# Colonialism as a European Project in Africa before 1914? British and German Concepts of Colonial Rule in Sub-Saharan Africa

**Ulrike Lindner**

## RESÜMEE

Der Artikel untersucht das deutsche und britische Kolonialengagement in Afrika vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg. Er analysiert, in welchem Maße unterschiedliche nationale Kolonialkonzepte identifiziert werden können, wie sich die Kolonialmächte gegenseitig wahrnahmen und inwiefern gemeinsame Formen der Kolonisation oder der Kooperation in Afrika bestanden. Außerdem wird gezeigt, wie sehr die afrikanische Bevölkerung in Interaktion mit den Kolonisierenden koloniale Herrschaftsformen prägte und wie diese auch von den jeweiligen geographischen und klimatischen Bedingungen abhingen. Die Autorin arbeitet Charakteristika deutscher und britischer Kolonialherrschaft heraus und illustriert dabei, dass die oberste Maxime der Kolonisierenden, eine „weiße Vorherrschaft" über die schwarze afrikanische Bevölkerung zu erhalten, Kooperation und Wissensaustausch in Afrika trotz europäischer Rivalitäten förderte.

British and German colonial rule in Africa developed during the period of European imperialism before WWI. At the time, almost all European powers were engaged in the scramble for Africa and were trying to evolve forms of colonial rule, even though "islands of rule" may be a more appropriate term for these early colonial attempts in Africa.[1]

---

1    For the useful term "islands of rule", see: M. Pesek, Koloniale Herrschaft in Deutsch-Ostafrika. Expeditionen, Militär und Verwaltung seit 1880, Frankfurt am Main / New York 2005, p. 190; for the partition of Africa, see: H. L. Wesseling, Divide and Rule: The Partition of Africa 1880–1914, Westport / London 1996.

The process of evolving colonial rule was full of tensions and contradictions; the development of a self-definition as colonial ruler in the African environment was first and foremost connected with a concept of white racial superiority. Black Africans became a primary means of defining European colonisers and a way of creating a unity for the latter beyond class and wealth differences.[2] Furthermore, it should be stressed that almost everywhere in Africa the various forms of colonial rule were imposed with violence and brutality, a fact highlighted by the many wars and battles between the indigenous populations and the European colonisers during the 1880s and 1890s.[3]

Within this context, different national concepts of colonial governance and modes of administration were being developed. They were adapted to the various indigenous populations and adjusted to local circumstances, but they were also shaped by different ideologies emanating from the respective motherlands and influenced by neighbouring colonial powers that were observed with great attention. Even if the European colonial states shared most of the challenges that the African people and environment posed for them, and even if they developed similar attitudes towards their 'new mission', there were also significant contrasts between national approaches.[4] In the case of German and British colonialism, the long experience of the British Empire in colonising foreign territories and people remained a salient difference between the two.[5] Even in Africa, British colonisers had a precedent for their involvement in the new colonies, with their presence at the Cape Colony and in Sierra Leone since the end of the 18th century.[6] In contrast, the Germans were complete newcomers to the colonial sphere and could not rely on their own experience in that field. Thus, they were keenly interested in the knowledge and experience of other colonising nations. Before issuing new colonial decrees, the German colonial administration usually discussed the regulations of other European empires.[7]

2   S. Conrad / S. Randeria, Einleitung. Geteilte Geschichten – Europa in einer postkolonialen Welt, in: id. (eds.), Jenseits des Eurozentrismus. Postkoloniale Perspektiven in den Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften, Frankfurt am Main / New York 2002, pp. 9-49, pp. 25-27.

3   As an example, between 1891 and 1897, there were 60 military expeditions against the indigenous population in German East Africa, see: H. Gründer, Geschichte der deutschen Kolonien, Paderborn 2004, p. 154; in British East Africa, Berman and Lonsdale find 20 military expeditions alone in the highlands of Kenya between 1893 and 1905 to establish British rule, see: B. Berman / J. Lonsdale, Unhappy Valley: Conflict in Kenya and Africa, v. 1: State & Class, London 1992, pp. 28-29.

4   C. Young, The African Colonial State in Comparative Perspective, New Haven 1994, p. 79; George Steinmetz recently stated that it would not be possible to identify a German colonial style, given the variability of colonial rule in different German colonies, see: G. Steinmetz, The Devil's Handwriting: Precoloniality and the German Colonial State in Quingdao, Samoa and Southwest Africa, Chicago/London 2007, p. 5. Since Steinmetz studies three German colonies, one in Africa, one in China and one in the South Sea, the differences clearly prevail. However, I propose that when concentrating on colonies in sub-Saharan Africa, which were ruled by different European imperial powers, one can identify significant national features of colonial rule.

5   See: J. Osterhammel, Symbolpolitik und imperiale Integration. Das britische Empire im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert, in: R. Schlögel (ed.), Die Wirklichkeit der Symbole. Grundlagen der Kommunikation in historischen und gegenwärtigen Gesellschaften, Konstanz 2004, pp. 397-420, here p. 400.

6   T. Rodney / H. Davenport / C. Saunders, South Africa: A Modern History, Houndmills/Basingstoke 2000, pp. 101-113.

7   See: Die Behandlung der Asiaten in fremden Kolonien, 1912, in: Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde (BAB) R 1001/8731. For the German interest in British colonial work and British colonial reports, see: Cape of Good Hope,

Often, the British Empire was referred to as a role model, particularly by German colonial secretaries Bernhard Dernburg (1906–1910) and Wilhelm Solf (1911–1918) who both stressed the importance of British examples when looking for solutions to colonial problems.[8]

The ensuing period 1880–1914, the period of focus for this article, was a phase of growing interconnectedness and globalisation throughout the world, economically, technically and socially. Christopher Bayly has aptly called it a period of "great acceleration".[9] Steamships and telegraphs were now connecting colonies and motherlands, often in cooperation with other European imperialist nations. Also, German and British colonisers used the same ships and sometimes the same telegraphs for transport and communication in Africa. For example, the telegraphs between German South West Africa and the Cape were connected in 1910.[10] On the one hand, this new connectedness in Europe and overseas created growing transnational networks and enabled the European states to perceive each other's colonial policy more directly and to exchange knowledge. This was also the case on the British side, where from 1900 onwards a great interest in other empires and their methods began to flourish, even in the small German Empire: Colonial journals reported about German colonies, translated articles from German journals, and German colonial experts gave talks in colonial societies in London.[11] On the other hand, the increased exchange of knowledge led to a growing desire to define a trademark national style as an imperial and colonial power.

This article will analyse different approaches of British and German colonisers towards colonial rule and race policies in sub-Saharan Africa and assess to what extent different national concepts can be identified, how they were mutually perceived by the colonisers and to what extent common forms of colonising Africa before WWI prevailed.[12] The paper refers to German and British colonisers and focuses mainly on administrative colonial elites as well as on concepts of state colonialism. There were of course various factions within the group of white colonisers (settlers, planters, missionaries) that had quite different notions of colonialism – John Comaroff called them competing models of

Blue Book of Native Affairs 1891, in: BAB R 1001/8739; Das Swaziland, nach dem Colonial Report No. 559, Cd. 3729/23, 1908, in: BAB R 1001/8729.

8   Dernburg to Kaiserliche Gouverneure der deutschen Schutzgebiete, 17 November 1906, in: BAB R 1001/6882/1, pp. 36-37; Anon., Staatssekretär Dernburg in England, in: Deutsche Kolonialzeitung, 13 November 1909. See also: P. H. S. Hatton, Harcourt and Solf: the Search for an Anglo-German Understanding through Africa, 1912–1914, in: European Studies Review, 1 (1971), pp. 123-145.

9   C. A. Bayly, The Birth of the Modern World, 1780–1914: Global Connections and Comparisons, Oxford 2004, pp. 451, 461; S. Conrad, Globalisierung und Nation im Deutschen Kaiserreich, München 2006, pp. 38-44.

10   Office of the Governor-General of South Africa, Postal Telegraphs, Linking up of Cape colony and German South West Africa Telegraphs, Report, 2 July 1910, in: National Archives of South Africa, Pretoria, GG 1391 43/6.

11   See: Anon., The Economic Development of German East Africa, in: Bulletin of the Imperial Institute, 1 (1903), pp. 124-142; Anon., German View on Colonisation: Extracts from German Sources, in: Journal of the African Society, 14 (1914), pp. 40-52.

12   The paper is part of the project "Colonial encounters: Germany and Britain as European imperial powers in Africa 1890–1914"; the research was conducted with help of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation and the German Historical Institute London. I would like to thank them for their support.

colonialism. The following arguments however will mainly concentrate on administrative concepts.[13]

## 1. Concepts and Characteristics of British and German Colonial Rule

When looking at concepts of colonial rule in Africa, German and British colonies seem to have had several features in common. Neither British nor German colonisers used the concept of assimilation in their sub-Saharan colonies. This notion was mainly prevalent in French colonies in Northern Africa; it was connected with the French concept of a *mission civilisatrice* and with the will to promote a universal French republicanism, whereas in the German and British context, colonial rule was linked to ideas of guidance and rule over racially diverse and inferior people.[14] Both colonial rulers also distanced themselves from the approaches employed in the Portuguese colonies, where the racial distance between black and white was not upheld in a way German and British colonisers considered appropriate. Furthermore, Portuguese colonial rule was perceived as corrupt and weak.[15] Both British and German colonial administrations also developed dual systems of law in many of their new African colonies: native and customary law that dealt with the indigenous population contrasted with British or German law that was only appropriate for the European inhabitants of the colonies.[16] In addition, both colonisers certainly aimed at the economic exploitation of their new territories. The colonies should prove at least self-sufficient within a certain period of time.[17]

Besides these similarities, there are some distinct national features to be found. For British colonies in Africa, the concept of state colonialism was associated with the notion of *Pax Britannica*: British rule should bring peace to the 'tribes' in Africa, should be just

13    J. L. Comaroff, Images of Empire, Contests of Consciences: Models of Colonial Domination in South Africa, in: F. Cooper / A. L. Stoler (eds.), Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World, Berkeley 1997, pp. 163-197, here pp. 179-180.

14    A. Eckert, Die Verheißung der Bürokratie. Verwaltung als Zivilisierungsagentur im kolonialen Westafrika, in: B. Barth / J. Osterhammel (eds.), Zivilisierungsmissionen. Imperiale Weltverbesserungen seit dem 18. Jahrhundert, Konstanz 2005, pp. 269-284, p. 270; J. Osterhammel, "The Great Work of Upflifting Mankind". Zivilisierungsmission und Moderne, in: B. Barth / J. Osterhammel (eds.), ibid., pp. 269-284, p. 372; for the French concept of a civilising mission, see: A. L. Conklin, A Mission to Civilize: The Republican Idea of Empire in France and West Africa, 1895–1930, Stanford 2001, pp. 11-37.

15    R. Hyam, The British Empire in the Edwardian Era, in: J. M. Brown / W. R. Louis (eds.), The Twentieth Century: The Oxford History of the British Empire, v. IV, Oxford 1999, pp. 47-63, here p. 61; W. R. Louis, Great Britain and German Expansion in Africa 1884–1919, in: P. Gifford / W. R. Louis (eds.), Britain and Germany in Africa: Imperial Rivalry and Colonial Rule, New Haven / London 1967, pp. 3-46, here pp. 38-39.

16    For the German law system, see: H. Sippel, Typische Ausprägungen des deutschen kolonialen Rechts- und Verwaltungssystems in Afrika, in: R. Voigt / P. Sack (eds.), Kolonialisierung des Rechts. Zur kolonialen Rechts- und Verwaltungsordnung, Baden-Baden 2001, pp. 351-372; for Britain, see: K. Mann / R. Roberts, Introduction: Law in Colonial Africa, in: id. (eds.), Law in Colonial Africa, Portsmouth (N. H.) 1991, pp. 3-60, here pp. 18-23; the dual law system did not apply in the Cape colony; here the law did not make racial distinctions for defendants or witnesses, see: L. A. Benton, Law and Colonial Cultures: Legal Regimes in World History, 1400–1900, Cambridge 2002, p. 175; see also Ulrike Schaper's article in this volume.

17    M. Pesek, Koloniale Herrschaft (footnote 1), p. 17.

and fair.[18] Empire in that sense was seen as a "shelter from anarchy for hundreds of millions of human beings", as F. W. Moneypenny, a journalist writing for the Times, put it in 1905.[19]

Formally, British African colonies were under the administration of the long-established Colonial Office. The administration would draw from Indian experiences, especially when establishing colonial rule in East Africa.[20] The Colonial Office was a sturdy machinery that could incorporate the new territories within the administration of older colonies. Moreover, colonial careers were perceived as quite prestigious in the context of the British Empire.[21]

During the 19th century, British colonialism had been influenced by humanitarian ideas and had developed a strong notion of its civilising mission. In Africa this notion was mainly connected with the aim to suppress the slave trade and to end slavery.[22] However, contrary to its outspoken aims, the British government de facto tolerated slavery in many colonies in East and West Africa during the first decades of colonial rule and was anxious about disrupting the economic system.[23]

The general ideal was to achieve British supremacy mainly via trade and treaties with local rulers or with the leaders of local 'tribes', and this with a minimum of state intervention by superimposing a low-cost, minimal form of British rule upon an extant so-called 'native administration'.[24] Uganda is often cited as an example in this context, since only 25 British officers ruled over an indigenous population of three million before WWI.[25] Another example is the island of Zanzibar in East Africa where during the 1870s the Sultan of Zanzibar became completely dependent on the British Empire, which was represented locally by only a few officials. And it was not only commerce that was primarily in British hands in Zanzibar; in 1872 the Sultan also signed a treaty to abolish the slave trade in his territory.[26]

Frederick Lugard, who served in Uganda from 1890 to 1892 and was later High Commissioner and Governor of Nigeria (1902–1906, 1912–1918), later developed such concepts of indirect rule into an African policy in his famous book *Dual Mandate in British*

18     J. L. Comaroff, Images of Empire (footnote 13), pp. 179-180.

19     W. F. Moneypenny, quoted after Hyam, The British Empire (footnote 15), p. 49.

20     See: G. H. Mungeam, British Rule in Kenya, 1895–1912: The Establishment of Administration in the East Africa Protectorate, Oxford 1966. Many colonies in Africa were first under the administration of the Foreign Office before being transferred to the colonial office. This was also the case in British East Africa, which came under the Colonial Office in 1905.

21     The careers were prestigious, even if the recruiting system for colonial careers seems to have been somewhat eccentric; for the memoirs of the most eminent recruiting officers for the colonial service, see: R. Furse, Acuparius: Recollections of a Recruiting Officer, London 1962.

22     J. Osterhammel, "The Great Work" (footnote 14), p. 402.

23     K. Mann / R. Roberts, Introduction (footnote 16), p. 28; F. Cooper, From Slaves to Squatters: Plantation Labor and Agriculture in Zanzibar and Coastal Kenya, 1890–1925, New Haven 1980.

24     C. Young, The African Colonial State (footnote 4), p. 82.

25     D. A. Low, Uganda: The Establishment of the Protectorate, 1894–1919, in: V. Harlow/E. M. Chilver (eds.), History of East Africa, v. 2, Oxford 1965, pp. 57-122.

26     L. W. Hollingsworth, Zanzibar under the Foreign Office 1890–1913, Westport 1975, pp. 13-15.

*Tropical Africa*, published in 1922.[27] However, research has revealed that his actual style of government in Northern Nigeria was extremely authoritarian and not at all successful. Nevertheless, mainly thanks to his journalist wife Flora Shaw and his biographer Margery Perham, Lugard succeeded in styling himself as the designer of *the* concept of British rule in Africa – in contrast with Portuguese and French concepts of assimilation and as opposed to concepts of segregation prevalent in the Boer colonies. Indirect rule became the reference point for British colonial government in Africa until the 1940s and was generally seen as a benign form of colonialism by the British ruling class.[28] Furthermore, the ideology of indirect rule allowed for various forms of leeway and flexibility in colonial decisions as well as for self-stylisation as a liberal coloniser. It also proved to be a highly cost-effective system. However, research has convincingly pointed to the huge problems generated by this concept with its reliance on corrupt rulers and chiefs that were arbitrarily chosen by the colonisers and with its negligence towards a growing educated African class. Furthermore, for the African population it usually meant equally high taxes and burdens, even if these were not collected by British officials but by their own chiefs.[29]

Another important feature of British rule in Africa remained the small number of administrators from the metropolis.[30] This was also a point frequently emphasised when observing the German administration in neighbouring colonies, as aptly described in the following quote:

> *There is no British territory in South Africa which is so little developed as this colony, but it is burdened with more official ordinances and revelations than would be required to run an Empire. […] There is far too much government. There is one official out of every three in the population and it is a great burden on the country. Take a place like Keetmanshoop [in German South West Africa]. The town and country around can be compared with Upington [in the Cape Colony] and the district where they probably have a magistrate and one or two clerks. At Keetmanshoop they have a Deputy Governor with a secretary and about half-a-dozen policemen who are also largely engaged in clerical work. Then there are the law courts, with two judges, a secretary, and another half-dozen clerks.*[31]

Initially, Germany hardly had any concept of colonial rule, as its colonial expansion happened quite unexpectedly in the 1880s. German colonial rule thus often developed

---

27 F. Lugard, Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa, Edinburgh, London 1922; for the Lugard myth, see: M. Perham, Lugard. The Years of Adventure, London 1956; for a more critical view on Lugard, see: J. E. Flint, Frederick Lugard: The Making of an Autocrat, 1858–1943, in: L. H. Gann / P. Duignan (eds.), African Proconsuls: European Governors in Africa, New York 1978, pp. 290-312.

28 J. W. Cell, Colonial Rule, in: J. M. Brown / W. R. Louis (eds.), The Twentieth Century (footnote 15), pp. 232-254, here pp. 240, 247.

29 K. Mann / R. Roberts, Introduction (footnote 16), pp. 20-21.

30 J. W. Cell, Colonial Rule (footnote 28), p. 233.

31 A. F. Calvert, South West Africa during the German occupation 1884–1915, London 1915, p. 7.

in an experimental fashion.[32] A civilising mission was barely detectable when German colonies were established and economic interests clearly prevailed.[33] Later, when the colonies turned out to be more or less an economic failure, the prestige argument certainly became the main issue guiding German colonialism.[34] Administrative problems shaped German colonialism from the beginning. The Colonial Office developed out of a sub-division of the Foreign Office and had an ambivalent status in the German administrative hierarchy.[35] Careers in the Colonial Office, and even more so in the colonies themselves, were never perceived as prestigious – in contrast with British colonial careers. It was thus difficult to recruit adequate personnel. A more elaborate educational system for colonial personnel was only implemented during the last years of German colonial rule.[36]

In the 1890s, one can hardly speak of colonial rule in the German African colonies since very few officials were present at all. This changed around the turn of the century when a colonial administration was more widely established. However, there were huge differences, for example, between the only settler colony in South West Africa with an increasing white population as well as a fast-growing administration and a colony such as Cameroon where, in 1914, only 90 civil servants were to be found in the whole country.[37] Generally though, the aim in the German context was to develop a more rigid form of colonial management than in British colonies, a management which was also labelled as a 'better way' of colonising than the far too liberal and uncoordinated British style: "The fiasco of British liberalism in South Africa and the lack of any uniformity in questions of native policy are results of a general policy of bumbling through from case to case".[38] One should also stress the highly militarised form of administration in German colonies. In the interior of the colonies, German rule consisted mainly of military stations, and personnel were often recruited amongst officers or ex-officers of the German colonial troops.[39] This was perceived critically by the British neighbours and seen as a major reason for German colonial problems and administrative mistakes:

---

32   W. Speitkamp, Deutsche Kolonialgeschichte, Ditzingen 2005, p. 45.

33   K. J. Bade, Imperial Germany and West Africa: Colonial Movement, Business Interests and Bismarck's 'Colonial Policies', in: S. Förster/W. J. Mommsen/R. Robinson (eds.), Bismarck, Europe, and Africa: The Berlin Africa Conference 1884-1885 and the Onset of Partition, Oxford 1988, pp. 121-147; see also: H. Pogge von Strandmann, Imperialismus vom Grünen Tisch. Deutsche Kolonialpolitik zwischen wirtschaftlicher Ausbeutung und "zivilisatorischen" Bemühungen, Berlin 2008.

34   For colonies as objects of prestige, see: B. Kundrus, Die Kolonien – "Kinder des Gefühls und der Phantasie", in: id. (ed.), Phantasiereiche. Zur Kulturgeschichte des deutschen Kolonialismus, Frankfurt am Main/New York 2003, pp. 28-30.

35   John Iliffe's view on the problems of the German colonial administration is still quite instructive, see: J. Iliffe, Tanganyika under German Rule 1905–1912, London 1969, pp. 30-34.

36   See for example the colonial institute in Hamburg that was founded in 1908: J. Ruppenthal, Kolonialismus als "Wissenschaft und Technik". Das Hamburgische Kolonialinstitut 1908 bis 1919, Stuttgart 2007.

37   For Kamerun, see: K. Hausen, Deutsche Kolonialherrschaft in Afrika. Wirtschaftsinteressen und Kolonialverwaltung in Kamerun vor 1914, Zürich/Freiburg 1976.

38   G. Hartmann, Gedanken über die Eingebornenfrage in Britisch-Südafrika und Deutsch-Südwestafrika, in: Koloniale Rundschau, 1910, pp. 26-43, p. 42 (my translation).

39   For East Africa, see: M. Pesek, Koloniale Herrschaft (footnote 1); for South-West Africa: J. Zimmerer, Deutsche Herrschaft über Afrikaner. Staatlicher Machtanspruch und Wirklichkeit im kolonialen Namibia, Münster 2002.

> *The numerous German officials and soldiers in the colonies who, far from Germany's effective control, live in laborious idleness and consequent ennui, frequently fall a prey to their worst instincts or they busy themselves by wantonly interfering with the civil part of the population or by trying to earn military laurels by making unnecessary expeditions into the interior for 'punishing' natives.*[40]

This style of colonial rule was also characterised by a form of daily violence that became one of the characteristic marks of German colonies in Africa, not only in South West Africa with the establishment of an extremely brutal racial order after 1905, but also in East Africa with the ubiquitous whip in every planter's and official's house.[41] In British colonies, flogging had also become a widespread measure to coerce Africans. In most of their colonies – excepting the Cape Colony – it was part of the criminal code and could be used as a penalty for delinquents. In the Cape Colony, flogging was still routinely carried out in prison.[42] Thus, corporal punishment was practised by all British colonial regimes in Africa.

But in the German colonies it seemed to be virtually omnipresent and was far more openly implemented. For example, the indigenous population of neighbouring colonies referred to Togo as "the twenty-five country" since even low-ranking officials could sentence Africans to twenty-five lashes without any court decision.[43] When Africans from the Cape Colony came to German South West Africa as working migrants after 1904, these differences became obvious. The migrant workers complained regularly about the flogging they had to endure in the German colony that differed considerably from their experiences at home.[44] Even the Governor of German South West Africa, Theodor Seitz, said in 1911 that the Cape workers were obviously "not used to flogging".[45] Furthermore, a major problem in German colonies remained the "parental chastisement" right that the farmers and planters exercised over their indigenous workers and servants. Colonial secretary Bernhard Dernburg tried to reform this indiscriminate flogging and to introduce stricter regulations. However, his endeavours do not seem to have proved very successful since statistics document increasing numbers of flogging cases until 1914.[46]

---

40　O. Etzlbacher, The German Danger to South Africa, in: The Nineteenth Century, 58/60 (1905/1906), pp. 524-538, here p. 527.

41　For a detailed account of the *Prügelstrafe* in German colonies, see: M. Schröder, Prügelstrafe und Züchtigungs-recht in den deutschen Schutzgebieten Schwarzafrikas, Münster 1997.

42　Dr. Ernst Feder, Die Prügelstrafe in den englischen und französischen Kolonien, 30 April 1904, in: BAB R 1001/5379.

43　H. Stoecker, The Position of Africans in the German Colonies, in: A. J. Knoll / L. H. Gann (eds.), Germans in the Tropics: Essays in German Colonial History, New York 1987, pp. 119-128, pp. 123-124; see also: T. v. Trotha, "One for Kaiser" – Beobachtungen zur politischen Soziologie der Prügelstrafe am Beispiel des "Schutzgebietes Togo", in: P. Heine / U. v. d. Heyden (eds.), Studien zur Geschichte des deutschen Kolonialismus in Afrika. Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Peter Sebald, Pfaffenweiler 1988, pp. 521-551.

44　See: J. Abramse to Consul Müller, 25 December 1910, in: National Archives of Namibia, BCL 17.

45　Kaiserlicher Gouverneur von Deutsch-Südwestafrika, Seitz, to Reichskolonialamt Berlin, 12 April 1911, in: BAB R 1001/1231.

46　M. Schröder, Prügelstrafe und Züchtigungsrecht (footnote 41), p. 94.

During the last years of German rule, civil administration became more widespread. Particularly under Dernburg, who aimed for thorough reforms within the German colonial system, the British example of indirect colonial rule (even if the term 'indirect rule' was not used) became an important model for the development of the German tropical colonies. This was especially true in German East Africa, even if his ideas were heavily combated by colonial settlers and by the more conservative factions of the German colonial movement.[47]

A quite distinct feature of German colonialism was their scientific approach towards the colonies, which developed particularly after 1900 with the German colonial congresses of 1902, 1905 and 1910, the establishment of various colonial research institutes in Germany as well as in the colonies themselves (e.g. the Amani-institute in German East Africa which became an internationally leading place for agrarian and botanical research), and a growing range of journals discussing colonial sciences.[48] The German dedication to these issues was even admired by the British colonial experts, as is obvious in the following excerpt drawn from the *Journal of the African Society* in 1914:

> *In other directions, however, Germany's progress during thirty years of Colonial policy has been nothing short of phenomenal. She has thrown herself heart and soul into the Colonial problem with extraordinary thoroughness and energy. Expedition after expedition has been sent out to investigate on the spot every conceivable aspect of the subject. No stone has been left unturned, and for much information of a scientific kind about Africa, German literature is almost the only available source of supply.*[49]

## 2. Local Conditions of Colonial Rule in Africa

Besides these national characteristics, Africa consisted of many different colonies, and colonial rule was of course shaped by various local conditions – first and foremost by the populations that had lived there for centuries and had developed certain social and economic structures. Obviously, the new colonisers had to interact with the colonised peoples when they entered their territories, and during these exchanges representations and imaginations could change, and new forms of culture could evolve within the zones of colonisation.[50]

Colonies were also structured by different geographical surroundings, different durations of colonial rule and the different degrees of its enforcement, as well as by the interests

---

47 F.-J. Schulte-Althoff, Koloniale Krise und Reformprojekte. Zur Diskussion über eine Kurskorrektur in der deutschen Kolonialpolitik nach der Jahrhundertwende, in: H. Dollinger / H. Gründer / A. Hanschmidt (eds.), Weltpolitik – Europagedanke – Regionalismus. Festschrift für Heinz Gollwitzer zum 65. Geburtstag, Münster 1982, pp. 407-426.

48 P. Grosse, Die deutschen Kolonialkongresse in Berlin 1902, 1905 und 1910, in: U. v. d. Heyden / J. Zeller (eds.), "…Macht und Anteil an der Weltherrschaft". Berlin und der deutsche Kolonialismus, Münster 2005, pp. 95-101; J. Ruppenthal, Kolonialismus (footnote 36).

49 W. A. Crabtree, German Colonies in Africa, in: Journal of the African Society, 14 (1914), pp. 1-14.

50 H. Bhabha, The Location of Culture, London 1994, pp. 37-38; R. Young, Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race, London / New York 1995, pp. 21-27.

of various groups of colonisers and especially by the ever-growing interest of Europeans in cheap African labour. A 'West Coast' African policy of cash crop production combined with an African farmer agriculture, a 'South African' concept of European settlement, and a planter's economy in 'East Africa' were normally identified as alternatives of colonial rule in Africa.[51] In the Cape and later in Rhodesia and German South West Africa, with their substantial white minorities and settler structures, colonial rule took on a very different character, distinguishable from the East and West African colonies. Settlers occupied an important intermediary position between the colonial government and the colonised. They could exercise political pressure on the colonial government; they saw themselves as entitled to a key position within the colonial administration and substantially influenced decisions in the colony.[52] Often these types of rule did not lack ambiguity; they were a product of struggles and negotiations between different groups within the colonies and with the metropole, as could be observed especially in East Africa. Whereas the governments in both British and German East Africa tended towards a cash crop policy which would reap more benefits for the colonial government, the growing settler population and several colonial groups in the metropole opposed these goals and aimed for a planter economy. British East Africa finally developed into a white settler and planter colony after 1905.[53]

A second aspect worthy of note is the fact that colonial rule changed over time. It produced more forms of regulation and often turned into a rather direct rule with a decisive impact on the indigenous population. At the beginning, the new European colonial states were weak and fragile and had to rely heavily on the structures they found in the subjugated countries. Symbols of rule were thus a major instrument of power.[54] In the beginning of colonial occupation European rule hardly affected the majority of the African population, especially in areas far away from the European centres. This can be clearly illustrated by the situation in German East Africa, a territory of approximately one million km² without significant infrastructure that had to be supervised by few German officials. Only in 1903, almost 20 years after the occupation of the colony, was a sort of colonial administration established in the Western regions of the East African colony.[55] In such surroundings, Africans still had room to negotiate, since the colonisers were dependent upon their support. Later on, infrastructure and especially railways were established within the colonies and made administration easier for the colonisers; the territories were mapped, sometimes a census was undertaken, and knowledge about the territory and the indigenous population was accumulated.[56] Generally, in British as

---

51    J. Iliffe, Tanganyika under German Rule (footnote 35), p. 50.
52    C. Young, The African Colonial State (footnote 4), p. 102.
53    G. H. Mungeam, British Rule (footnote 20); D. Kennedy, Islands of White: Settler Society and Culture in Kenya and Southern Rhodesia 1890–1939, Durham 1987; J. Koponen, Colonial Racialism and Colonial Development: Colonial Policy and Forms of Racialism in German East Africa, in: W. Wagner (ed.), Rassendiskriminierung, Kolonialpolitik und ethnisch-nationale Identität, Münster/Hamburg 1992, pp. 89-107.
54    R. Hyam, Britain's Imperial Century, 1815–1914: A Study of Empire and Expansion, Basingstoke 2002, pp. 301-303.
55    M. Pesek, Koloniale Herrschaft (footnote 1), pp. 17-18.
56    Ibid., pp. 310-311.

well as in German African colonies, taxation was increased, and taxes were collected with growing efficiency. This meant far less leeway for the indigenous population. In the Cape Colony – under British rule since 1806 and thus the oldest British colony on the continent – these processes had already taken place during the 19th century, and many frontier wars had been fought against the indigenous populations.[57] In most of the new African colonies, this occurred around the turn of the 20th century. The enforcement of colonial rule actually led to devastating wars during the first decade of 1900, such as the Herero-and-Nama War in German South West Africa, the Maji-Maji War in German East Africa, the Ndebele and Shona risings in Rhodesia and the hut tax wars in Sierra Leone.[58] These wars also shaped the future of the colonies and intensified the demarcation lines between colonised and colonisers, between black and white. Specifically the exceedingly brutal Herero-and-Nama War in German South West Africa led to a racial radicalisation of the German colony with the introduction of a radical segregation policy.[59]

Thirdly, since neither the settlers nor planters in Africa undertook any manual labour themselves, the control of 'native labour' became the paramount issue of colonisation in Africa. European colonisers were thus extremely dependent on cheap African labour. This was even more obvious in the mining industry in British Southern Africa and, during the last years before WWI, in the diamond industry in German South West Africa as well. In almost all British and German African colonies, forms of hut or head taxes were established, taxes which had to be paid in cash in order to force the indigenous population to take on paid labour and to migrate to the places where the workforce was needed, and thereby disrupting African societies all over the continent.[60] In many African colonies – under British, German, Portuguese or French rule – the colonial administrators even developed systems of unpaid forced labour that the indigenous population had to provide. In German Togo, for instance, this was essential for building up an infrastructure in the interior of the colony, as Trutz von Trotha has shown in his research.[61] Generally for the African population, developments before WWI meant shrinking room for manoeuvre, diminishing possibilities of negotiation, growing financial burdens, more coercive measures and an increasing penetration of their living spaces.

## 3. Race Policies

Concepts of colonial rule in Africa during the imperialist period were always connected with the notion of ruling over inferior races. Theories of race were developed in all Euro-

---

57    Cf. the many conflicts between the colonists and the Xhosa in the Cape territory, see: T. Rodney / H. Davenport / C. Saunders, South Africa (footnote 6), pp. 132-149.

58    C. Young, The African Colonial State (footnote 4), p. 99.

59    J. Zimmerer, Deutsche Herrschaft (footnote 39), pp. 56-109.

60    For this growing penetration of the colonies, see: R. Hyam, British Empire (footnote 15), p. 59; K. Mann / R. Roberts, Introduction (footnote 16), pp. 30-31.

61    T. v. Trotha, Koloniale Herrschaft. Zur soziologischen Theorie der Staatsentstehung am Beispiel des "Schutzgebietes Togo", Tübingen 1994, pp. 349-350; for an account on cocerced labour in general, see for example: F. Cooper / T. C. Holt / R. Scott, Beyond Slavery, Chapel Hill 2000, p. 131.

pean countries at the end of the 19th century, expounding on concepts of higher and lower races that were allegedly based on natural science. Biological racism, with its ideology of the "right of the fittest", was dominant and had a strong impact on the formation of colonial rule.[62] Generally, the mixing of races was viewed as a danger for the white race, and the increasing mixed populations in Africa were viewed with apprehension.[63] Both British and German colonisers adhered to the concept of dissimilation in colonial administration, even if their racial theories and practices differed in several ways.

The British discussion on racism and colonialism seemed to allow for a greater diversity of opinions. There was a growing group of colonial experts at the end of the 19th century who were strongly influenced by eugenic and social Darwinist ideologies and supported concepts of dissimilation and separation between colonisers and colonised. Colonial policy was increasingly influenced by this current, as particularly obvious in the Crewe directive from 1909. For the first time, the directive, named after the secretary of state for the colonies, provided a general rule discouraging concubinage for members of the colonial service, as it would endanger the authority of the colonial administration in the British colonies.[64] However, it should be stressed that these new trends at the end of the 19th century were only one phase within a long tradition of colonial rule. Other convictions had been predominant earlier, as could be witnessed especially in the Cape Colony, where a more liberal, less racial form of colonial government had been introduced during the 19th century. Voting rights in the Cape Colony were not organised on racial, but on economic terms: voters had to prove a certain income or display possessions. Moreover, the law was explicitly extended to persons of colour in the 1820s. It was only at the end of the 19th century, as Vivian Bickford-Smith has shown in his research, that a more rigid racial hierarchy was introduced in many fields of politics and daily life. Voting rights for black people were restricted by various bills, but African and coloured people still represented between 15 and 16 percent of all voters between 1892 and 1910.[65] The notion of a civilising mission, of a humanitarian duty towards the indigenous population, remained a strong impulse within British colonialism. And abolitionist associations, who had fought against slavery at the beginning of the 19th century, endured in a different form, seeing themselves as the defenders of the colonised.[66] The *Aborigines Protection Society* in particular tried to strengthen the rights of the indigenous populations in

62    A. L. Stoler / F. Cooper, Between Metropole and Colony: Rethinking a Research Agenda, in: id. (eds.), Tensions of Empire (footnote 13), pp. 1-56, p. 7; J. Osterhammel, "The Great Work" (footnote 14), p. 387; B. Barth, Die Grenzen der Zivilisierungsmission. Rassenvorstellungen in den europäischen Siedlungskolonien Virginia, den Burenrepubliken und Deutsch-Südwestafrika, in: B. Barth / J. Osterhammel (eds.), Zivilisierungsmissionen (footnote 14), pp. 201-228, here p. 203.

63    S. Gilman, Rasse, Sexualität und Seuche, Hamburg 1992, p. 147.

64    R. Hyam, Empire and Sexuality: The British Experience, Manchester 1990, p. 157.

65    D. R. Edgecombe, The Non-racial Franchise in Cape Politics 1853–1910, in: Kleio, 10 (1978), pp. 21-37; V. Bickford-Smith, Ethnic Pride and Racial Prejudice in Victorian Cape Town, Cambridge 1995, p. 10; L. A. Benton, Law and Colonial Cultures (footnote 16), pp. 175-176.

66    P. Grosse, Kolonialismus, Eugenik und bürgerliche Gesellschaft in Deutschland 1850–1918, Frankfurt am Main / New York 2000, p. 26.

the African colonies.[67] Furthermore, the common notion of an evolutionary "Family of Man", which was more widespread in Britain than in Germany, even though it assigned an inferior position to the black population, still seemed to leave more room for upward mobility and the education of the "lower races".[68] Additionally, there were more voices within the British racial/colonial discourse than within the German discourse that stressed the beneficial effects of race mixing, which could lead to an uplifting of the inferior races.[69] In general then, state racism concepts were largely unpopular in British colonial thought.

In the German colonial and racial discourse, other tendencies came to the fore. First of all, the German Empire was a latecomer to colonisation and entered the field exactly when racial considerations became paramount in European colonial policies. Thus, earlier phases of colonisation were not experienced by the Germans. When they began their colonial experiment, the biologisation of politics and society had already reached a high point. Therefore, it should not come as a surprise that concepts of dissimilation and segregation were prevalent in Germany and that there was a consensus to class the black population of Africa as ultimately inferior. Furthermore, ever since the wars in German East Africa and German South West Africa, the relationship between the colonised and the colonisers had become greatly strained. From that point onwards, colonial concepts focused strongly on separation and on the harmfulness of race-mixing, which would ultimately lead to the ruin of a colonial society.[70] The exaggerated discussion of the few mixed marriages found in German colonies can be seen as a prominent example of these notions.[71] In German South West Africa – the only German settler colony – racial concepts of dissimilation were used to introduce an atrociously suppressive regime that would degrade the black population into mere working slaves. The native ordinances of 1907 forbade 'natives' to hold land or enjoy freedom of movement; they had to wear identification badges, and their lives and movements were strictly regulated.[72] Generally, racial concepts in German colonial thought seem to have been less varied than in the British context. Additionally, the enforcement of racial regulations was viewed as a task for the colonial state, to a much greater extent than in the British colonies.

In a colonial sphere largely influenced by racist ideas, mixed marriages, forms of concubinage and generally miscegenation were the most important areas illustrating the com-

---

67 C. A. Cline, E. D. Morel, 1873–1924: The Strategies of Protest, Belfast 1980.

68 A. McClintock, Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest, London/New York 1995, pp. 49-52.

69 Cf. J. Lubbock Avebury, Inter-racial Problems, in: Fortnightly Review, 90 (1911), pp. 581-589; J. R. Maxwell, The Negro Question, or Hints for the Physical Improvement of the Negro Races, London 1892, pp. 88-96.

70 See: M. Schubert, Der schwarze Fremde. Das Bild des Schwarzafrikaners in der parlamentarischen und publizistischen Kolonialdiskussion in Deutschland von den 1870er bis in die 1930er Jahre, Stuttgart 2003, pp. 227-305.

71 B. Kundrus, Moderne Imperialisten. Das Kaiserreich im Spiegel seiner Kolonien, Köln 2003, pp. 219-280. For the contemporary discussion, see for example: J. Friedrich, Die rechtliche Beurteilung der Mischehen nach deutschem Kolonialrecht, in: Koloniale Rundschau, 1 (1909), pp. 361-368; M. Fleischmann, Die Mischehen in den deutschen Schutzgebieten vom Rechtsstandpunkte, in: Verhandlungen des deutschen Kolonialkongresses, Berlin 1910, pp. 548-567.

72 J. Zimmerer, Deutsche Herrschaft (footnote 39), pp. 77-83.

plex processes of separation and transgression between colonised and colonisers.[73] Racial separation from the colonised had always been a matter of sexual definition. Gender-specific sexual sanctions developed into important mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion for colonial societies.[74] In contrast with the widespread theories of race segregation, mixed-race relations were an everyday phenomenon in all African colonies.[75] During the early colonial endeavours of the European imperial powers on the African continent, it was chiefly men who came to the new African colonies and initiated sexual relations with indigenous women. This was linked to the idea of colonial manliness which celebrated the roles of conqueror and "imperial patriarch".[76] The relations between a colonised woman and a coloniser did not affect the racial and sexual balance of power. They just confirmed the established type of rule in the colonies.[77]

From the turn of the century on, mixed-race relationships were increasingly regarded as a problem. The growing colonist societies and the arrival of white women in those colonies with farm and plantation economies (e.g. in German South West Africa and British and German East Africa) meant that the question of a greater separation between colonisers and colonised came to the fore. The regulation of sexual relations between indigenous people and colonisers became one of the most important everyday issues in the colonies. White wives following their husbands were explicitly chosen to convey a European way of life to the colonies. These women were particularly intent on a strict separation of interracial sexual contacts in order to protect their own status.[78] Sexual relations between black men and white women were considered to be even more problematic: not only were they said to cause racial degeneration, they also questioned the whole colonial and sexual hierarchy.[79] In many colonial societies, such as various British colonies and the Dutch East Indies, these sexual relations were forbidden at the turn of the 20th century. On the German side, the issue of separating the Europeans from the black Africans and from mixed-race people became more important, especially after the wars in the East

---

73 For a detailed account of mixed marriages in German and British colonies, see: U. Lindner, Contested concepts of "white" and "native". Mixed marriages in German South-West Africa and the Cape Colony, in: BAB Working Paper 2008:06, http://www.baslerafrika.ch/d/bab_working_papers.php (accessed on 13 January 2009).

74 C. Hall, Of Gender and Empire: Reflections on the Nineteenth Century, in: P. Levine (ed.), Gender and Empire, Oxford 2004, pp. 46-76, here p. 50.

75 F.-J. Schulte-Althoff, Rassenmischung im kolonialen System, in: Historisches Jahrbuch, 109 (1985), pp. 52-94, here p. 53.

76 L. Wildenthal, German Women for Empire 1884–1945, Durham / London 2001, p. 80; S. Maß, Weiße Helden, schwarze Krieger. Zur Geschichte kolonialer Männlichkeit in Deutschland 1918–1964, Köln 2006, p. 121; H. Callaway, Gender, Culture and Empire: European Women in Colonial Nigeria, Urbana / Chicago 1987, p. 4.

77 P. Levine, Sexuality, Gender and Empire, in: id. (ed.), Gender and Empire, Oxford 2004, pp. 134-155, here p. 140.

78 For a contemporary account of the role of white women in the German colonies, see: L. Niessen-Deiters, Die deutsche Frau im Auslande und in den Schutzgebieten, Berlin 1913; cf. also K. Walgenbach, "Die weiße Frau als Trägerin deutscher Kultur". Koloniale Diskurse über Geschlecht, "Rasse" und Klasse im Kaiserreich, Frankfurt am Main / New York 2005, pp. 125-126; L. Wildenthal, German Women (footnote 76), pp. 131-171.

79 F. El-Tayeb, Dangerous Liaisons: Race, Nation, and German Identity, in: P. Mazon/R. Steingröver (eds.), Not so Plain as Black and White: Afro-German Culture and History 1890-2000, Rochester 2005, pp. 27-60, here p. 48; A. L. Stoler, Sexual Affronts and Racial Frontiers: European Identities and the Cultural Politics of Exclusion in Colonial Southeast Asia, in: F. Cooper / A. L. Stoler (eds.), Tensions of Empire (footnote 13), pp. 198-237, here pp. 218-219.

African and South West African colonies, culminating in the regulations banning mixed marriages.[80] These ordinances were introduced in German South West Africa in 1905, in German East Africa in 1906 and in Samoa in 1912.[81] Miscegenation was prevalent, and there was a growing mixed-race population, but only low numbers of actual mixed marriages; still, German legislation concentrated on mixed marriages. The aim was to prevent a growing number of "bastards" with German citizenship. In German South West Africa, not only were new mixed marriages forbidden, but also existing mixed marriages were denied legal status from 1907 onwards, and children from these marriages were declared to be "natives". These measures led to huge problems and many contested cases, as formerly "white" people were suddenly degraded to "natives" having hardly any rights according to the newly issued native ordinances of 1907.[82]

In the British African colonies there were no official laws banning mixed marriages and no new legal definition of white versus native before WWI.[83] Laws and decrees issued at the beginning of the 20th century aimed more at relationships between white women and black men, the ultimate danger of colonial rule in the eyes of contemporaries. In 1903 Rhodesia forbade the cohabitation of white women and black men, and similar regulations followed in Natal and the Cape Colony at the same time. These decrees intended to suppress the relationships between poor white women, white prostitutes and black men. They thus aimed at persons of low status who would endanger the superiority of the white race.[84] Mixed marriages between white men and black/coloured women were of course socially banned in the higher circles of both the old and new settler communities. Generally, racial exclusion and inclusion in British colonies was established by using social mechanisms rather than by introducing new legal regulations. An important focus of these negotiations of race boundaries were the clubs that existed in all British settler colonies and that became the focal points for defining a white identity as coloniser.[85]

In comparison, German racial policies in the colonies were more rigid; the administration of racial policy through the state was a strong focus of German colonial policy, particularly in German South West Africa.[86] In British colonies similar concepts of racism prevailed, but were rather implemented via social exclusion. Thus, there seemed to

---

80    F.-J. Schulte-Althoff, Rassenmischung (footnote 75), p. 86.

81    B. Kundrus, Moderne Imperialisten (footnote 71), p. 219.

82    H. Bley, Kolonialherrschaft und Sozialstruktur in Deutsch-Südwestafrika 1894–1914, Hamburg 1968, pp. 249-256.

83    The Transvaal with its tradition of Boer native policy was the only exemption; here, mixed marriages were illegal since 1898. On the regulations concerning mixed marriages and miscegenation in British African colonies, see: M. Chanock, The Making of South African Legal Culture, 1902–1936, Cambridge 2001; see also: P. Scully, Rape, Race, and Colonial Culture: The Sexual Politics of Identity in the Nineteenth-Century Cape Colony, South Africa, in: American Historical Review, 100 (1995), pp. 335-359.

84    G. Cornwell, George Webb Hardy's 'The Black Peril' and the Social Meaning of 'Black Peril' in Early Twentieth-Century Africa, in: Journal of Southern African Studies, 22 (1996), pp. 441-453, here pp. 443-444; E. B. v. Heyningen, The Social Evil in the Cape Colony 1868–1902, in: Journal of Southern African Studies, 10 (1984), pp. 170-197.

85    R. Hyam, Britain's Imperial Century (footnote 54), p. 302.

86    I would therefore not agree with Boris Barth's thesis that strict race policies, as in German South-West Africa and the Boer republics, were always connected with the absence of state interventionism. I think quite the contrary was the case in German South-West Africa, see: B. Barth, Die Grenzen der Zivilisierungsmission (footnote 62), p. 227.

be much more leeway in the British colonies, even if the actual social demarcation lines of race became almost equally strict as in the German colonies at the beginning of the 20th century.

## 4. Mutual Perceptions and Co-operations

When seen in context, British and German concepts of colonial rule differed in several ways; however, often the differences seemed to be rather a matter of degree. If one looks at the mutual perceptions of the two neighbouring colonisers as I have done extensively in my research, one could roughly conclude that British observers (e.g. consuls in German colonies or governors of neighbouring colonies) often pointed to overstaffing and the military character of German rule, on which they blamed the failures and problems of German colonialism and in which they saw the reasons for the wars in German South West Africa and East Africa. The state racism of German South West Africa with its 'over-regulation' was also perceived with concern. Such criticism was often made by observers in a transnational way to stabilise and demarcate their own position as good and benign colonisers. Only during the last years can one observe a growing admiration for German achievements in the colonies.

German observers, as colonial newcomers, had ambivalent positions from the beginning: on the one hand, they criticised the "superficial" style of British colonisation and the "mild" politics towards the indigenous population, which they identified in turn as the reasons for British colonial problems:

> It is the tragic fate of the well-intentioned British method of colonisation which originates from the noblest motives, that the native question cannot be solved by using erroneous preconditions and subjective assumptions and it will not be solved in that way.[87]

On the other hand, they referred to British colonial concepts as role models for their own colonial engagement. One sees thus a complex international network of mutual influence and observation.

During the last years before WWI an important third element emerged: co-operation and exchange of knowledge became more important points of colonial rule in Africa for both colonisers. This can be observed in the colonial discourse in the metropole, with conferences and talks in each other's colonial societies and a growing number of articles on each other's colonial journals, and with British administrators visiting for example the agrarian Amani Institute in German East Africa and German colonial secretaries travelling through British African colonies.[88] Particularly under the colonial secretaries

---

87 G. Hartmann, Eingeborenenfrage in Britisch-Südafrika, in: Koloniale Rundschau, 1909, pp. 750-761, here pp. 759-760 (my translation).
88 O. Bongard, Staatssekretär Dernburg in Britisch- und Deutsch-Süd-Afrika, Berlin 1909; for Solf's journey cf. Solf Wilhelm, Afrikareise, 1912, in: Bundesarchiv Koblenz, N 1053/34.

Dernburg and Solf, British concepts of colonial rule in Africa became an essential role model for Germany. Furthermore, German colonialism was now to bring Pax Germania to Africa just as British colonialism had brought Pax Britannica, as Bernhard Dernburg explicitly said in a talk he gave in London in 1909 in front of the British Colonial Society.[89] On the British side as well, the exchange of colonial knowledge turned into an important aspect of colonial rule. Programmatically, an article in the *Bulletin of the Royal Colonial Institute* of 1912 stated: "The Germans are willing to learn where they can from us: let us be equally open-minded and learn where we can from them".[90]

In East Africa especially, German and British colonisers had reached a high degree of understanding, as can be seen for example in publications of the British press praising German East Africa as the ideal destination for safaris, introducing the notable persons of the colony and admiring the infrastructure of the country. The reports of the British vice-consuls in Dar-es-Salaam, Dundas and King are favourable as well. British administrators and engineers from the neighbouring colony tended to admire the beauty of Dar-es-Salaam as a colonial city in contrast to Mombasa and to admire the German railway.[91] Generally, there are also laudatory words about the German colonies, as this article from the journal United Empire of spring 1914 shows:

> […] *that the German colonies have entered upon a period of increasing prosperity, and that the work undertaken by the mother country has aimed at opening up the colonies, establishing order and peace, improving the conditions of the native and, in short, setting them on their feet, and giving them a chance to continue along the path of prosperity that is being prepared for them.*[92]

At the highest level, a co-operation between the two colonisers in regards to their African colonies can be observed as well. Colonial secretary Solf visited British Nigeria on a journey to West Africa in 1913 and maintained an ongoing correspondence with governor Lugard, the 'inventor' of indirect rule, who had published widely on the theory and practice of colonialism. The letters point to a significant amount of knowledge exchange between the European powers concerning colonial issues, not only in the colonies but also between the administrations of the motherlands. The last letters between the two colonial administrators were exchanged in June 1914. Solf wrote on June 16th:

> *You very likely have gathered from the reports on colonial debates in the Reichstag that at various occasions I have quoted Nigeria in connection with the future development of the Cameroons and pointed out the wonderful achievements of your work in West Af-*

---

89   The Times, 6 November 1909.

90   L. Hamilton, The German Colonies 1910–1911, in: United Empire, 3 (1912), pp. 969-972, here p. 970; R. Hyam, The Road to Decolonisation, 1918–1968, Cambridge 1968, p. 429.

91   African World, Special Edition German East Africa, 15 November 1913, in: Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes, Berlin, R 14817; see also: C. C. F. Dundas, History of German East Africa, 1914 (manuscript), in: Rhodes House, Oxford, Dundas Papers, MSS Afr. p. 948.

92   L. Hamilton, The German Colonies 1912–1913, in: United Empire, 5 (1914), pp. 493-497, here p. 493.

*rica. I think I have profited a great deal from the valuable information received during my interesting stay in your colony and have already put into practise in several instances of your westafrican administration.*[93]

## 5. Conclusion

Shaped by African environments, by the distinct development of each colony, by British and German policies and by a general concept of European superiority, one thus finds different forms of colonial rule based on diverging interests and to some degree contradictory to each other. Still, some distinct national features seem to prevail, especially in the implementation of racial policies.

Seen in a broader perspective, some of the identified national features of colonial rule also correspond with general issues judged as key elements of German or British national identity at the end of the 19th century. The British view on German "scientific colonialism" reflects general stereotypes in German-British relations. German scientific education and German excellency in technical fields were generally points of envy and admiration on the British side. Furthermore, the more rigid systems introduced in German colonies in Africa mirrored the general British critique on the inflexibility of German bureaucracy. On the German side, the critique of too flexible and too lenient forms of colonial rule also corresponds with a general assessment of British policy at that time.[94] One could also argue that the strict racial policies in German colonies reflect to some extent the insecurity of a new colonial power, whereas the more flexible British approach may point to the confidence of extensive experience in colonial policies, thereby reviving the image of forerunner and latecomer in British-German relations.[95]

In a wider context of geopolitics, Germany and Great Britain were major and competing European powers with a growing rivalry, particularly regarding naval policy.[96] Still, the African colonies seem to be a field where these developments were of less importance, as the examples of co-operation and knowledge transfer have shown.

There remains an overarching tension between the demarcating of national colonial styles, and the aim to defend European rule and interests against a black African majority with violence, coercion and methods of racial exclusion. Mostly, the sharing of the

---

93  Solf to Lugard, 16 June 1914, in: Bundesarchiv Koblenz, N 1053/41.

94  On mutual perceptions and stereotypes, see: R. Muhs / J. Paulmann / W. Steinmetz (eds.), Aneignung und Abwehr. Interkultureller Transfer zwischen Deutschland und Großbritannien im 19. Jahrhundert, Bodenheim 1998; for the admiration of German technology and science, see: J. Paulmann, Interkultureller Transfer zwischen Deutschland und Großbritannien. Einführung in ein Forschungskonzept, pp. 21-43, here p. 38.

95  For the image of forerunner and latecomer, see: H. Berghoff / D. Ziegler, Pionier und Nachzügler. Kategorien für den deutsch-britischen Vergleich?, in: id. (eds.), Pionier und Nachzügler? Vergleichende Studien zur Geschichte Großbritanniens und Deutschland im Zeitalter der Industrialisierung. Festschrift für Sidney Pollard zum 70. Geburtstag, Bochum 1995, pp. 15-28.

96  For German-British rivalry, see: the standard work by P. M. Kennedy, The Rise of Anglo-German Antagonism 1860–1914, London 1980.

"white man's burden" to colonise and civilise Africa seemed to overcome most of the differences.[97] These trends could be interpreted as the creation of pan-European colonial concepts; they could also be seen as proof of the need for developing a common imperial archive. Such a European imperial archive would allow exchanges of colonial knowledge between European imperial states consisting of information about techniques of rule and suppression with the ultimate aim of a better 'management' of the indigenous populations.[98] Even if the outbreak of WWI ended co-operations between British and German colonisers, in my view, the aspects of mutual support and exchange of colonial knowledge dominated at least the decade before 1914, thereby transforming colonial rule in Africa into a European project.[99]

97    For the aspect of the common imperial project, see: D. v. Laak, Kolonien als 'Laboratorien der Moderne'?, in: S. Conrad/J. Osterhammel (eds.), Das Kaiserreich transnational, Göttingen 2004, pp. 257-279, here p. 257. The Brussels Institut Colonial International, with many German and British colonial politicians as members, is also an important example for imperial co-operation.
98    In a more literary context, see: T. Richards, The Imperial Archive: Knowledge and the Fantasy of Empire, London 1993; see also: A. L. Stoler, Colonial Archives and the Art of Governance, in: Archival Science, 2 (2002), pp. 87-109.
99    Also, one has to add that co-operation between Germany and other European states in the field of African Studies re-emerged already in the 1920s, see: H. Stoecker, Afrikawissenschaften in Berlin von 1919 bis 1945: Zur Geschichte und Topographie eines wissenschaftlichen Netzwerkes, Stuttgart 2008.