultz-Ewerth and Leonhard Adam: *Das Eingeborenenrecht* (Stuttgart 1930), a legal and anthropological study complementing Dr. Schnee’s *Koloniallexikon*.

⁵ Unlike Zeller (p. 138) I would interpret the respect paid at the site of the Kribi *Dominikdenkmal* as a way for a number of groups – not solely the former Kamerun-Schutztruppler – to express dissatisfaction with the Mandate-System and Wilsonian false promises. Cf. Victor T. LeVine: *The Cameroons from Mandate to Independence* (Berkeley 1964), pp. 35-38, esp. 36. One may have a sense of local Kamerun expectations by examining petitions filed with the Weimar government (June 1919) and the Versailles meetings (August 1919). See

By 1945 the Kolonialherrschaftssysteme established in the nineteenth century were unravelling. Although the Kolonialreich lay twenty-five years or more in the past, its traces continued to inspire strong emotions. Zeller describes the *damnatio memoriae* of the colonial past in those regions which fell to *Rotherrschaft*. In the western portions of the old Kaiserreich the Denkmäler remained – to the dismay of reforming groups. Zeller’s discussions of opposition to the von Wissmann- and Dominikdenkmäler is even-handed, for this is a position with which he is in agreement, although the destruction of the monuments parallels NS abuse of the memory of Kolonialhelden (pp 206-215, cf. 161-168). I found his discussion of post-war attitudes towards the *Reiterdenkmal* at Windhuk detailed and well-documented: It highlights the immense respect most Namibians have for a rule of law and preserves the statement made by the *princeps* Clemens Kapuuo concerning the reason for the 1959 blindfolding of the *Reiter*: To insure that “*der deutsche Schutztruppler die Misere der Herero auf der Alten Werft nicht sieht.*” (Zeller pp. 244-245, p. 245 n. 622). Respect for monuments, commensurate with ancestral Herero custom, was combined with the belief that the *Reiter* personified an ideal and honor from which others have fallen away. Zeller’s otherwise exemplary account is marred by his decision to characterize as *Heuchlerei* (p. 262) attempts by the descendants of the Kolonialdeutsche to extend the boundaries of remembrance at Waterberg.

Zeller concludes his text with a discussion of the *Modernisierung*- and *Dependenztheorien*, and a summation of his findings. It is the *Anhang* to his work, a

Ralph A. Austen and Johnathan Derrick: *Middlemen of the Cameroons Rivers* (Cambridge 1999), table 5.3 on pp. 146-147. One might expand the definition of *Kolonialdenkmäler* when considering the former *Schutzgebiete*: How does one interpret the Yaunde statue of Charles Atangana (LeVine pp. 95-96, p. 271 n. 19), interpreter, Schutztruppler, *princeps* under German and French *Kolonialherrschaft*? For a study of how monuments and ceremonies could be used to inspire loyalty at a local level I recommend (from my own field of ancient history) Clifford Ando: *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire* (Berkeley 2000).

catalogue of Kolonialdenkmäler, which represents perhaps his most valuable contribution – for it offers a convenient starting point for more detailed investigations of individual monuments.

In the previous section I alluded to the disdainful and ideologically-colored manner in which Zeller presents his material. The scope of German history is collapsed by his tendency to portray matters colonial as adumbrations of events decades later. Nor is there any attempt, other than a few asides, to place the Kolonialdenkmäler into a larger European or international context.⁶ His reluctance to delve deeper into the iconography of the monuments robs his analysis of depth – for in the selection of motifs we learn the artist's (and his patron's) perception of events and perceptions of the past.

First I shall discuss Zeller's *Tendenz* in his treatment of the *Traditionsverband ehemaliger Schutz- und Überseetruppen* (pp. 229-237, 273-274), not so much because I am a member, but because as a historian I had access to much the same source material as he, the extant issues of the *Mitteilungsblätter*, which I had read in chronological order before I had obtained Zeller's work. In the course of this discussion I shall comment on the unsuitability of v. Borries' *Theoriekonzepte* for the study of Kolonialgeschichte. Then I shall turn to consider a number of individual monuments and demonstrate how a closer consideration of iconography and of context can result in less tendentious interpretations. Finally, I will comment on the structural flaws in Zeller's catalogue and offer suggestions as to how it might be expanded and rendered a more useful research tool.

Zeller places his examination of the Traditionsverband under the rubric "*Pflege eines statischen Geschichtsbildes: Die Kolonialapologetik des Traditionsverbandes ehemaliger Schutz- und Überseetruppen*". The adjective *statisch* is accurate in part: those who reestablished the Traditionsverband in 1956, in accordance with the rule of law set down by the ancestral constitution of the *Bundesrepublik*, were veterans whose military careers began in the years before 1919. The nature of any Traditionsverband is the handing across from one generation to the next (*traditio*) a shared set of values, ceremonies, memories, and friendships. Over the past 45 years the organization has evolved, in a process not unlike the transformation of legionary encampments to today's European cities, from one of veterans to one containing their descendants, relatives, descendants of friends – in Germany and abroad – and those interested in the German colonial empire, a field of history which extends in scope from family lore to the international arena. As a result, one

⁶ E.g. p. 61 n.137, p. 265 n. 688, final paragraph on p. 276. Fortunately, this gap can be filled by utilizing Rudy Koshar's *From Monuments to Traces: Artifacts of German Memory, 1870-1990* (Berkeley 2000), in which is created a German and European framework into which the *Kolonialdenkmäler* may be placed.

should be neither surprised nor dismayed at the Traditionverband's continued participation in ceremonies, which have also changed over time, honoring colonial soldiers and officials, such as Hermann von Wissmann.

Here is raised the issue of *Kolonialapologetik*. The words criticized by Zeller on pp. 232-233, taken from the 1971 granite tablet dedicated by the Traditionsverband in von Wissmann's honor, are reminiscent of those spoken at von Wissmann's funeral in 1905, for the inscription was fashioned by those for whom von Wissmann was living memory, a colleague, a family friend.⁷

The continuity in thought should cause no surprise: Funeral and memorial speeches tend to be conservative in structure and focus on deeds to be emulated by those in attendance. They do not bow readily to transitory popular fashion.

In his account of the Traditionverband's activities Zeller appears to have little patience for the efforts of private individuals. The museums he criticizes were private homes whose owners were willing to share their interests and their collections with the public. Regrettably he offers no specific positive suggestions as to how such private collections might be better displayed. The more recent writings of the Traditionverband's members, many professionals, but not professional historians, may be placed into the long practice of individuals recording their memoirs or investigating the history of their family, nation, or profession. That Zeller looks upon these efforts with askance is reminiscent of the jealousy and concern the "ethnological elite" expressed at colonial officers conducting ethnological and anthropological investigations.⁸ And, most regrettably, Zeller is silent on the Traditionsverband's long-standing practice, carried out alone or in conjunction with other organizations, of providing humanitarian aid to those regions once under the *Kaiseradler*, e.g. educational assistance for Namibia, and financial support first for the Askari, then for their descendants, relatives, and friends.⁹

⁷ Illustration, text, 1905 speeches: Heinrich Meyer: *Erinnerungsstätten an Hermann v. Wissmann*, Traditionsverband ehemaliger Schutz- und Überseetruppen, Sonderdruck aus Nr. 51 des Mitteilungsblattes (Herbst 1972).

⁸ Zeller p. 232 with notes 576, 577. Woodruff D. Smith: *Anthropology and German Colonialism*, pp. 39-57 in Arthur J. Knoll and Lewis H. Gann, eds.: *Germans in the Tropics. Essays in German Colonial History*, New York 1987.

⁹ The latter efforts are the *mos maiorum* of the Familie Scheel, Margarethe Scheel, German honorary consul at Tanga, taking up the responsibility at the death of her husband (and soon earning the appellation "Mama Askari") and handing it down to her daughter-in-law, Jane Tamé. Cf. Werner Haupt: *Hundert Jahre Traditionsverband ehemaliger Schutz- und Überseetruppen*, T.V.e.SÜT-Mitt.bl 80 (Juli 1997), p. 54, 65-66; cf. *Nachrichtenblatt* 28 (Dez. 2000), p. 19.

He seems not to recognize the changes an organization undergoes over a number of decades. One might find the Eurocentric, racist wording of which he complains (without documentation, note 576, p. 232) as late as 1974. The term “*primitiven Naturmenschen*” appears in an examination of Karin Hausen’s work on Kamerun made by the long-lived colonial officer (one of many), Lt. Max Koehn.¹⁰ The context is a discussion of the training received by the German and non-German members of the colonial military forces. Koehn holds the Germans received the superior training. I would be surprised if the Schutztruppler failed to look back with pride at their careers in a distant, simpler past. It is in the memoirs of officers who served in the colonies, whose formative years lay nearly a century in the past, that one finds the phraseology which Zeller finds unacceptable, but for which I find parallels in a variety of ethnocentric statements made in antiquity about foreign peoples.¹¹ One might find those phrases in recent issues of the *Mitteilungsblätter* – in original documents, primary source material reprinted and commented upon.

I disagree with Zeller’s conclusion that the *Mitteilungsblätter* of the Traditionsverband are without significance in modern investigations into colonial history (Zeller p. 232 n. 576). In making an examination of *Kolonialdenkmäler* a dispassionate consideration of the archives and memories of a organization made up of colonial veterans would add much hitherto unknown data. And now, the last of these veterans having answered the Final Role Call, the *Mitteilungsblätter* remain an important source for family history, local history, imperial history. The continued publication of personal narratives once “hidden” in family archives may be compared with the publication of archaeological evidence which sheds new light on antiquity. And narratives not designed originally for “public consumption”, as Gesine Krüger demonstrates in her mature analysis of soldiers’ testimony, may present complementary and, at times, more accurate assessments of events.¹²

Zeller has viewed the Traditionsverband through the lense of v. Borries’ Theoriekonzepte, the Traditionsverband representing the Modernisierungstheorie, Zeller championing a modified form of the Dependenztheorie. Both theories threaten to be too-simplistic mirror-images of each other, best suitable for exercises in rheto-

¹⁰ On p. 13 in “Eine kritische Betrachtung von Max Koehn, Freiburg i. Br.” in: T.V.e.SÜT-Mitt.bl 53 (Nov./Dez. 1974), pp. 8-20, i.e. a review of Karin Hausen: *Deutsche Kolonialwirtschaft in Afrika* (Zürich 1970).

¹¹ Note some of the Greco-Roman assessments cited in Susan P. Mattern: *Rome and the Enemy* (Berkeley 1999) pp. 202 ff.

¹² Gesine Krüger: *Kriegsbewältigung und Geschichtsbewußtsein*.(Göttingen 1999), pp. 69-103, 118.

ric or parody.¹³ Nor are they not the foregone result of the study of modern colonial activity, but find echoes among the ancients. Consider the following: “They call theft and slaughter and pillage by the false name of ‘empire’, and when they have made a wasteland they call it peace.” This statement of the “*Dependenz-Theorie*” is drawn from the Roman historian Tacitus, who placed these words into the mouth of the chieftain Calgacus as part of a speech delivered in the laudatory biography of Agricola, Roman governor of Britain (Tacitus *Agricola* 30.5). Of the remaining two Theoriekonzepte, the one holding colonial history to be *Wahnsinn und Weltzerstörung* permits some Europeans the luxury of taking an idealizing, anti-modern position, while denying to the inhabitants of the colonized regions the humanity and intelligence to make mistakes and adopt/adapt technology. The locals are noble savages – a role they have no permission to abandon. The last concept, the *Irrelevanz- oder Nulleffekt-These*, one may find espoused by the colonizers themselves, e.g. in the sobering introduction to Paul Samassa’s *Die Besiedlung Deutsch-Ostafrikas* (Berlin 1909), which begins with the observation “[W]ir bei die Aufteilung der Erde zu spät gekommen waren und wertvolles Land für eine weisse Besiedlung grossen Stils nicht mehr erlangen konnten” (p.3). It would be prove salutary to take another *Studienreise* through the primary source material – one will find groups of both colonizers and colonized achieving some temporary advantage. Perhaps I betray too much my Classical training when I suggest that a realistic departure point for the understanding of the memoirs of a colonial officer, a colonialrevisionist’s broadsheet, a veteran’s impassioned and well-documented response to one-sided television propaganda, the respect – sometimes grudging – displayed by the “helpless” colonized towards their German administrators, and the Kameradschaft shared by soldiers of different skin colors is the German equivalent of the Roman concept *decus, Ansehen*.¹⁴

¹³ In general, for this paragraph, see the excellent work by Susan P. Mattern: *Rome and the Enemy* (Berkeley 1999). Her discussion and translation of the Tacitus citation is at p. 207 ff. For a discussion and its parody: The Babylonian Talmud (*Sabbath* 33b) reports the dispute among rabbis concerning the relative merits of Roman improvements to the infrastructure of Judea, one rabbi taking the “*Fortschritts*” position, another espousing the “*Dependenz-Theorie*” (cf. Zeller p. 190 n. 471 on “*technische Denkmäler*”). – The same discussion is parodied as speakers equivocate their originally rigid viewpoints in the comedy, *Monty Python’s Life of Brian*. An English translation of the Talmud passage appears in Naphtali Lewis and Meyer Reinhold, eds.: *Roman Civilization. Sourcebook II: The Empire* (New York 1955), p. 414. My thanks to Dylan Sailor, who is preparing a study of Tacitus at the University of California, Berkeley.

¹⁴ It is not my intention to precipitously stamp an *interpretatio Romana* on the *Kolonialreich*, but rather to encourage the study of its primary sources with the same care ancient historians have taken with Caesar, Tacitus, etc. Part of that study must be examination of the

A proper understanding the Kolonialdenkmäler and their perception by the public requires consideration of both the visual and literary record.¹⁵ Zeller makes much progress in doing so, but his tendency not to examine the monuments as artwork shaped by both past and present influences, by national and international trends, by personal loyalties to those commemorated leaves his analysis as one too much shaped by the events of the mid-twentieth century and Zeller's reaction to them. Interpretations which do not look ahead to later historical events may be reached by considering nineteenth and early twentieth century evidence in its context.

In his discussion of the Doeberitz memorial Zeller points to the “(*Blut und*) *Boden-Mythos*”, but an investigation into the background of Jesko v. Puttkamer, the motivating force behind the monument's construction, indicates personal and family loyalties may have played an important role: von Puttkamer, himself a Schutztruppenerführer who served in Kamerun, appears to have been the nephew of the like-named former Governor of that Schutzgebiet.¹⁶

A number of monuments, some in the Schutzgebiete, others in the Kaiserreich, wrestle with the issue of how to commemorate both the accomplishments and sacrifices made overseas, while instructing the audience in a moral lesson. I take as my starting point the 1907 *Marinedenkmal* (Zeller nr. 131, pp. 113-114), which depicts two soldiers, one on guard, ready to continue the battle, the second, a casu-

background and training of colonial officers. I note the use of *Ansehen* as a motivation at a very local level in the diary of Lt. Freiherr von Muenchhausen, who was stationed in the far west of Ostafrika, on the border of Ruanda with the Belgian Congo. Rebels who crossed over from Belgian territory must be dealt with quickly; the Leutnant will do this with his own forces only (so to avoid any *Verpflichtungen an Kongo-Staat*); although small in number, his troops will prevail if superior strategy and discipline are exercised. Extracts of the diary may be found in Klaus-Friedrich Hetzer: *Tagebuch des Leutnants Leopold Freiherr von Muenchhausen in Ruanda/Deutsch-Ostafrika 1900*, T.V.e.SÜT-Mitt.bl 86 (April 2000) 65-73. On local initiative see Arthur J. Knoll: *Decision-Making for the German Colonies*, pp. 131-149 in Arthur J. Knoll and Lewis H. Gann, eds.: *Germans in the Tropics. Essays in German Colonial History* (New York 1987).

¹⁵ As an exemplar for the consideration of monuments in which all evidence is presented and analyzed in context: Paul Zanker: *Augustus und die Macht der Bilder* (Munich 1987).

¹⁶ Prosopographical data on Puttkamer *Minor* were transmitted to me 27 Jan. 2001 courtesy of Herr Wolfgang Herterich, Kamerun-Fachberater and Herr Dipl.-Kfm Hermann Mietz, Geschäftsführer, both of the Traditionsverband ehemaliger Schutz- und Ueberseetruppen. In 1908 Puttkamer held the rank of Oberleutnant and served as Adjutant for Governor Theodor Seitz, Puttkamer *Maior*'s successor. Puttkamer's appointment under Seitz might be seen as Seitz' solidifying his own support among men with personal loyalty to the former governor. The Adjutant is mentioned, although without details as to parentage, in Theodor Seitz: *Vom Aufstieg und Niederbruch deutscher Kolonialmacht*, Band II (Karlsruhe 1929), pp. 76-77, 104.

alty, lies below, still grasping his weapon. The monument had been planned for Windhuk, but concerns over the impact the representation of both soldierly determination and heroic death might have on the *Eingeborener* (joy at a dead German) caused it to be placed at Swakopmund instead. Similiar concerns were raised in regard to Adolf Kürle's proposal for the *Kolonialkriegerdenkmal* at Windhuk (ill. on Zeller, p. 116), a triumphant *Reiter* atop a massive pedestal, a contemplative soldier below. One need not evoke *völkische NS-Fantasie*. This is the imperial era *Hermannsdenkmal*¹⁷ interpreted for a colonial context, the *Schutztruppler* and wreath below the pedestal a representation of the memorial ceremonies to take place in the future. The presence, in this case, of a secondary, 'mourning' figure created misgivings among judges who feared it diminished the monument's triumphant appearance. A later Kürle design, the horse and *Reiter* alone, now stands at Windhuk.

Subsidiary figures were not removed from the von Wissmanndenkmal at Daressalam (Zeller nr. 142, cf. nr. 50), and there are two to be considered: The Askari looking upward at von Wissmann's figure on the pedestal, and the dead lion, lying at the monument's base, draped by the Askari's flag, its paws and body hanging over the edge of the base. I must reject Zeller's interpretation that "*Wissmann erschient hier aber nicht nur als 'Herrenmensch' über die ihm ergebenen Afrikaner und als Herrscher über das eroberte Land, sondern auch als Bezwingen der Natur. Denn offensichtlich ist der getötete König der Tiere sein Werk und seine Beute. So tritt Wissmann hier – in Anspielung auf Herkules mit dem getöteten Löwen – gleichsam als ein 'kolonialer Herkules', mit übermenschlichen Kräften versehen, auf.*" (Zeller pp.123-124). Instead, I believe the lion *is* von Wissmann – that is why the Askari is draping the lion with a flag, much as a soldier's coffin is draped, and that is why the Askari looks upward at von Wissmann, or rather upward toward the Askari's memory of von Wissmann. The monument not only commemorates von Wissmann by illustrating him in heroic pose, but also commemorates how he will be remembered by his Kameraden, his contemporaries, and those after: *Der Löwe Deutsch-Ostafrikas*.¹⁸

¹⁷ For an illustration and discussion of the *Hermannsdenkmal* see Rudy Koshar: *From Monuments to Traces* (Berkeley 2000), pp.35-41. The reader should compare Koshar's method of analysis – using comparative material to place the monument into a wider historical context – with Zeller's: No mention is made of a possible visual parallel between Kürle's proposal and the *Hermannsdenkmal* (cf. Koshar p. 38: Hermann's posture is at once defensive and aggressive).

¹⁸ Illustrations of the Wissmanndenkmal may be found on the covers of *T.V. e.SÜT-Mitt.bl* 60 (März 1981), 66 (Januar/Februar 1986); cf. ill. on Zeller p. 141. I offer here an American parallel: When President Theodore Roosevelt died, a telegram was sent to one of his sons informing him that the lion was dead.

Within the Kaiserreich, objections seem not to have been raised about the 1909 “*dying Schutztruppler*” at Düsseldorf¹⁹, an *interpretatio Germanica* of the Capitoline Gaul (Rome Musei Capitolini, n. 747, cf. Zeller p. 168 n. 410), itself appearing the scholarship of the Kaiserreich as a monument symbolizing the victory of civilization over barbarism (the Gaul).²⁰ I suggest that the dying Gaul was chosen as an embodiment, suitable for placement in a garrison, of the soldierly pride expressed, for example, by Hans Dominik in his use of the Latin phrase *dulce et decorum est pro patria mori* as he calls to mind the images of fallen Kameraden.²¹ It was others, decades, later, who abused that pride.

The state of documentation for the Kolonialreich permits discussion even of monuments not built – heir designs and the debates about them preserve much about the perception of Germany’s colonial activities. Zeller is to be complemented for the most part on his presentation of the decision-making processes behind the proposed Berlin monument (pp. 85 ff.). This was to be a three-dimensional representation of the German colonial achievement, an artistic complement to Schnee’s *Koloniallexikon* and other, retrospective considerations of the *Kolonialreich* which began to appear around its thirtieth anniversary.²² Thus I regret Zeller did not spend more time elucidating the iconographic elements of Behn’s initial award-winning design. The illustration on p. 86 (cf. pp. 93-94) permits me to raise questions others might be able to answer. The lozenge-shaped pedestal supporting the elephant contains a number of panels separated by columns. Some of these columns support portrait-busts: whose? The panels are carved reliefs. One can make out traces of the “Kolonialkrieg”. The front panel seems to

¹⁹ Zeller’s entry requires further precision (see my comments below). Nr. 29a: as of May 1909, inscription honoring five fallen in Suedwest; Nr. 29b: as of September 1935, in a new, more public location, new inscription honoring all *Kolonialhelden* (cf. illustration on Zeller p. 167).

²⁰ The Capitoline Gaul is illustrated as figure 70 in Nancy T. de Grummond and Brunhilde S. Ridgeway, eds.: *From Pergamum to Sperlonga: Sculpture and Context* (Berkeley 2000). The Wilhelmine-era interpretation of the statue is discussed by John R. Marszal: “Ubiquitous Barbarians” pp. 192-195 in that same work. For the ancient political background see pp. 17-31: Erich S. Gruen: “Culture as Policy. The Attalids of Pergamon”. On the impact the Pergamene monuments made in the *Kaiserreich* see Suzanne L. Marchand: *Down From Olympus. Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany 1750-1970* (Princeton 1996), pp. 96ff

²¹ Hans Dominik: *Kamerun. Sechs Kriegs- und Friedensjahre in deutschen Tropen. Zweite Auflage* (Berlin 1911, originally 1901) vi, p. 346; *Von Atlantik zum Tschadsee* (Berlin 1908), p. 308 for a Wilhelmine-era restatement.

²² On the *Koloniallexikon* see Heinrich Schnee: *Erinnerungen. Als letzter Gouverneur in Deutsch-Ostafrika* (Heidelberg 1964), p. 118, 157 ff.

depict two rows of three shields on the left: were these the *Wappen* then under design for each of the Schutzgebiete? To the right are shown a series of overlapping standards: those of the forces from the Habicht or stationed at Tsingtau? A figure reminiscent of the Düsseldorf *Schutztruppler* is represented as reclining on a cenotaph (?). What was the complementary figure on the other side? That the monument was never built because of the First World War must be assigned to Tyche. The overall monument would have defined – so it was hoped – the character of the German colonial achievement.

In the proposals for an *Ostafrikadenkmal* at Potsdam one may perceive not simply *NS-Feindschaft*, as does Zeller, but the gap between how the NS-Herrschaft wished the colonial episode to be remembered and how it was perceived by colonial veterans and the local citizenry. The first design, von Ruckteschell's "Heia Safari!" (Zeller nr 87, cf. nr. 3), was the product of a *Lettowmann*, the collaborator in the production of the General's work, *Heia Safari!* (Leipzig, 1920). Von Ruckteschell has illustrated the same-named song which became identified with Ostafrika campaign. The statue group includes the *Schutztruppler* (cf. photo of von Lettow-Vorbeck on p. 155 of *Heia Safari!*), the *Askari* (in a pose much like the Askari's on the book's cover), and the *Träger*. Zeller does not specify the identities of those mocking the design as a "*Jagdszene*" devoid of heroism. They were influential enough to shelve the design. The second design, considered in 1938, was Georg Lang's: "*Langs Entwurf sah die von einem altarähnlichen Denkmalblock knieende Aktfigur einer Afrikanerin vor*" (Zeller p. 186). Here should not be seen a mortal, a recipient for *NS-Schimpfwörter*, but the personification of East Africa, the *Tyche* or *Fortuna Ostafrikas* in the act of mourning not only those who fell in battle, but also those whose honor was wounded at Versailles. The monument thus commemorates fallen soldiers and a wrongfully lost Schutzgebiet. The design met with local approval (Zeller pp. 187-188) only to be sent down by the shrill supporters of *NS-Rassenpolitik*. The traditional perceptions of the von Lettow-Vorbeck-led campaigns, focusing on bravery, loyalty, and the Kameradschaft shared by all members of the forces, appears at last in August 1939, when two terra-cotta reliefs, designed by von Ruckteschell, were dedicated at Hamburg's Lettow-Vorbeck-Kaserne (Zeller nr. 52). Here are represented the figures from the old battle-song – all idealized, robust, shattering the frame of the panels. One need not indulge in Zeller's sinister perception that the figures' *Gleichschritt* mark some out as inferior (Zeller p. 185). The figures lack none of the humanity of von Ruckteschell's work decades earlier. And one should not imply that the "*Treue der Askaris*", although a Leitmotiv in *Kolonialrevisionismus*, was without basis in fact and lacking in true feeling.

The data collected and presented in Zeller's catalogue of monuments form the base for further study – but that base has only the illusion of solidity. Close examination of the *Zellerverzeichnis* reveals it to be uneven in content, confusing in presentation. A number of the monuments are inscribed, but inscriptions are cited in summary form only (e.g. Zeller nr. 11, 29, 128) or not at all (e.g. nr. 18, 26, 134, 155), even in the case of the more significant pieces. It is not easy to determine from each entry where one might find an illustration of a monument. Zeller does not even cite his present work.²³

Many Kolonialdenkmäler changed both in appearance and location: precision in description and in cross-referencing is lacking in the *Verzeichnis*. The monument planned for Potsdam (Zeller nr. 87) needs to be articulated as 87a (the von Ruckteschell design – itself first planned for Duesseldorf, Zeller nr. 30, but now standing at Aumuehle, Zeller nr. 3) and as 87b (the Lang design). The same precision is required for the series of monuments which make up the Sakarani gravesite at Tanga, Tanzania (Zeller nr. 155): 155a – the main monument's appearance until 1962, 155b – the *Neugestaltung* dedicated in 1962 by the *Volksbund Deutsche Kriegsgräberfürsorge e. V.* This is not pedantry, for the appearance of the new monument raises the question of whether a changing historical consciousness can represent the same information in a new form thereby shaping future consciousness in a manner not intended by the first form. The pre-1962 wooden tablet articulated the fallen by rank and unit: empty space surrounding scattered letters, the appearance of a skeleton or office-building directory. The 1962 stone inscription made up of closely arrayed letters conveys the impression that the fallen, although different in life, are now all of one rank, all of one unit, under God's command.²⁴

Transforming the Zeller handlist into a proper catalogue requires careful observation, reporting, and data organization, tasks well within the capabilities of the edu-

²³ E.g., on p. 60 Zeller prints an illustration, depicting twelve monuments, which appeared in *Kolonie und Heimat in Wort und Bild* (1911/12, V, nr. 24 pp. 4-5): He does not identify the monuments in his text. His handlist refers to the original illustration in the case of only four of the monuments (Zeller nr. 140, 149, 117, 115 left to right on the original p. 4; the others – left to right, top to bottom – nr. 154, 163; for original p. 5: nr. 139, 150, 165, 124, 131, 114) and fails to indicate that this illustration can be found on p.60.

²⁴ One may find illustrations and text of the Sakarani monuments in the following issues of *T.V.e.SÜt-Mitt.bl*: Nr. 53 (Nov./Dez. 1974) cover (post-1962 main monument and inscription), p. 4 (1935 Swahili inscription honoring the Askari); Nr. 68 (November 1989) pp. 140 (post-1962 main monument and inscription), 141 (1935 Swahili inscription), 148-149 (trilingual inscription, English, German, Swahili, describing the gravesite complex); *Sonder-Nummer*, November 1966, cover, for earlier wooden tablet.

cated public.²⁵ Place the monument into its geographical context, locate it on a site or city map, photograph it from afar (indicative of the impression made on a passerby), photograph it from a variety of documented positions. Include each section, each element of iconography. Report as accurately as possible the content of the photographs.

Care must be taken if the monument is inscribed, particularly if that inscription is lengthy. Ideally one should be able to read the inscription from the photograph. Transcribe (for printing) the inscription: each carved line of text a line of printed text. The Doeberitz-monument's inscription is thus printed:

DEUTSCHES LAND
IN FREMDER HAND

i.e. two inscribed lines rendered as two printed lines. Be certain to include any inscribed symbols indicating word division (e.g. hyphens) or dividing the portions of the inscription (e.g. the crosses separating the names of the fallen on the present main monument at Sakarani). When documenting source material in a printed catalogue, organize the references so as to make immediately apparent those illustrating the monument and those discussing it in text alone. In the *Zellerverzeichnis* references should have been divided, as well, into those relating to the planning and design of monuments, and those discussing the monument after construction (or once plans for construction were set aside).

In spite of my many disagreements with the tone and viewpoint of Zeller's work I find myself in the position of recommending its acquisition by anyone interested in the study of *Kolonialdenkmäler*, German and non-German.²⁶ Consult the works in

²⁵ Zeller (pp. 59-60) omits some 'minor' monuments. Such is the fate of Gefreiter Mueller's memorial at Kemberg, location reported by Dr. Frank Volta in a transmission to the Forum within www.traditionsverband.de dated 25 Feb. 2001. On said officer, see the comments by his fellow soldier, Moritz Bruno Salomon, p. 240 in Friedrich Frhr. v. Dincklage-Campe: *Deutsche Reiter in Suedwest* (Berlin o.J.). I thank Dr. Volta for transmitting to me a photo of the memorial.

²⁶ Apparently there is no work parallel to Zeller's for other 19th and 20th century colonial empires, not even the oft-studied British. Cf. notes and bibliographies in William Roger Louis, Editor-in-Chief: *The Oxford History of the British Empire*, 5 vols., Oxford 1998-1999. Some interesting notations on the French and African perceptions of their imperial past can be found in Alice L. Conklin: *A Mission to Civilize: The Republican Idea of Empire in France and West Africa, 1895-1930* (Stanford 1997), pp. 246-248, cf. vii-viii. For the most part, so reports Prof. Thomas Metcalf, Dept. of History, University of California, Berkeley (e-mail transmissions, 20 and 21 Feb. 2001), one may find studies of colonial architecture and urban design. On the fates of monuments he reports: "Many of the British

Zeller's bibliography, reconsider the evidence passed over or placed into improper context, build the monument handlist into a true catalogue. In that fashion you shall prove correct the historian Polybius' observation, made long ago, on the mutability of fortune: For on the pedestal designed to support tendacious and politicized pleading will stand, instead, a monument to the results of dispassionate, historical, inquiry.

monuments and statues in India, e.g. were allowed to stand for a decade and more after independence and then placed into storage. Some were collected at the Victoria Memorial in Calcutta and others at the Coronation Ground in New Delhi where they remain on display. Some (e.g. those relating to 1857 revolt) were destroyed or renamed. Others remain as they were. In French colonies I believe destruction was common. In European cities, at least in Britain colonial monuments have not been taken down or vandalized in the manner you describe. Perhaps passions have been more aroused in Germany."

The New Delhi statue of George V has been examined by Narayani Gupta: "Kingway to Rajpath. The Democratization of Luytens' Central Vista", pp. 257-269 in Catherine Asher and Thomas Metcalf, eds.: *Perceptions in South Asia's Visual Past*. (New Delhi 1994). I recommend in particular Metcalf's *Ideologies of the Raj* (Cambridge 1995), the type of work sorely needed for the *Kolonialreich*.