

University of Mary Washington

Eagle Scholar

Student Research Submissions

Spring 5-10-2018

“The Peace of the Graveyard”: Remembrance and Memorialization of Crimes Against Humanity in Colonial Southwest Africa and East Africa

Drew Mesa

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholar.umw.edu/student_research



Part of the [History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mesa, Drew, "“The Peace of the Graveyard”: Remembrance and Memorialization of Crimes Against Humanity in Colonial Southwest Africa and East Africa" (2018). *Student Research Submissions*. 224. https://scholar.umw.edu/student_research/224

This Honors Project is brought to you for free and open access by Eagle Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Research Submissions by an authorized administrator of Eagle Scholar. For more information, please contact archives@umw.edu.

“The Peace of the Graveyard”: Remembrance and
Memorialization of Crimes Against Humanity in
Colonial Southwest Africa and East Africa

Drew Mesa

HIST 485

Professor Al-Tikriti

4/2/18

Abstract

How does one analyze the memorialization or remembrance of an event, or pair of events, when they have been nearly forgotten? To many individuals, the Herero and Nama Genocide in Namibia and the Maji Maji Rebellion in Tanzania are unknown; however, these two events decimated a region and left a lasting impact that is still felt to this day. In recent years, the Herero and Nama tragedy has become increasingly well-known to the international community. But why has this genocide in Namibia become the focus of attention, while the atrocities in Tanzania have remained largely unknown? Namibia's connections to the Holocaust, in the form of concentration camps, medical experimentation, and personal connections, have led many to believe the event set a precedent for the Nazis; this, in turn, has led to more intense examination and analysis of the event by scholars. Additionally, Namibia's victims' human remains were sent to museums around the world, thus globalizing the genocide in Namibia. Further, the Herero tribe in Namibia, which was nearly destroyed in the genocide, experienced a revival of power in the 1920s, which culminated in the rise of a political party and kept the memory of the genocide alive. Conversely, the core of the rebellion in Tanzania was driven by shamanism and witchcraft. The witchcraft eradication movements which swept through Tanzania in the aftermath of the rebellion destroyed the core of the Maji Maji Rebellion. Furthermore, the tribes at the core of the rebellion in Namibia were eventually forcibly settled and decentralized, losing their power and thus, losing their voice. Numbers, in both terms of German casualties and tribes involved, have led to the Herero and Nama event receiving increased coverage as more Germans died in Namibia and fewer tribes were involved.

“German imperialism had largely broken the Herero’s and Nama’s power to resist, so that in the remaining years of German colonial rule the peace of the graveyard reigned in the territory.”¹ Horst Drechsler’s adaption of a quote from German colonial official Paul Rohrbach fittingly describes the silence that befell the region of present-day Namibia after two tribes – the Herero and Nama - were nearly wiped from existence. How does one analyze the memorialization or remembrance of an event, or pair of events, when they have been nearly forgotten? To many, the Herero and Nama Genocide in German Southwest Africa and the Maji Maji Rebellion in East Africa are unknown; however, these two events decimated a region and left a lasting impact that is still felt to this day. The human costs of these two forgotten tragedies were enormous and shockingly one sided, with one side losing nearly all the victims, but little physical evidence remains and the memory of these events have all but disappeared. If these events are not widely remembered or memorialized, how does one analyze the remembrance of these events in Southwest Africa and East Africa? In reviewing subsequent literature and news media regarding these two events, it becomes apparent that the Herero and Nama tragedy has, only recently, become more well-known to the international community. But why has the genocide in Namibia become the focus of attention, both within the country and internationally, and not the atrocities in Tanzania? Connections to the Holocaust, in the form of concentration camps, medical experimentation, and personal connections, has led many to say the Namibia genocide set a precedent for the Nazis, leading to a closer examination of the event. Additionally, the genocide in Southwest Africa has become more globalized, with many of the human physical remains sent to museums around the world, even reaching locations in the United States and Germany. The Herero eventually regained political clout and wielded a stronger political

¹ Horst Drechsler, *Let Us Die Fighting: the struggle of the Herero and Nama against German imperialism (1884-1915)* (New York: Lawrence Hill Books, 1981), 231.

apparatus in the aftermath of the killings. Conversely, the witchcraft eradication movements which swept through Tanganyika—modern day Tanzania—largely stamped out the core of the Maji Maji Rebellion. Eventually the tribes became settled and decentralized and lost their political clout. Additionally, the larger numbers of German dead in Southwest Africa may correlate with increasing coverage, and subsequent remembrance, in German newspapers compared to the rebellion in Tanganyika, where far fewer German soldiers died. The number of tribes involved, two in Southwest Africa and thirty in East Africa, can also be an influential variable in memorialization. These social and political variables have led to the recent prominence of the Herero and Nama atrocities receiving critical attention in the past two decades, while the events in German East Africa have remained largely out of the limelight.

The history of the Herero and Nama peoples in southwest Africa before the German occupation of the region is one of conflict and tension. The region that would become known as Southwest Africa, or Hereroland, under German occupation, was originally inhabited not by the Herero or Nama, but by the San and Mountain Damara peoples.² The Bantu ancestors of the Herero soon grew in power in central Namibia throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth century, increasingly marginalizing the indigenous populations. Through the next century, the Herero had become the leading power in central Namibia.³ This increase in power led to a transition in Herero society, away from horticulture to the establishment of vast cattle herds.⁴

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Herero people populated what is today central Namibia. The population totaled around 80,000 people. The Nama was a smaller tribe of

² William Parsons, *Centuries of Genocide: Essays and Eyewitness Account* (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2012), 92.

³ *Ibid.*, 93.

⁴ *Ibid.*

20,000 individuals.⁵ The Nama inhabited the lands south of the Herero and had arrived in the area in the mid-nineteenth century as they escaped the violence of the Boers in South Africa. The Herero and Nama tribes would fight against each other many times; their conflict in 1880 led to German occupation.⁶

The Germans had established missionary outposts in the area of southwest Africa in the 1840s. However, German colonialism did not take hold until forty years later.⁷ In late 1881, the Germans sent officials to explore ore deposits in the area and in 1882 a German merchant, Adolf Luderitz, acquired a land holding near the coast.⁸ Luderitz purchased this piece of land for 2,500 deutsche marks, two-hundred rifles, and a selection of toys.⁹ In April 1884, German Chancellor Otto von Bismarck indicated that he wanted full German control over the entire area, planning to use the region of southwest Africa as a stepping stone for entry into the interior of the continent.¹⁰ The land acquired by Germany was immense, over 360,000 square miles; it was composed of 200,000 Africans—Herero, Nama, and Ovambo (the northernmost, and largest, tribe).¹¹ Soon after Germans began arriving in the mid-1880s, their prospective rule was soon hampered. The colonizers were not able to legitimize their claims to power due to the lack of savagery among the natives, and the fact that both tribes were nomadic.¹² Additionally, German colonization of Namibia was stunted by a lack of investment and resources.¹³

⁵ Horst Drechsler, *Let Us Die Fighting*, 17.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 21.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 19

⁸ *Ibid.*, 21. This piece of land was located along the coast of a bay that would later honor the explorer, being named Luderitz Bay.

⁹ Robert Gaudi, *African Kaiser: General Paul von Lettow-Vorbeck and the Great War in Africa, 1914-1918* (London: Penguin, 2017), 73.

¹⁰ Bismarck's proposed route to the Upper Congo came about as a result of his failed negotiations with King Leopold II of Belgium to sell his colonial holdings in the Congo. *Ibid.*, 26.

¹¹ Isabel V. Hull *Absolute Destruction: Military Culture and the Practices of War in Imperial Germany* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006), 8.

¹² A. Dirk Mose, ed., *Empire, Colony, and Genocide: Conquest, Occupation, and Subaltern Resistance in World History* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2009), 199.

¹³ *Ibid.*

Despite initial difficulties, German officials, including Chancellor von Caprivi, pushed for further control: “We possess South-West Africa once and for all; it is German territory and must be preserved as such.”¹⁴ As German immigrants came into the region, they soon found themselves outnumbered and isolated. The colonizers sheltered behind a number of protective treaties signed between the German colonial administration and the local tribes. Between 1884 and 1885, the German government negotiated with the Herero leadership and eventually came to an agreement. These treaties marked the beginning of settler expansion and systematic expropriation of African tribal land. By 1888, German holdings in the area reached 835,000 square miles.¹⁵ The 1890s saw a new colonial governor, Theodor Leutwein, lead further expansion efforts. He also formed a partnership with the chief of the Herero tribe, Samuel Maherero, during the tribe’s conflict with the Nama. Using this relationship, the Germans further increased their land holdings.¹⁶

With the Herero tribespeople under increasing pressure from an influx of German settlers onto their territory, and an epidemic of rinderpest, which decimated Herero cattle stocks,¹⁷ tensions began to rise. Despite the German government’s promises in the “protection” treaties it had signed in the 1890s, by 1904 many believed that the colonial administrators were not respecting the tribe’s customs or habits.¹⁸ The spark that would ignite these tensions occurred on January 12, 1904 in the town of Okahandja, in the central region of the colony. This town had a large population of Herero and was home to Paramount Chief Samuel Maherero. On January 10, the German officer in command of the city, Lieutenant Ralph Zurn, was given information by a

¹⁴ Reginald Herbold Green, *Namibia: The Last Colony* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall Press, 1982), 1.

¹⁵ Gaudi, *African Kaiser*, 73.

¹⁶ Drechsler, *Let Us Die Fighting*, 112.

¹⁷ Sebastian Conrad, *German Colonialism: A Short History* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 83.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 133. This sentiment can be documented in the 1/7 rule: 7 Herero were needed when testifying against a white individual. Furthermore, the Herero felt that the colonial legal system had failed them in their acquittal of rapists.

Boer trader who reported that he had seen a large column of 300 armed Herero heading for the town two days prior.¹⁹ The soldiers and civilians held themselves up in the local fortress for two days. Upon receiving a further report of a large number of tribal warriors,²⁰ German soldiers began to fire upon the Herero.²¹ The violence had begun.

After Okahandja, the Herero successfully managed to capture all of Hereroland and laid siege to fortified towns in the area. The tribe also managed to capture a majority of German livestock and killed 126 German settlers.²² Reports of settlers being caught on farms, or captured soldiers being killed in horrible fashions, including being buried alive or cannibalized, permeated the newspapers of not just Germany but the world.²³ This killing of settlers alarmed Berlin, which immediately sent reinforcements.²⁴

By April 9, 1904, Leutwein and the German forces had successfully advanced to the mountains—their march supported by Nama scouts who fought with the Germans against the Herero. After a subsequent defeat by the Herero, the German government replaced Leutwein with a commander they thought would be more effective: Lothar von Trotha.²⁵ General von Trotha was a natural choice to lead the response to the uprising, having served during the East African Wahehe Uprising in 1894, as well as in the Boxer Rebellion in China, gaining notoriety

¹⁹ David Olusoga and Capser Erichsen, *The Kaiser's Holocaust: Germany's Forgotten Genocide and the Colonial Roots of Nazism* (London: Faber and Faber, 2011), 124.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 125. In reality, the large number of Herero tribesmen were there because of a gathering of the northern Herero clans to seek arbitration from the paramount chief.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 127. The Herero had a long, personal history with Lt. Zurn. At the end of 1903, Zurn summoned Herero leaders from the northern portion of Hereroland to a meeting at the fort in Okahandja. There he demanded that they sign a contract that transferred large tracks of land to German authorities and establish a Herero reservation. The chiefs refused and Zurn had them forcibly removed from his office. He then forged their signatures thinking they could not write despite the fact that several could. In December 1903, he announced the new boundaries of central and northern Hereroland, infuriating the leadership of the Herero tribe.

²² Drechsler, *Let Us Die Fighting*, 144.

²³ *The Independent* Vol 56. Issue 2879, New York Feb 4, 1904.

²⁴ Olusoga and Erichsen, *The Kaiser's Holocaust*, 132.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 137-138.

for his violent tactics.²⁶ The General arrived on June 11, 1904, and immediately began setting about a new, chilling policy regarding the Herero. In an exchange with Governor Leutwein, von Trotha stated that he “shall destroy the rebellious tribes by shedding rivers of blood and money.”²⁷

General von Trotha began to plan for a final, decisive battle to end the Herero threat to the colony. Nearly 50,000 Herero, including 2,500 to 3,000 warriors, were held up at a mountain known as the Waterberg, and it was there that von Trotha planned for a decisive battle. General von Trotha felt a need to end the rebellion and annihilate the Herero, as he believed that if the Herero were not wiped out, that a resurgence of their social customs would occur and lead to further bloodshed for years to come.²⁸ In his directives issued on August 4, 1904, von Trotha laid out his plans for the attack. From troop placement, the goal of the Germans was to drive the surviving Herero into the desert.²⁹ A report from the Colonial German Command said as much: “If, however, the Herero were to break through...the enemy would then seal his own fate, doomed to die of thirst in the arid sandveld.”³⁰

After two days of heavy fighting at the mountain that began on August 11, 1904, the Herero fled. This flight followed the Germans’ tactical plan perfectly, with the Herero warriors, and civilians breaking through the small German contingent to the southwest and retreating into the desert.³¹ Despite the defeat and flight of the Herero, the violence was only just beginning. Soon after fleeing the Waterberg, Herero numbers began to dwindle due to starvation and thirst,

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Drechsler, *Let Us Die Fighting*, 154.

²⁸ Tilman Dederig, “The German-Herero War of 1904: Revisionism of Genocide or Imaginary Historiography?” *Journal of Southern African Studies* 19, no. 1 (March 1993): 84.

²⁹ Drechsler, *Let Us Die Fighting*, 155.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Drechsler, *Let Us Die Fighting*, 156.

the few watering holes not enough to ensure the survival of all the refugees.³² On August 13, von Trotha gave the command for the German forces to pursue the Herero into the desert.³³ He ordered the military to establish a 155 square mile cordon around the region to ensure that no Herero escaped. In a letter von Trotha stated his objectives for this new campaign:

I believe that the nation should be annihilated... This will be possible in the water holes from Grootfontein to Gobabis which are occupied... My intimate knowledge... has convinced me of the necessity that the Negro does not respect treaties, but only brute force.³⁴

From August to September, the German military chased the Herero from watering hole to watering hole, with many old, ill, women, and children killed as they ran for their lives.³⁵ During this pursuit, von Trotha's incessant racism, coupled with his soldiers' lack of training and frustration at their lack of success against the Herero, led to widespread atrocities and massacres occurring throughout this brutal campaign.³⁶ Jan Cloete, a Herero survivor of the campaign, recounted that "the Germans set off in pursuit of the rest [of the Herero], and all those found by the wayside and in the sandveld were shot down or bayoneted."³⁷ This pursuit continued until early October, when the chase reached its geographical limits and the Germans, exhausted and hungry, came to a halt.³⁸

Finally, in October, the war against the Herero would take a genocidal turn, with the issuing of General von Trotha's infamous "annihilation order" on October 2, 1904.

I, the great general of the German soldiers, send this letter to the Hereros. The Hereros are German subjects no longer. They have killed, stolen, cut off the ears and other parts of the body of wounded soldiers, and now are too cowardly to

³² Parsons, *Centuries of Genocide*, 91.

³³ Olusoga and Erichsen, *The Kaiser's Holocaust*, 146.

³⁴ Jan Bart-Gewald, "Herero Genocide in the 20th Century: Politics and Memory," in *Rethinking Resistance: revolt and violence in African history*, ed. M.E.Bruijn (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2003), 284.

³⁵ Hull, *Absolute Destruction*, 46.

³⁶ Isabel Hull, "The Measure of Atrocity: The German War Against the Hereros," *GHI Bulletin*, no. 39 (Fall 2005): 42.

³⁷ Drechsler, *Let Us Die Fighting*, 158.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

want to fight any longer. I announce to the people that whoever hands me one of the chiefs shall receive 1,000 marks, and 5,000 marks for Samuel Maherero. The Herero nation must now leave the country. If it refuses, I shall compel it to do so with the 'long tube' (cannon). Any Herero found inside the German frontier, with or without a gun or cattle, will be executed. I shall spare neither women nor children. I shall give the order to drive them away and fire on them. Such are my words to the Herero people.³⁹

The German general no longer saw submission as acceptable, only the disappearance of the Herero nation as a whole.⁴⁰ To make it seem somewhat humane, von Trotha issued a supplemental order to his proclamation regarding women and children:

And the shooting of women and children is to be understood to mean that one can shoot over them to force them to run faster. I diffidently mean that the order will be carried out and that no male prisoners will be taken... but that it should not degenerate into killing women and children.⁴¹

The General's intention for shooting over the heads of women and children, while seemingly positive, meant those that were not simply shot on sight would be forced back into the desert to die slow, painful deaths from starvation, thirst, and exhaustion.⁴² The government in Berlin initially supported the measure; however, German Chancellor Bernhard von Bulow vigorously protested the proclamation and ordered an alternative. On December 5, over two months after von Trotha issued his policy of annihilation, and after tens of thousands had died in the desert, Chief of the German General Staff Alfred von Schlieffen ordered von Trotha to pardon

³⁹ Rene Paux, *The German Colonies: What is to Become of Them?* (London: Wightman, 1918), 16.

⁴⁰ Hull, *Absolute Destruction*, 56. The day of the proclamation's issue, von Trotha ordered that captured Herero prisoners be made to listen to the reading of it. Afterward, he ordered the males hung or shot and the women and children chased back into the desert.

⁴¹ Parsons, *Centuries of Genocide*, 89.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 90.

all Herero and rescind the order.⁴³ Von Trotha begrudgingly complied and the war against the Herero ended soon after.⁴⁴

As the war against the Herero wound down in the fall of 1904, the conflict with the Nama to the south began to heat up. Much like the Herero, the systematic expropriation of Nama tribal land and cattle and the same sense of an absence of rights underscored the revolt.⁴⁵ After the rebellion of the Herero, however, the Nama feared the atrocities committed against their tribal neighbors to the north would soon be visited upon themselves.⁴⁶ Hendrik Witbooi, the leader of the Nama tribe, as early as the 1890s, expressed concerns and sentiments that would, over 12 years later, drive the Nama to take up arms against the Germans. “The White Men’s laws are quite unbearable and intolerable to us Red [Nama] people: they oppress us and hem us in in all kinds of ways and on all sides.”⁴⁷

The prelude to the ensuing violence occurred on August 30, 1904 when Jakob Morenga, a Nama tribal leader, attacked and defeated a German patrol.⁴⁸ Then, on October 3, 1904, Hendrik Witbooi sent a letter to Ludwig Ookopfel stating that he had broken from the Germans.⁴⁹ The tribe initially killed a few German settlers, hoping that it would incentivize the colonizers to move off of their lands. However, in response, the German military sent 15,000 soldiers to fight the estimated 1,000 to 2,000 Nama warriors.⁵⁰ In the spring of 1905, von Trotha

⁴³ Hull, *Absolute Destruction*, 64. Most of the German General Staff, including Schlieffen, commended von Trotha on his genocidal proclamation. However, members of the German Colonial government were appalled by the order, saying in a report that the document was “contrary to the principles of Christianity and humanity.” Heeding this warning, Kaiser Wilhelm asked Schlieffen to issue an alternative order which resulted in von Trotha’s order being cancelled on December 5, 1904.

⁴⁴ George Steinmetz, “The First Genocide of the 20th Century and its Postcolonial Afterlives: Germany and the Namibian Ovaherero,” *Journal of the International Institute* 12, no. 2 (Winter 2005).

⁴⁵ Drechsler, *Let Us Die Fighting*, 181.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 183.

⁴⁷ Hendrik Witbooi, *The Hendrik Witbooi Papers* (Windhoek: National Archives of Namibia, 1996), 80.

⁴⁸ Drechsler, *Let Us Die Fighting*, 180.

⁴⁹ Drechsler, *Let Us Die Fighting*, 184.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 187.

headed south to assume command and, in April, he ordered the Nama to unconditionally surrender. They refused and the war devolved into a guerilla war that would last for 18 months.⁵¹

To defeat the Nama, von Trotha instituted a “scorched-earth” policy, burning villages and granaries. These harsh policies, along with atrocities against the Nama similar to what was seen with the Herero in the aftermath of the Waterberg, did not end until the fall of 1905. In October of that year, Hendrik Witbooi was fatally injured during an attempted raid on a German supply convoy.⁵² With the death of Hendrik Witbooi, the Nama resistance, now unable to unite around a central figure, began to break down and soon surrendered.⁵³ The Nama population that was captured, and survived, were soon deported to concentration camps being built on the coast, where thousands of their former adversaries—the Herero—had been sent.⁵⁴ When the conflict was finally over, and the deaths in the concentration camps had been tallied, 19,000 German troops had been mobilized and 1,500 had died. That number pales in comparison to the nearly 80,000 people—70,000 Herero and 10,000 Nama—who died in the bloodshed. Before the two engagements, the tribes’ prewar population totaled around 100,000.⁵⁵

At the same time that the Herero and Nama genocide was occurring in Southwest Africa, in German East Africa another violent campaign against native peoples was underway. This rebellion was sparked in the southeastern region of the colony, an area settled by the Ngoni people. In the mid-nineteenth century, the Ngoni had migrated to present-day southeastern Tanzania, due to an upheaval in their native homeland of northeastern South Africa caused by

⁵¹ Ibid., 188.

⁵² Ibid., 190.

⁵³ Susanne Kuss, *German Colonial Wars and the Context of Military Violence* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017), 44.

⁵⁴ Parsons, *Centuries of Genocide*, 92.

⁵⁵ Hull, *Absolute Destruction*, 76.

environmental crises, the intensification of the slave trade, and the rise of the Zulu nation.⁵⁶ The tribe remained a powerful player in their newly-settled homeland until the latter part of the century.

In 1884, German colonists arrived in East Africa.⁵⁷ Despite German arrival in the mid-1880s, German and Swiss missionaries only began arriving in the region in 1898, with the German government still not maintaining control over a large portion of the colony.⁵⁸ In the mid-1890s, the Ungoni region—the territory of the Ngoni people—was considered to be one of the last frontiers of German rule. The year 1896 saw a number of large-scale tribal raids along the coast of Lake Malawi, and attacks against trade caravans. These actions by the Ngoni challenged the idea of German supremacy in the colony and called into question Germany's ability to protect subjects, as 2,000 captives had been taken during these attacks.⁵⁹ In response, the fledgling colony sent a contingent of German troops into the area to show tribes that violence would not be tolerated.⁶⁰ The Ngoni people, as well as other tribes in the area, despite German threats, continued to resist colonial rule. By the dawn of the new century, German East Africa contained nearly 3,000,000 to 4,000,000 inhabitants, yet only 2,000 of those individuals were Germans. German authority, therefore, was largely symbolic, upheld through military stations in the interior.⁶¹ With this lack of manpower and control of vital areas, especially in the southeast, coupled with German intentions of increasing their authority in the area, conflict in East Africa was inevitable.

⁵⁶ Heike Schmidt, "(Re)Negotiating Marginality: The Maji Maji War and Its Aftermath in Southwestern Tanzania, ca. 1905-1916," *International Journal of African Historical Studies* 43, no.1 (2010):34.

⁵⁷ Schmidt, "(Re) Negotiating Marginality," 40.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

⁵⁹ James Giblin and Jamie Monson, eds. *Maji Maji: Lifting the Fog of War* (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2010), 191.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 192. The Germans showcased their power by shooting through Ngoni warrior shields and killing five tribespeople who attempted to flee discussions.

⁶¹ Hull, *Absolute Destruction*, 138.

Maji, in Kiswahili, means water; it also can mean war medicine. *Maji* would become a key factor in the rebellion in Tanzania. It was through this *maji* that the seeds of the rebellion in German East Africa spread.⁶² The summer of 1905 saw tribal chiefs all over the region face uncertainty and friction from their tribes over the future, as pressures increased under German control. Since the colonization of the region, the native tribes had to adapt to a new system of taxes imposed by the colonial government, the rise of a plantation economy that used native workers and forced labor for public works projects.⁶³ These hardships led to a religious revival amongst the tribes of what would become Tanganyika. This revival was led by a prophet named Kinjikitile Ngwale. Ngwale, a medicine man, offered tribal leaders sacred water which would release them from the restrictions of existing beliefs and superstitions by giving them a new and freer life.⁶⁴ Ngwale's words spread amongst various tribes in the Southern Highlands of East Africa, along with the belief that *maji* could protect tribes from German bullets.⁶⁵

In late July 1905, men from the Nandete tribe approached their chiefs in a cotton field which they had been cultivating for the Germans. The two leaders of the Nandete, Ngulumbalyo Mandi and Lindimyo Machela, subsequently pulled three plants out of the ground, symbolically declaring war upon the colonizers.⁶⁶ The Maji Maji Rebellion, as it would be known, began among the tribes of the southeast, including the Ngoni. The rebellion quickly spread to the Southern Highlands, and eventually reached the Matabi hills in the central eastern part of the colony. From there it rapidly spread north, south, northwest, and southwest.⁶⁷ The rebellion spread through messengers who carried word of rebellion, along with *maji*. At first, tribes

⁶² Schmidt, "(Re)Negotiating Marginality," 27.

⁶³ Hull, *Absolute Destruction*, 138.

⁶⁴ Patrick M. Redmond, *The Politics of Power in Sonoga Ngoni Society, 1860-1962* (Franklin Square, NY: Adams Press, 1985), 118.

⁶⁵ Hull, *Absolute Destruction*, 138.

⁶⁶ John Iliffe, *A Modern History of Tanganyika* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 168.

⁶⁷ Schmidt, "(Re)Negotiating Marginality," 41.

attacked German representatives—mainly tax collectors— plus supply caravans and Arab foreign traders.⁶⁸ After the symbolic declaration of the rebellion, the Germans immediately sent additional reinforcements into the region. Colonial Governor Gustav Adolf von Gotzen only had 588 *askari* (native African soldiers) and 458 “law enforcement officers” in the region when the uprising began. Gotzen ordered the reinforcement troops to advance into the region; however, the troops were subjected to frequent ambushes by tribespeople. Lieutenant Lincke, a German colonial officer on an expedition to Matumbi, reported “that an unusual morale animated the attackers.”⁶⁹

The Germans initially attempted to quell the rebellion by destroying its leadership. Almost immediately after the rebellion began, the shooting of those suspected of being rebel leaders became military policy. German naval officer von Paasche described such a situation:

At the suggestion of Keudel [a local administrator] Capt. Merker arrived and proclaimed a state of war so that he could immediately hold a court-martial and hang three main magicians [rebel leaders], whom Keudel feared might be freed.⁷⁰

As part of this campaign by the Germans, Ngwale was hanged on August 4. As he prepared to die, he gave an ominous warning: the medicine had already reached the Kilosa and Mahenge, districts in central East Africa.⁷¹ By July 30, 1905, the rebellious tribes had sacked German settlements, and on July 31, burned the important trading town of Samanga. Additionally, on August 13, Ngindo warriors from southern Tanzania intercepted Benedictine missionaries and shot them dead, as they tried to explain that they were peaceful.⁷² News of the killings soon spread north across Rufiji River and into

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Iliffe, *A Modern History of Tanganyika*, 171.

⁷⁰ Hull, *Absolute Destruction*, 146.

⁷¹ Iliffe, *A Modern History of Tanganyika*, 172.

⁷² Ibid.

the region neighboring Dar es Salaam—the capital of the colony. In this district, the Zaramo tribe received the *maji* in late August and rebelled soon after. The rebellion had reached the doorstep of the colonial government. This, coupled with the burnings of the villages of Nyangao and Masani in late August and the killings of the Benedictine missionaries, led the colonial government to take further action.⁷³

These burnings convinced Governor Gotzen that force needed to be used. He sent limited forces into the interior; however, throughout August, the tribes were able to defeat and turn back German soldiers.⁷⁴ In response to these defeats, Governor Gotzen asked the Reichstag for reinforcements of 150 German soldiers and 600 *askari*—native African soldiers. The government refused the request, but sent two cruisers and marines from China and the Pacific to Dar es Salaam.⁷⁵

In the late summer and early fall of 1905, the progress of the rebels slowed and grew to a stalemate as they were defeated in battle and other native tribes did not take *maji*.⁷⁶ After a particularly gruesome battle that saw *askari* defeated by Ngindo warriors and resulted in the *askaris*' heads being spiked onto flag poles, the Germans formed a force of 60 men to respond to the violence. After a pitched battle, these 60 German soldiers prevailed, killing 150 adversaries with their modern weapons.⁷⁷ Additionally, in late August 1905, another German expedition travelled to Songea, a town in the southwest. Upon their arrival, the forces of 56 colonial *askari* and auxiliaries surprised the local chief as he was handing out *maji* to 500 warriors who were armed with spears. In the ensuing battle, 200 warriors were killed; only one colonial soldier was

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 173-175.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 172.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 175.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 184.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 177.

killed.⁷⁸ After these defeats, the tribes began to question the efficacy of the “medicine” that was meant to protect them from German bullets.

On August 30, 1905, the failure of *maji* became clear. On that date, 1,200 warriors advanced on the town of Mahenge, which was occupied by the Germans. The attack on the village came in three waves: the first was a full-frontal assault against German machine guns, which resulted in many deaths. The second occurred when warriors, now recognizing the failure of the *maji*, broke formation and took cover behind rocks; the third and final wave occurred after warriors from the Mbunga tribe arrived on September 1. They sent forward a single man while thousands watched. He was shot and killed soon after.⁷⁹

The battle at Mahenge exposed the failure of the *maji* on the battlefield. As a result of the defeat, the tribes began to revert back to native combat methods. In September 1905, the Germans began receiving reports of increasing guerilla activity. “Hardly any day passes without some combat small and large,” a German soldier reported.⁸⁰ These guerilla activities increased in frequency, as natives resorted to using traditional weapons.⁸¹ On October 21, 1905 the rebellious tribes blockaded the town of Namabengo in southeastern East Africa. This blockade was lifted when 200 colonial reinforcements arrived and dispersed the 5,000 warriors with machine guns.⁸² After the defeat, the warriors all fled in different directions, their intertribal unity broken. This battle officially marked a shift from the previous tactics of raiding utilized by the tribes to guerilla-style warfare.⁸³

⁷⁸ Ibid., 186.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 179.

⁸⁰ Gilbert Clement Kamana Gwassa, *The Outbreak and Development of the Maji Maji War 1905-1907* (Koln, Germany: Rudiger Koppe, 2005), 185.

⁸¹ Ibid., 185.

⁸² Schmidt, “(Re)Negotiating Marginality,” 42.

⁸³ James Giblin and Jamie Monson, eds. *Maji Maji: Lifting the Fog of War* (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2010), 184.

Between November 1905 and January 1906 sporadic fighting continued. This began to decrease as many tribes started to surrender, leaving few pockets of resistance.⁸⁴ At the same time, Governor von Gotzen reviewed options to end the rebellion once and for all. The Waggenhiem report proposed that “only hunger and want can bring about a final submission. Military action alone will remain more or less a drop in the ocean.”⁸⁵ In early 1906, Major Kurt Johannes arrived with fresh reinforcements, and Governor Gotzen, heeding the words of the Waggenhiem report, began to plan for a new, destructive strategy: famine. Gotzen, after the arrival of fresh soldiers, proclaimed that the “military leadership has no other alternative than to use this ally—famine.”⁸⁶ The Governor immediately instructed the Major to implement a counterinsurgency campaign which would result in the destruction and confiscation of all food and supplies and show no mercy to the native population.⁸⁷

The famine order culminated in the burning of fields and homes during planting seasons; the holding of women and children hostage to get rebellious male warriors to surrender; and the captured warriors being assigned to forced labor, with tribal leaders being executed.⁸⁸ A German captain, Richter, commenting on the policy of famine: “That’s right, the fellows can just starve...If I could I would even prevent them from planting anything. This is the only way we can make the fellows sick of war.”⁸⁹ Furthermore, a military report from the commander of the German naval forces in East Africa stated that the rebels would be forced “to a lasting capitulation through permanent harassment, destruction of their villages, and removal of livestock and food stores.”⁹⁰ As the famine strategy wore on, former militants reported that

⁸⁴ Redmond, *The Politics of Power*, 130.

⁸⁵ Iliffe, *A Modern History of Tanganyika*, 193.

⁸⁶ Gwassa, *The Outbreak and Development*, 198.

⁸⁷ Schmidt, “(Re)Negotiating Marginality,” 43.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Gwassa, *The Outbreak and Development*, 193.

⁹⁰ Hull, *Absolute Destruction*, 156.

conditions amongst the tribes had become dire. One warrior said, “We had no stronghold, no place to stay in to do this or that.” Hunger further affected the native war effort, as warriors became more focused on finding food than fighting. In one instance, an ambush was averted by German soldiers when tribal warriors went out to pick bananas on the side of the road and were spotted.⁹¹ The “scorched-earth” campaign finally ended the rebellion in 1907. The two-year rebellion and subsequent famine devastated the whole southern part of the colony and led to an estimated 250,000 to 300,000 deaths, around one-third of the total population of the region.⁹² Meanwhile, the death toll for the colonial government stood at 15 German soldiers, 73 *askari*, and 215 auxiliaries.⁹³

Connections to the Holocaust

These two tragedies occurred over 100 years ago; however, in recent years, the rebellion of the Herero and Nama in Namibia has become much more prominent. One of the reasons of this renewed interest is the rebellions’ structural and personal connections to the Holocaust. One simple connection is that both of these events were genocides; the Herero and Nama event now being considered the first genocide of the twentieth century. Characteristics of the genocide in Southwest Africa included the willingness and acceptance of mass death—by colonial officials like Governor Leutewin and General von Trotha, the destruction of native culture, and extremist language from the Germans. Comparatively, in the German East African rebellions, while the numbers of dead were substantially higher - 250,000 in German East Africa compared to 80,000

⁹¹Iliffe, *A Modern History of Tanganyika*, 196.

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ Ibid., 200.

in Southwest Africa, there is no evidence in German East Africa that the military or colonial officials in the colony willingly sought the destruction of the 30 tribes in active rebellion.

An acceptance of mass casualties was established early after the rebellion of the Herero had begun in 1905. After being questioned by the Director of the Colonial Department Dr. Oskar Stuebel on the nature of the fighting, Governor von Leutwein said, "It is only natural, however, that after all that has happened to our soldiers [they] do not show excessive leniency."⁹⁴ When it came to dealing with the Nama, the Germans resorted to using cruel and violent tactics in pursuing a small band of Nama renegades led by Joseph Morenga. A colonist, Richard Denker, reported that German troops had captured 50 women and 38 children and, lacking proper transport to prison facilities and having gotten no useful information from them, the colonial soldiers shot all of them. Upon seeing this tragedy, Denker reportedly said, "I am ashamed to be a German."⁹⁵ After von Trotha issued his annihilation order, which showed an intent to destroy the Herero as an ethnic group, he issued the additional order regarding women and children, ordering that soldiers shoot over their heads in order to scare them off. However, when prisoners began to be captured, von Trotha issued yet another, more chilling, order regarding women and children. In a letter of von Schlieffen on October 4, 1904, von Trotha stated the new measures put in place to prevent the capture of prisoners.

Accepting women and children who are ill pose an imminent danger to the troops... Therefore, I think it better the nation perish rather than infect our troops and affect our water and food.⁹⁶

⁹⁴ Drechsler, *Let Us Die Fighting*, 152.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 204.

⁹⁶ Hull, *Absolute Destruction*, 61.

Thus, Von Trotha justified the deaths of unarmed women and children because they posed a potential threat to the health of his soldiers. At this point in the rebellion, after the battle of the Waterberg and the desert pursuit, he saw extermination, not surrender, as the only way forward.⁹⁷

The openness of using tactics that caused mass death was one that led to the physical extermination of tens of thousands of Herero and Nama people; however, the conflict also saw the destruction of tribal culture. Herero tribal lands were a place where “places of meaning” such as graves, waterholes, and events of historical significance took place.⁹⁸ The Herero viewed the land as a place where memories and meaning were inscribed on the land itself from previous generations, acting as mnemonic devices for cultural history and identity.⁹⁹ However, during the era of German colonialism, the land was lost by means of physical and cultural expropriation. Germans renamed the Herero’s sacred and significant places, thus these places lost their significant cultural meanings. Additionally, the destruction of Herero villages and the restriction, or outright banning, of the Herero cultural traditions of owning cattle and pastoral nomadism destroyed activities central to the tribe’s cultural and socio-economic traditions.¹⁰⁰ The Germans also executed, or killed in battle, nearly all of the Herero chieftainship and deported their surviving family members. These chiefs represented a cornerstone of Herero society and cultural

⁹⁷ Ibid., 64.

⁹⁸ Marie-Aude Baronian, Stephan Besser, and Yolande Jansen, eds., *Diaspora and Memory: Figures Displacement in Contemporary Literature, Arts, and Politics* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007), 35.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

tradition.¹⁰¹ The deaths of the whole tribal leadership significantly weakened the group's economic, political, and social institutions.¹⁰²

This intentional annihilation and genocide of a people was further propagated by concentration camps, similar to those utilized in the genocide carried out by the Third Reich nearly 40 years later. As the campaign against the Herero continued into 1905, the establishment of prisoner-of-war camps became a military necessity. While small, temporary prison camps had been in use since the winter of 1904, the spring of 1905 saw the establishment of four main concentration camps to hold tribal prisoners: Windhoek, Shark Island, Okahandja, and Swakopmund.¹⁰³ When captured, Herero and Nama prisoners automatically fell under the military authority of area commanders who were responsible for caring for the prisoners under their control. At a time when many German soldiers lacked basic supplies, this proved to be a difficult responsibility. In January 1905, General von Trotha issued guidance regarding the treatment of prisoners, which stated that priority would be given to the needs of his own troops, and that the needs of the tribal prisoners would be addressed only after military needs had been satisfied.¹⁰⁴ This rigid maintenance of military policy regarding provisioning would have disastrous consequences for the Herero and Nama captured and imprisoned for the next three years.

Eventually, this guidance devolved from prisoners not taking priority, to active mistreatment, cruelty, torture, rape and countless deaths in concentration camps. As the war

¹⁰¹ Olusoga, *The Kaisers Holocaust*, 159.

¹⁰² Andrew Zimmerman, "Adventures in the Skin Trade: German Anthropology and Colonial Corporeality," in *Worldly Provincialism: German Anthropology in the Age of Empire*, ed. H. Glenn Penny and Matti Bunzl (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003), 173.

¹⁰³ Hull, *Absolute Destruction*, 90.

¹⁰⁴ Kuss, *German Colonial Wars*, 53.

progressed, many thousands of tribespeople would meet similar fates in the concentration camps. After taking command over the Herero revolt, General von Trotha established principles for imprisonment that defined how prisoners-of-war were treated in the concentration camps. Under these policies, the local officer capturing the prisoners would be given the authority to determine how to transport them; security was to be kept at an absolute minimum, necessitating the usage of chains and other inhumane devices; and the Herero were to be kept visibly and permanently identified with tin passes around their necks.¹⁰⁵ Nama prisoners were originally meant to be deported to the German colonies of Somoa and Adamauna, as Colonel von Deimling, the commander of the German *Schutztruppe*, German soldiers in the colony, believed the tribe posed a greater security risk than the Herero due to the recent escape of the surviving Witbooi soldiers from custody.¹⁰⁶ However, the high cost of transport killed this idea of deportation and instead the Nama were to be sent to prison camps along the coast, mainly Shark Island.¹⁰⁷

Many prisoners, upon their capture, were taken to collection camps where they were sorted by their level of health. The sick were sent to concentration camps while the healthier individuals were sent to labor camps.¹⁰⁸ However, even transporting prisoners proved to be a major problem. The German government had refused to subsidize the costs of prisoners due to their belief, much like von Trotha's, that military resources should not be burdened by caring for prisoners. The government did institute a tax to help pay for prisoner costs; however, its effects were negligible.¹⁰⁹ This ideology had tragic consequences. Benjamin Burger, a Dutch South African serving as a guide for the *Schutztruppe*, bore witness to the surprise attack and

¹⁰⁵ Hull, *Absolute Destruction*, 73.

¹⁰⁶ Great Britain, *Report on the Natives of South West Africa and their Treatment by Germany* (London: HMSO, 1918), 173. While mass deportations were shelved, a few hundred Nama prisoners, mainly tribal leaders, were deported to Cameroon.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 85.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 74. Some smaller prison camps were run by private companies contracted by the colonial government.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 75.

subsequent capture of Nama prisoners. German soldiers, Burger said, had found a group of 13 women and elderly men in a cave and ordered them to come out and surrender. As they came out, the Germans shot all of them as they exited. The commanding officer in charge ordered the deaths of these prisoners in order to avoid having to escort them back to a holding camp and wasting time and resources in the process.¹¹⁰

By April 1905, the colonial government was in possession of 4,000 prisoners, a number that would balloon to 13,216 by December of that year.¹¹¹ The locations of the concentration camps at Shark Island, Swakopmund, and Windhoek, made death an easy proposition for arriving prisoners. The commanders of these prison camps had been given orders that they were not to help the sick upon arrival, only those able-bodied and healthy, so labor could be supplied for the various infrastructure projects in the colony.¹¹² Missionary Heinrich Ledder visited the camp at Swakopmund in early March 1905 and was shocked at the conditions. The camp was located along the coast and, during the months of April to October, was subjected to cold, harsh winds whipping off the sea. He said of the occupants, “Some of them had been starved to skeletons...In the settlements they were placed into big *kraals* [huts]...without blankets, and some without clothing.”¹¹³ The prisoners at the camp were crammed 30 to 40 into simple huts made from sticks with simple canvas cloth roofs that did little to protect them from the winds. Supplies, due to von Trotha’s distaste at allocating military resources for prisoners, were extremely scarce at the camp. Ledder reported that there were only 80 blankets to protect the over 1,200 people imprisoned at the camp. He also reported that the prisoners could not eat

¹¹⁰ Great Britain, *Report on the Natives*, 171-172.

¹¹¹ Hull, *Absolute Destruction*, 73.

¹¹² Casper Erichsen, “‘The angel of death has descended violently among them’: Concentration camps and prisoners-of-war in Namibia, 1904-08,” *African Studies Centre* 79 (2005): 46.

¹¹³ Bart-Gewald, “Herero Genocide in the 20th Century”, 285-286.

sufficiently since they had no cookware to cook the uncooked rice they were allotted.¹¹⁴ Henry Francis Walker, upon visiting the remains of the camp 10 years later, would describe it as having “the most miserable habitations imaginable.”¹¹⁵ Medical facilities at the camp, while officially provided, were relegated to a cramped space located near animal stables and sewage lines.¹¹⁶ The two prison camps at Windhoek held over 5,000 prisoners by mid-August 1906. These two camps, as with Swakopmund, were very small and had frequent, deadly outbreaks of disease epidemics. These two camps used barbed-wire or thick bushels of thorn bushes to keep prisoners contained in these small spaces.¹¹⁷

It was the concentration camp at Luderitz Bay, located on the aptly named Shark Island, which would become infamous for its suffering. The camp, established in March 1905, was where many Herero and nearly all captured Nama were sent. Located on the northern tip of the island, the camp was exposed to the cold winds and weather from the South Atlantic at their most extreme.¹¹⁸ The environment proved fatal for many prisoners-of-war. The Herero and Nama peoples had historically been located inland, away from the coast, for much of their existence, and many tribespeople had never set foot near the coast during their entire lives. Their bodies were not acclimated to cold climates, only that of the dry, warm interior of the colony.¹¹⁹ Additionally, Shark Island contained no actual buildings, with prisoners being given a few surplus, or broken, military tents, and others making shelters with spare blankets to protect them from the constant wind.¹²⁰

¹¹⁴ Erichsen, “The angel of death”, 76.

¹¹⁵ Walker, *A Doctor's Diary*, 144.

¹¹⁶ Erichsen, “The angel of death”, 56.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 46.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 72.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 53.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, 72.

General Lothar von Trotha's continual resistance to allocate more money to the camps had a particularly devastating effect at Shark Island. From September to December 1906, of the 1,795 Herero and Nama imprisoned at the camp, 1,032 would die of exposure, disease, or starvation.¹²¹ In December 1906, after the death of 276 of the 1,464 Nama that month, the commander of the camp, Colonel Deimling, received numerous complaints from missionaries regarding the horrid conditions of the prisoners. After asking the commandant to remove the women and children from the camp in order to save their lives, Deimling jokingly replied, "It hadn't occurred to me that there are actually more women than men in there."¹²² The large female population at the camp led to many instances of German soldiers sexually assaulting and raping female prisoners. Many of these rapes went unreported and were not taken to court, with few exceptions.¹²³

Lack of and contaminated food became a common source of death amongst the Nama located on Shark Island. The ideal daily nutritional intake for prisoners was 1,190 calories, which was frequently adjusted downward and given only when available.¹²⁴ With rations consisting mainly of grains, rice and flour, many of the prisoners had no idea how to prepare or cook such foods. This forced diet of high fiber foods contrasted, many times fatally, with the traditional diet of milk and meat that tribal people were accustomed to consuming from their large stocks of cattle.¹²⁵ Edward Fredricks, the son of Chief Joseph Fredericks, the leader of the Bethany Nama tribe, was captured and sent to Shark Island as a prisoner. He described being beaten daily by Germans with *sjamboks*—leather whips—and women being violated by German guards on a

¹²¹ Hull, *Absolute Destruction*, 87. This figure is regardless of the fact that von Trotha would be forced out in December 1905 and replaced by a new colonial governor, Friedrich von Lindquist, who went about reforming von Trotha's policies to better assist suffering prisoners. Despite his positive reforms, the death rates in all the camps continued to rise unabated.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 86.

¹²³ Erichsen, "The angel of death," 87-88.

¹²⁴ Kuss, *German Colonial Wars*, 54.

¹²⁵ Erichsen, "The angel of death," 49.

regular basis. Fredericks tallies the number of his tribespeople who died on Shark Island at 168 males, 97 women, and 66 children.¹²⁶ Fritz Issac, another prisoner of the camp on Shark Island, mentioned that of the 3,500-member prisoner party he was sent with, only 193 survived the first year on Shark Island; over 3,300 had died.¹²⁷

A 1908 report from the *Schutzruppe* Command showed that a total of 17,000 Herero and Nama were taken as prisoners-of-war between 1904 and 1907. Out of this total, the report estimates that 7,682 of those imprisoned, 45 percent, died. However, modern scholars consider those numbers to be inaccurate and estimate the following numbers are more precise: 33,000 tribespeople were taken prisoner and 17,000 or 51 percent, died in the camps.¹²⁸ In total, owing to a spike in mortality rates in 1906, 61 percent of prisoners at the two camps in Windhoek did not survive imprisonment. At the Okahandja camp, the death rate was lower, at 37 percent. However, the camps at Swakopmund and Shark Island became places of death for Herero and Nama prisoners sent to them. At Swakopmund, between 1904 and 1907, 74 percent of prisoners died. Those numbers would be superseded by the dead at Shark Island: 86 percent of the Herero prisoners and 223% of the total Nama prisoners died on the small island of rock in Lüderitz Bay.¹²⁹

In addition to the intent to target and annihilate ethnic groups and the use of concentration camps, extremist language and institutionalized racism marked the third aspect of the genocide in Namibia that connects it, structurally, to the Aryan race rhetoric of the Nazis in the 1930s and 1940s. After the rebellion had begun in 1904, false reports of barbaric atrocities

¹²⁶ Great Britain, *Report on the Natives of South West Africa*, 172.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 173.

¹²⁸ Hull, *Absolute Destruction*, 89.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.* The rate of 223% indicates that death killed the entire population of original Nama prisoners sent to the island plus two times that number in total due to incoming captives throughout the next three years.

committed by the Herero began to be reported in newspapers around the world. News organizations in Germany widely reported stories of German soldiers being gruesomely killed by savage tribespeople, which were also reprinted in the United States. The New York *Independent* reported in February 1904 that families caught on farms had been horribly slain, including cannibalization, and that captured soldiers were being tortured and buried alive by the marauding bands of Herero warriors.¹³⁰ These false claims increased the violence visited upon the Herero warriors and prisoners, and also may explain German atrocities and acceptance of mass death and the inherent institutionalized racism as well.

The year 1905 saw the passage of a law banning *rassenmischung*, race-mixing, in the colony. The law in Namibia was a catalyst for similar laws in German East Africa the following year and Samoa seven years later.¹³¹ The race laws of German Southwest Africa provided a conceptual basis that would later be applied by Nazi lawmakers to draft the 1935 Defense Law, which prohibited soldiers from marrying non-Aryan peoples, as well as the infamous Nuremberg Laws.¹³² Furthermore, in 1908, after the end of the Herero and Nama revolts, legislation ordered that all Africans over the age of eight-years-old had to wear tin passes embroidered with the imperial crown, district area, and labor number.¹³³ These tin passes bear a resemblance to the identification patches worn by victims of the Holocaust four decades later.

Extreme language also permeated the conflict in the colony. As has already been seen, members of the colonial government used extremist language when referring to their policy

¹³⁰ *The Independent*, February 4, 1904.

¹³¹ Benjamin Madley, "From Africa to Auschwitz: How German South West Africa Incubated Ideas and Methods Adopted and Developed by the Nazis in Eastern Europe," *European History Quarterly* 35, no.3 (2005): 438-439.

¹³² *Ibid.*, 439.

¹³³ Bart-Gewald, "Herero Genocide in the 20th Century": 286. For more information regarding the treatment of Herero and Nama tribe members after the revolts, legislation pertaining to their cultural survival, and subsequent native resistance, see Phillip Prien, "Guns and Top Hats: African Resistance in German South West Africa, 1905-1915," *Journal of Southern African Studies* 20, no.1 (March 1994).

goals or their thoughts on the native peoples. General von Trotha, before arriving in the colony, used Social Darwinism to explain his racist feelings regarding the Herero: “At the onset we cannot do without the natives. But they will finally have to melt away...philanthropic views cannot banish Darwin’s law survival of the fittest.”¹³⁴ In 1906, Captain Maximilian Rayer said that God ordained the destruction of the Nama. A year later, government official Paul Rohrbach argued that the Nama had no use economically, like the Herero had; therefore there was “no justification for the preservation of this race.”¹³⁵

Medical experimentation in the prisoner-of-war camps of Southwest Africa is also yet another structural link between Namibia and Nazi Germany. At the camp on Shark Island, the camp’s doctor, Dr. Bofiger, attempted to find the source of the high death rate amongst prisoners, as well as try to cure scurvy in the camp. To attempt this, the doctor performed a number of experiments on live prison subjects in which he injected them with various substances, including arsenic and opium, to find a cure— which he never did.¹³⁶ There were also reports that Herero prisoners were forcibly sterilized and injected with doses of smallpox, typhus, and tuberculosis.¹³⁷ Eugen Fischer, a German anthropologist who became an influential figure for race science, developed and tested racial hygiene theories in Southwest Africa. Using captured prisoners as experiments, Fischer tested, and subsequently allegedly confirmed, using physical measurements, his theories that genetic racial mixing between Germans and Africans was dangerous.¹³⁸

¹³⁴ Parsons, *Centuries of Genocide*, 97.

¹³⁵ Madley, “From Africa to Auschwitz,” 436.

¹³⁶ Olusoga and Erichsen, *The Kaiser’s Holocaust*, 225.

¹³⁷ Clarence Lusane, *Hitler’s Black Victims: The Historical Experiences of European Blacks, Africans and African Americans During the Nazi Era* (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2002), 50.

¹³⁸ Naomi Baumslag, *Murderous Medicine: Nazi Doctors, Human Experimentation, and Typhus* (Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2005), 37.

The structural connections between the Herero and Nama genocide and the Holocaust are striking: intent to annihilate, concentration camps, extremist language and institutionalized racism, and medical experiments on live prisoners; however, within the past decade, a literature has formed linking these events in Namibia at the turn of the twentieth century to the Holocaust by way of individual, personal connections. In the aftermath of both the Herero and Nama rebellions, as well as World War I, and during the socialist uprisings in Germany in the 1920s, many veterans of the colonial wars formed *Freikorps*—free army—units to fight against socialist groups.¹³⁹ General Ludwig von Maercer, having served in German Southwest Africa and having overseen prisoners at Shark Island, formed the first *Freikorps* unit to crush the revolutionary uprising in Munich.¹⁴⁰ Several men who would become influential in the Third Reich held positions in the unit, including a young Reinhard Heydrich.¹⁴¹ Other influential members of the future Nazi regime included Paul Emil von Lettowvorbeck, Franz Ritter von Epp, Eugen Fischer, and Herman Goering.

Paul Emil von Lettowvorbeck, a veteran of the war in Namibia, formed his own *Freikorps* unit and suppressed the Communists in Berlin during the violence in 1919. Lettowvorbeck served at the battle of the Waterberg alongside another future Nazi, Franz Xavier Ritter von Epp. Members that served in Lettowvorbeck's unit included Wilhelm Stukart, who would go on to become a Nazi lawyer who would draft the Nuremberg Laws. Lettowvorbeck's aide-de-camp was Ernst Rohm, Hitler's future right-hand-man and driving force behind the Nazi Brown Shirts.¹⁴²

¹³⁹ Olusoga and Erichsen, *The Kaiser's Holocaust*, 282.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 283.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 285.

Franz Xavier Ritter von Epp arrived in Southwest Africa in 1904 as one of the first reinforcements sent to put down the revolt, holding the position as a company commander. He fought at the Waterberg and was stationed in the colony until 1906.¹⁴³ After World War I, von Epp became commander of the Bavarian *Freikorps*, who generally despised the Weimar Republic and wanted the reestablishment of the monarchy.¹⁴⁴ During this time, after World War I, von Epp became acquainted with Adolf Hitler, installing him as an “educator” in his *Freikorps* unit.¹⁴⁵ Von Epp subsequently became a member of the Nazi party and on March 9, 1933, von Epp was appointed as a Reich commissioner, on orders from Hitler, to take over the government in Munich.¹⁴⁶

As discussed earlier, Eugen Fischer was an influential anthropologist in German Southwest Africa during the revolt of the Herero and Nama. During his time in Namibia, Fischer studied the Baster people. The Basters were a mixed- race tribe, descended from Nama women and Boer men, who lived in a community named Rehoboth. Fischer studied them to show how race-mixing led to degeneration of the white race over time. He did this by measuring lengths of extremities and heads of Baster people.¹⁴⁷ His report, “The Rehobeth Bastards and the Basterization Problem in Man,” contained photographs and charts of eyes and hair color to argue the problems of race-mixing.¹⁴⁸ He subsequently released a joint report entitled “Human Heredity and Racial Hygiene.” This study would go on to become the most influential book on Nazi race science.¹⁴⁹ One of the anthropologist’s most prominent students was Joseph

¹⁴³ Madley, “From Africa to Auschwitz,” 452.

¹⁴⁴ David Clay Large, *Where Ghosts Walked: Munich’s Road to the Third Reich* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1997), 116.

¹⁴⁵ Madley, “From Africa to Auschwitz,” 453.

¹⁴⁶ Large, *Where Ghosts Walked*, 236.

¹⁴⁷ Olusoga and Erichsen, *The Kaiser’s Holocaust*, 246-247.

¹⁴⁸ Micahel Berenbaum and Abraham Peck, eds. *The Holocaust and History: The Known, the Unknown, the Disputed, and the Reexamined* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1998), 119.

¹⁴⁹ Olusoga and Erichsen, *The Kaiser’s Holocaust*, 298.

Mengele.¹⁵⁰ Adolf Hitler personally received a copy of Fischer's report while imprisoned in Landsburg, where it played a significant role in shaping his views of race and racial purity.¹⁵¹ Fischer later became director of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute of Anthropology from 1927-1942¹⁵² and would later become a powerful figure in Nazi racial science during the Third Reich.¹⁵³ Under Nazi rule, the anthropologist became a judge on the Superior German Health Court, which sought to perform studies using black Africans for purposes of exploitation.¹⁵⁴

The final, and perhaps most significant Nazi with connections to the events in Namibia in 1904-08, was Herman Goering. Goering's father, Heinrich, served as the *Reichkommissionar* of Southwest Africa between 1884-1891, where he suppressed small revolts and signed treaties that subdued African peoples.¹⁵⁵ Herman Goering, his son, held his father's service in Africa in high regard, saying that it is how he learned that the subjugation of non-Germans was a patriotic path to glory.¹⁵⁶ Herman Goering's official Nazi party biography claimed that his father, and his action against the Herero, influenced his son's character.¹⁵⁷ The Third Reich opened a museum to Herman Goering in 1940 as a memorial to Germany's lost empire. This memorial included various exhibition halls that contained, among other things, the Nazi flag alongside the flag of the Second Reich—the era of the Herero and Nama—and a large portrait of Hitler next to Alfred Lüderitz, the founder of German Southwest Africa.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁰ Mahmood Mamdani, *When Victims Become Killers: Colonialism, Nativism, and the Genocide in Rwanda* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002), 12.

¹⁵¹ Olusoga and Erichsen, *The Kaiser's Holocaust*, 298.

¹⁵² Berenbaum and Peck, *The Holocaust and History*, 358.

¹⁵³ Olusoga and Erichsen, *The Kaiser's Holocaust*, 298.

¹⁵⁴ Berenbaum and Peck, *The Holocaust and History*, 359.

¹⁵⁵ Madley, "From Africa to Auschwitz," 451.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁷ Olusoga and Erichsen, *The Kaiser's Holocaust*, 315. This is despite the fact that his father was not in the area during the time of the Herero revolt.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

Human Remains

The Holocaust had made it possible for anthropologists to acquire body parts from Nazi concentration camps, continuing a process that had begun in Southwest Africa.¹⁵⁹ With connections to individuals performing medical experiments, like Eugen Fischer, who would go on to become an influential Nazi member, the Herero and Nama genocide has become a “globalized” event, as the physical remains of those who died proliferated around the world. After the war against the Herero ended in December 1905, Lt. Ralf Zurn, who was a prominent individual in starting the war, was asked by anthropologist Felix von Luschan to bring back skulls of dead prisoners to Germany.¹⁶⁰ Reports from Germans involved in the process say that Herero women were forced to remove the heads of their countrymen with shards of broken glass.¹⁶¹ Zoologist Leonard Schultz, on a collecting trip in the colony, said: “I could make use of the victims of war... from fresh native corpses, which made a welcome addition to the study of the living body.”¹⁶² These skulls found their ways into the United States and Germany, leading to the Herero and Nama genocide becoming more well-known internationally than the events in East Africa. At the American Museum of Natural History in New York City, boxes of human skulls and bones remain stored inside the building after Luschan sold his entire private collection to the museum.¹⁶³ These skulls also found their way into the Medical History Museum of the Charite hospital in Berlin, which has become a recent center of controversy regarding the repatriation of skulls back to Namibia. Since 2008, 20 skulls have been returned to the country so far.¹⁶⁴ The spread of human remains around the world was a unique characteristic of the tragedy

¹⁵⁹ Andrew Zimmerman, *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 243.

¹⁶⁰ Zimmerman, “Adventures in the Skin Trade,” 174.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 175.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*

¹⁶³ Daniel Gross, “The Troubling Origins Of The Skeletons In A New York Museum,” *New Yorker*, January 24, 2018.

¹⁶⁴ “Over 1,000 skulls from Germany’s colonies still sitting in Berlin,” *Deutsche Welle*. November 23, 2016.

in Namibia, one not seen in the aftermath of the Maji Maji uprising in East Africa, and it led to increasing awareness of the genocide in Southwest Africa, in both Germany and the United States, as calls for repatriation grew in the first decade of the twenty-first century.

Political Power: Loss in Tanzania

The proliferation of human remains globalized the destruction of the Herero and Nama in a way that was not seen with the tribes of East Africa. While both tribes in Namibia would be repressed in the aftermath of the conflict, the tribes, particularly the Herero, would experience a resurgence of political, social, and economic power; however, the same cannot be said of the 30 tribes that participated in the Maji Maji Uprising in 1905. The memory of that rebellion has faded for public view, just as the Herero and Nama genocide had until the past two decades. This was due to political events that sought to not only destroy tribal political power but the very identity of the rebellion itself: the concept of *maji*.

German, and later British, officials saw the cornerstone of the revolt in East Africa, *maji*, as a dangerous form of spiritual and medicinal practice they associated with demonic forces and witchcraft. Therefore, after the rebellion, colonial officials believed that witchcraft had the potential to lead to another rebellion. Prior to the uprising in 1905, medicinal magic, which would soon be termed witchcraft by the Europeans, was practiced by over 100 tribes in the region.¹⁶⁵ After the rebellion, German officials believed that the *waganaga*, healers, who mobilized villages in a specific region—like what was seen in Maji Maji—could once again

¹⁶⁵ Stacey Langwick, *Bodies, Politics, and Africa Healing: The Matter of Maladies in Tanzania* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2011), 373.

threaten the colonial administration with violence.¹⁶⁶ To the German colonial government, the medicine practiced by these tribes was of a political nature.

After World War I and the Paris Peace Conference, the region of East Africa, now known as Tanganyika, came under the control of the British government. With the changing of government, however, the policy towards witchcraft remained unchanged.¹⁶⁷ Initially, the British colonial government distributed pamphlets regarding the use of witchcraft. These pamphlets did not treat witchcraft as a crime, however. Circular No. 15 of April 1919 treated witchcraft as a superficial threat, but warned that “the fact should not be lost sight of that witchcraft possessed in the past of this country, and still possess possibilities for evil as an incitement to native uprisings.”¹⁶⁸ This was a clear reference to the Maji Maji rebellion a decade prior. A later regulatory pamphlet, Circular No.22, still did not impose punishment for witchcraft, except during specific cases of riot incitement.¹⁶⁹

Not until the coming of the first British colonial governor of Tanganyika, Horace Byatt, were laws established that punished individuals for practicing witchcraft. The law passed in 1922, during his tenure as governor, was officially titled, “Ordinance to Provide for the Punishment of Persons Practicing Witchcraft or Making Use of So Called Witchcraft.” While the law was more expansive than Circular No. 22, covering not just witchcraft used for riot incitement, but any form of witchcraft used with “malicious intent,” it still did not ban outright the practice of tribal healing.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁶ Ibid.,46.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., 47. The British government initially had trouble identifying and separating European witchcraft from African witchcraft because African witchcraft did not contain devils, demons, prayers, or worship.

¹⁶⁸ Simeon Mesaki, “Witchcraft and Witch-killings in Tanzania” (PhD diss., University of Minnesota, 1993), 58.

¹⁶⁹ Simeon Mesaki, “Witchcraft and the law in Tanzania,” *International Journal of Sociology and Anthropology* 1, no. 8 (December 2009): 133.

¹⁷⁰ Mesaki, “Witchcraft and Witch-killings,” 59.

After Governor Byatt left colonial office in 1922, the incoming Governor of Tanganyika, Donald Cameron, proclaimed a major change in the laws regarding witchcraft. Cameron believed that the previous witchcraft law of 1922 was useless and set about redefining colonial ordinance by expanding and enlarging the scope of punishments for the practice of witchcraft.¹⁷¹ In 1928, his administration released a new law that made all practice of witchcraft illegal. The Witchcraft Act of December 1928 defined witchcraft to include “sorcery, enchantment, and bewitching.” According to the law, an individual was guilty of a crime if they had instruments of witchcraft in their possession, had a statement of intent to commit acts of magic, supplied others with instruments of witchcraft, advised others on performing the act, or threatened the use of magic.¹⁷² The punishment for violating the law depended on malicious intent. If a person performed witchcraft without malice, they were fined 1,000 shillings; if caught performing the act with malicious intent, the punishment was imprisonment for seven years and a 4,000 shilling fine.¹⁷³

Under British administration, tribal magic was repressed with ruthless efficiency; the memory of the rebellion faded as the supernatural beliefs and practices that defined it crumbled under increasing colonial scrutiny. The tribes that once practiced such spiritual practices, and spearheaded the rebellion in East Africa were accused by many in the government of greed, envy, and savage cannibalism.¹⁷⁴ These collective groups of peoples, once proud and prominent tribes in the region, had become, in the eyes of the colonizers, inhuman demons. In the southern part of Tanganyika, witchcraft was openly met with violence.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 59.

¹⁷² The Witchcraft Act, Ord. No. 45 of 1956.2 (1928). The law defines instruments of witchcraft as anything that is used to prevent or delay any person from doing any act a person may lawfully perform.

¹⁷³ Mesaki, “Witchcraft and the law in Tanzania,” 134.

¹⁷⁴ Langwick, *Bodies, Politics, and Africa*, 373.

These laws, and actions, against supposed witchcraft would continue well into the twentieth century. In the 1950s, the government of Tanganyika pushed for more stringent witchcraft eradication methods. In 1954, local town councils were instructed to cleanse districts of witchcraft and witches. These actions resulted in the “cure” of 704 people with medicines or the surrender of their magical instruments.¹⁷⁵ The year 1956 saw a revision of the 1928 Witchcraft Act. The revision created an official commission to review and assess the state of witchcraft in the territory. This committee approved a number of measures, including a vigorous educational strategy through law and propaganda, with the intention that such education, and spread of modern ideas, would marginalize and end beliefs in witchcraft; the committee also allowed for more cleansing actions in some areas of the colony.¹⁷⁶

In 1961, the former colony of Tanganyika declared independence and became the Republic of Tanzania. Despite independence, the new government of Tanzania, led by Julius Nyerere, did not alter its stance towards witchcraft in the country. The central government and Christian and Muslim leaders still did not sanction witchcraft in Tanzania.¹⁷⁷ A law passed in 1965 defined witchcraft to include “sorcery, enchantment, bewitching, the use of instruments of witchcraft, the purported exercise of occult power, and the purported possession of any occult knowledge.”¹⁷⁸ This new law parroted many aspects of the 1928 colonial law regarding witchcraft, but expanded the scope of punishment and the circumstances by which a person would be committing witchcraft.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁵ Mesaki, “Witchcraft and Witch-killings,” 92.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 134.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 98.

¹⁷⁸ Mesaki, “Witchcraft and the law in Tanzania,” 135.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

The 1970s saw a radical period in the suppression of witchcraft in Tanzania. This era saw the federal government institute Operation Mauaji, which rounded up and interrogated nearly 900 people suspected of being witches and performing witchcraft.¹⁸⁰ The 1970s also saw the creation of local vigilante organizations to fight against witchcraft: the *Sungusungu*. The *Sungusungu* were formed in the late 1970s with support from the central government at the end of the Ugandan War of 1979.¹⁸¹ The official goal of this group was the re-establishment of tranquility in villages by decreasing crime and the eradication of witches.¹⁸² These groups, particularly in the southern Tanzania, used violence to eradicate witchcraft, often killing the elderly, females, and vulnerable individuals.¹⁸³ Between 1970 and 1984, there were an estimated 3,333 witch-related cases of murders that killed 3,692 people.¹⁸⁴ These groups continued to grow and increase their violent activity throughout the 1980s, which led to a contentious debate over witchcraft in the 1990s. This debate came to an end at the dawn of the twenty-first century, with the passage of the 2002 Witchcraft Act, which continued many of the existing provisions and laws from both the 1928 and 1956 laws banning witchcraft.¹⁸⁵

In contemporary Tanzania, the repression of supposed witches and witchcraft is still an important concern to the federal government. At present, Tanzania is reluctant, according to the World Health Organization, to acknowledge that witchcraft still exists in the country.¹⁸⁶ While the government has made progress in recent years in combatting witch-killings, maintaining that they are illegal and subject to a fine and imprisonment, many officials within local councils continue to support the activities of the *Sungusungu*, and view these actions as pursuing justice

¹⁸⁰ Mesaki, "Witchcraft and Witch-killings," 135. Twelve people died during this process.

¹⁸¹ Mette Røkke, "Witch-Hunt in Contemporary Tanzania" (master's thesis, University of Tromsø, 2004), 27.

¹⁸² Mesaki, "Witchcraft and Witch-killings," 135-136.

¹⁸³ Langwick, *Bodies, Politics, and Africa*, 373.

¹⁸⁴ Mesaki, "Witchcraft and Witch-killings," 98.

¹⁸⁵ Mesaki, "Witchcraft and Witch-killings," 135.

¹⁸⁶ Røkke, "Witch-Hunt in Contemporary Tanzania", 23.

or ridding an area of bad luck.¹⁸⁷ The central government itself has come under renewed fire for actively supporting vigilante activities that kill innocent people suspected of being witches.¹⁸⁸

The persecution of suspected witches has not appeared to slow in recent years as people with albinism have been killed at increasing rates, and dismembered, because doctors argue such body parts are valuable. As recently as 2011, 600 elderly women were killed in Tanzania on suspicion that they were witches.¹⁸⁹

As witchcraft eradication increased over time, the Maji Maji rebellion faded from public view, as its core characteristics, healers and *maji*, have been deemed witchcraft. During the 1960s, the uprising was trumpeted by many politicians as a nation-building experience, the first event to unite the separate tribes in the area to achieve a common goal; however, as the decades have passed, this narrative of the Maji Maji rebellion, one where tribal, ethnic, and religious differences did not matter, was proven incorrect by scholars who, studying the evidence, argued that the revolt was indeed a tribal, ethnic, and religious conflict.

During the push for Namibian independence, many political leaders in Tanganyika argued that the Maji Maji rebellion was the first example of tribes coming together and exhibiting their national unity. This was spurred by a nationalistic interpretation that emphasized the strong positive resistance amongst tribes against the German government.¹⁹⁰ In a speech at

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., 24.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., 27. The *Sunday Observer* of May 9, 2004 argued that the government supported the *Sangusangu* because it was vital for community security. To show their support for the groups, the government awarded several for the “best practice in implementing local policies for crime prevention.”

¹⁸⁹ Errol Burnett, “Witchcraft in Tanzania: the good, bad, and the persecution,” *CNN*, October 8, 2012. The article also mentions how witchcraft eradication has become a lucrative business, with “doctors” charging \$20-\$120 for their services.

¹⁹⁰ Katrina Demulling, “We Are One: The Emergence and Development of National Consciousness in Tanzania” (PhD. diss., Boston University, 2005), 145-146. For further information regarding the development of the nationalist narratives, and the institutions the Tanzanian government used to distort facts in order to do this, see Thaddeus Sunseri, “Statist Narratives and Maji Maji Ellipses,” *The International Journal of African Historical Studies* 33, no.3 (2000):567-584.

the United Nations, future Tanzanian President Julius Nyerere voiced these common sentiments at the time:

The people fought because they did not believe in the white man's right to govern and civilize the black. They rose in a great rebellion not through fear of a terrorist movement or superstitious oath, but in response to a natural call of the spirit, ringing in the hearts of all men, and all times, educated or uneducated, to rebel against foreign domination.¹⁹¹

Although the rebellion was widespread throughout the colony, not every locality or tribe participated.¹⁹² The cause of the rebellion was not, according to historians, a result of German oppression, but one of economic power. The geographic spread of the rebellion strongly coincided with tribal divisions between trading networks, with tribes centered on a network usually joining the rebellion.¹⁹³

The Maji Maji was sanctified and extended by religious ideology, particularly by the Kolelo cult. This cult, run by ministers, interpreted the orders to rebel as having come from the heavens, who then brought these orders and grievances to regular tribespeople.¹⁹⁴ The Kolelo cult, which had widespread influence over southern Tanzania, was centered in the village of Ngarambi on the Rufiji River, and saw many people flock to them from many parts, particularly from the south and east, to seek advice and help.¹⁹⁵ The cult was also centered in other areas, and as a result, provided teachings and instructions to many tribespeople. The Kolelo cult provided a

¹⁹¹ Ibid.

¹⁹² Ibid., 149. When Maji rebels attempted to get the chief of the Mbuyuni tribe to participate, and he refused, they murdered him. Additionally, tribes that fought for the Germans wore red cloth arm bands to identify themselves.

¹⁹³ Felicitas Becker, "Traders, 'Big Men' and Prophets: Political Continuity and Crisis in the Maji Maji Rebellion in Southeast Tanzania," *Journal of African History* 45 (2004): 18.

¹⁹⁴ John Iliffe, "The Organization of the Maji Maji Rebellion," *Journal of African History* 8, no. 3 (1967): 503-504.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid.

mechanism to reach the people along the Rufiji river.¹⁹⁶ Another aspect of the religious character of the Maji Maji movement, disputed by the Tanzanian government, was the prophet Kinjikitile Ngwale, who effectively turned *maji* into war medicine, giving the spiritual water a new ideological meaning related to war.¹⁹⁷

As religion was a catalyst for the rebellion, tribalization directed action during the latter stages of the uprising. As the rebellion entered its second year and progress slowed, many tribes recognized the failure of the *maji* to protect them from the Germans. An example of this tribalization was seen in two tribes: the Vidunda and Ngoni. A *hongo*, a priest, came to the Vidunda tribe and informed its members that he was there to free them from European control. Tribespeople listened to the priest's word, over the calls of their chief, Ngwira, and accepted the *maji* and rebelled. The *hongo* took control of the tribe and increased his power within the district, gathering warriors to fight against the Germans. After gathering warriors, he fought, and lost, a battle against the colonizers. The warriors soon returned to their tribe and chief, returning to old tribal guerilla fighting methods after their loss.¹⁹⁸ The Ngoni tribe, at the outbreak of the rebellion was divided between northern and southern sections. After both sections accepted the *maji* and rebelled, they operated independently of each other, within the limits of their kinship and tribal structures.¹⁹⁹

As the contradictory narratives of the Maji Maji rebellion have led to its isolation from political speeches, with mentions of it seemingly only occurring during the annual anniversary of its beginning, the loss of tribal political power in the country has given few tribes the ability to

¹⁹⁶ Ibid., 505. Despite the power of the cult, none of the tribes in its area of influence rebelled.

¹⁹⁷ Mwitwa Akiri, "Magical Water Versus Bullets: The Maji Maji Uprising as a Religious Movement," *African Journal for Transformational Scholarship* 31, no.3 (2017): 36.

¹⁹⁸ Iliffe, "The Organization of the Maji Maji Rebellion," 507.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid., 511.

voice their stories and push for popular memorialization of the uprising. To illustrate the correlation between the loss of tribal power and the lack of remembrance, compared to the Herero and Nama, focus will be put on the largest, and one of the most influential tribes in the region, the Ngoni. When European settlers arrived in the region in the late nineteenth century, the Ngoni tribe in the southwestern region of Sonega, were regarded as a tribe of disciplined and fearless warriors. This sentiment was based on their authoritarian society, structured settlement pattern, and positive agricultural performance. Europeans viewed these as positive institutions and good values of discipline, strength, and order. Initially, German missionaries believed that Ngoni society offered the possibility for other tribes to reject the barbaric elements and to civilize them.²⁰⁰

The Ngoni, however, were one of the initial tribes to rebel against the Germans in 1905 and participated throughout. However, as the Germans systematically cracked down on the tribe's food production, its fighting began to wane. In 1906, the Germans captured and hanged nearly one hundred Ngoni elite and deported others as forced labor to the coast.²⁰¹ The repression of the rebellion had effectively destroyed the old chieftain system of the Ngoni tribe and the population fell by up to one-half—from a pre-war population of 60,000 to 30,000 after 1907.²⁰² After the Germans were forced out of the region after World War I, and East Africa came under a British mandate, the colonial government continued to control the formerly strong tribe by taking control of its lands away from the chiefs.²⁰³

²⁰⁰ David Edwards, "Settlement, Livelihoods, and Identity in Southern Tanzania: A Comparative History of the Ngoni and Ndendeuli" (PhD. diss., University of Edinburgh, 2003), 57.

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 59.

²⁰² *Ibid.*, 60.

²⁰³ *Ibid.*

By the 1950s, the positive attitude once held towards the Ngoni tribe by German missionaries in the early twentieth century had begun to shift and transform. Under British control, the Ngoni were now viewed as lazy, undisciplined, backward, and non-progressive.²⁰⁴ In 1954, the historian P.A. Gulliver described the stagnation of Ngoni life:

Whether one surveys their agriculture, their housing, their diet, their standards of life or their ceremonial, one finds only a depressing poverty of ideas, ambition and an equally depressing resignation to its perpetuation.²⁰⁵

Policies initiated by the British government in the mid-1940s began a process of resettlement that was to continue for the next four decades and had a profound effect on tribal power and the memory of the Maji Maji Uprising. The 1930s saw the colonial government institute a land policy in the Liwale region in southeast Tanganyika that favored nature over villages, with a goal of reducing tribal power and the risk of rebellion. This led to the movement of dozens of villages and the subsequent creation of the Selous Game Reserve in 1947.²⁰⁶

After independence in 1961, Julius Nyerere commenced a nationwide villagization program as rural development took center-stage in an effort to modernize.²⁰⁷ In 1961, the Ngoni people formed the Ruvuma Development Association with the intention of developing cottage industries like wool, masonry, carpentry, and soap-making. This society was initially heralded as a government success, but soon developed strong opposition within its ranks. In September 1969, the government disbanded the association, confiscated their assets, and no longer allowed the tribe to assert its autonomy.²⁰⁸

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 57.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 58.

²⁰⁶ Giblin and Monson, *Lifting the Fog of War*, 302.

²⁰⁷ Marja-Liisa Swantz and Aili Mari Tripp, *What Went Right in Tanzania: People's Response to Directed Development* (Dar es Salaam, Tanzania: Dar es Salaam University Press, 1996), 50.

²⁰⁸ Edwards, "Settlement, Livelihoods," 168.

In 1967, the Arusha Declaration saw the state assert increased control over agricultural production, which was soon followed by Operation Villagization.²⁰⁹ It was during this villagization period in the 1960s and 1970s that tribes from the south, in particular, were forcibly moved and forced to resettle in nearly 7,000 newly-created villages. This resettlement program led to the abandonment of traditional methods of farming and tribal ways of life²¹⁰ With President Nyerere ordering that all people were to live in villages by 1976, state control increased exponentially over rural areas and peoples, like the Ngoni.²¹¹ By the mid-1970s, the once prominent Ngoni had been forcibly resettled, with political power stripped from their control.

The effects of this eradication and the reduction of tribal political power through forced villagization, along with the criminalization of witchcraft is reflected in how the Maji Maji rebellion is remembered and memorialized in contemporary Tanzania. Within the southern region where the war occurred, many people, even those descended from individuals who experienced the war first hand, are not knowledgeable about it. In interviews with tribespeople, many appeared to not know of the suffering that their ancestors went through. Speaking with an 81-year-old man, historian Heike Schmidt discovered that the man was not told about the experience of his people and assumed that his people did not go hungry when the opposite was true.²¹² Another female individual stated that she did not know anything whatsoever about how her parents experienced the war, or anything about the war for that matter.²¹³

²⁰⁹ Ibid.

²¹⁰ Tim McClanahan, *East African Ecosystems and Their Conservation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 353.

²¹¹ Edwards, "Settlement, Livelihoods," 171.

²¹² Schmidt, "(Re)Negotiating Marginality," 44.

²¹³ Ibid., 45.

In the present day, many of the people living within what is referred to as the “Maji Maji Zone” somewhat know about the war and have a limited understanding of the tribes that participated in the rebellion. However, people outside of this zone do not have the same level of understanding of the rebellion, if at all, or of the cultural history of the tribes involved.²¹⁴ When it comes to memorialization of the rebellion, there exist only two nationally recognized monuments: one in Sonaga and the other in Nandate.²¹⁵ Additionally, remembrance of the rebellion takes place on one day, February 27, and occurs in only one area of the country, Ungoni, where the Sonaga memorial is located. The day is dedicated to the 68 warriors who were executed by Germans on that day in 1905.²¹⁶

Political Power: Revival in Namibia

As the Ngoni tribe lost its political power and its land, the memory of the Maji Maji faded from the minds of Tanzanians. In Namibia, however, the Herero people, nearly decimated after the end of the rebellion in 1907, would experience a transformation in their political, and cultural power; this transformation would see them spearhead remembrance and reparations for the genocide around the globe.

After the end of the Namibia rebellion and before the First World War, many of the surviving Herero were used as forced labor on plantations and public infrastructure projects. During the military campaign in Southwest Africa in 1915, many Herero men deserted in masse from their places of forced employment and sided with the British forces.²¹⁷ After the British

²¹⁴ Nancy Rushohora, “Theorizing the Maji Maji—Landscape, Memory, and Agency,” *Journal of African Cultural Heritage Studies* 1, no.1 (2017): 25.

²¹⁵ *Ibid.* The memorial at Nandete is not well-known, as it lies in an area of poor infrastructure. Additionally, a majority of the other monuments to the rebellion, which are not state recognized, are dedicated to missionaries who died during the conflict. These monuments are usually only dedicated to a single group or individual, thereby obscuring the war through the erasure of additional important participants and locations.

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 247.

²¹⁷ Bart-Gewald, “Herero Heroes,” 232.

victory in the region in 1916, many of the Herero were freed from their forced labor.²¹⁸ The Herero, now free from their laborious tasks, began to re-establish a major tenet of their culture—cattle farming—which was formerly restricted and made illegal by the Germans.²¹⁹ With the reestablishment of cattle farming, Herero survivors began to settle, many times illegally, on former lands that had been lost after German settlement in the region. The Herero began to reoccupy lands to such an extent that the tribe created a new leadership, and the English/South African administration was forced to recognize its legitimacy, as well as the right of the tribe to own cattle.²²⁰

By 1916, the government had established the first Herero reserve, measuring 30,000 acres, and by 1921 additional reserves were granted for tribal use due to the extensive cattle herds it controlled.²²¹ The Herero were becoming increasingly independent, seeking ways to express their identity. A Report on Native Affairs in 1919 stated that the Herero “have a very independent spirit... The native with just a few head of cattle considers it [unfair] [to] dig to work.”²²² That same year, Namibia became a mandated territory of South Africa, and the Herero, having undergone a radical reconstruction, would now push for political change. With the newly-created South African administration, one that pushed racist policies and racial superiority, the tribe soon realized that the inequality they had been subjected to under the Germans would continue and their land would not be returned to them.²²³ These realizations that the new government had the potential to be as unfavorable and dangerous as the German colonizers two

²¹⁸ Ibid., 234. These vacant positions were quickly filled by Ovambo peoples who had migrated from the north that year due to poor grain harvests.

²¹⁹ Ibid. The Germans made it illegal for cattle to enter central Namibia—Hereroland—from Ovamboland to the north.

²²⁰ Ibid., 236. With this recognition, the colonial government had to accept, deal, and negotiate new legislation and laws with the Herero chiefs.

²²¹ Ibid., 260.

²²² Ibid., 261.

²²³ Ibid., 260.

decades prior, led tribespeople to unite in opposition.²²⁴ Following the expulsion of the Germans and the South African mandate in the early 1920s, the Herero tribe, once on the brink of collapse, was now attempting to rebuild its political autonomy.

Under the new government, Herero leaders, once in exile, returned to Namibia to strengthen the new chieftainship. Hoseah Kutako, the son of Samuel Maherero, was made regent of the tribe.²²⁵ It was during this time of transition that the Herero, historically militarized, once again organized themselves into armed regiments, or *Otruppe*, commanded by tribal leaders.²²⁶ In 1920, the Universal Negro Improvement Association arrived in Namibia and the Herero leaders quickly warmed to the organization, eventually granting allegiance to it. The UNIA served as a catalyst for Herero communities to voice their grievances and accusations against the South African government.²²⁷ The UNIA in Namibia quickly expanded, soon becoming dominated in central Namibia by Herero, and by January 1922, 500 members were located in Windhoek, with regional offices opening in Swakopmund and other locations.²²⁸ The UNIA proved to be a crucial link to the political activity of the tribe for the next two decades, linking members in Namibia to other societies all around the globe.²²⁹ The push for political power amongst the Herero, started by the Universal Negro Improvement Association, would climax in the aftermath of World War II.

After the end of World War II, a nationalist sentiment spread across the continent of Africa. In Namibia, these feelings led to the discussions about the establishment of a political

²²⁴ Ibid.

²²⁵ Ibid., 262.

²²⁶ Ibid., 266. These armed units closely resembled the German military.

²²⁷ Ibid., 267-268. The UNIA began a campaign to buy back former tribal lands through soliciting donation; the campaign was unsuccessful.

²²⁸ Ibid., 268.

²²⁹ Ibid., 270.

party mainly made up of Herero members.²³⁰ This newfound nationalistic sentiment spurred the Herero to immediately set about petitioning the United Nations to vote against incorporating the Namibian territory into the South African state, as was the original plan when the mandate was given to the country.²³¹ In 1947, Chief Frederick Maherero and the Herero Chiefs Council drafted a petition to prevent incorporation into South Africa; in the 1950s, the Herero would send representatives to New York City to physically hand in further petitions against the maneuver.²³² The year 1959 saw Herero political ambitions become reality, with the creation of the South West African National Union, a predominantly Herero political party. In the early 1960s, this party internationalized the issues of the Herero tribe by opening foreign party offices, most notably in Cairo, Egypt.²³³

Thus, the Herero tribe experienced a virtual rebirth and transformation after its near demise in 1907. The increasing political power of this tribe, in comparison to the tribes in East Africa, has caused the Herero and Nama genocide to become a nationwide event in contemporary Namibia. Since 1923, the Herero people have commemorated “Herero Day.” This date, August 26, marks the anniversary of the burial of Samuel Maherero in Oakhandja. In 1980, this tribal holiday became a national holiday, and was renamed “Heroes Day,” to commemorate the Namibian War of Independence, which began on August 26, 1966.²³⁴ Recently, the ruling party of the Namibian government, the South West Africa People’s Organization, have attempted

²³⁰ M.Bollig and Jan-Bart Gewald,eds., *People, Cattle, Land: Transformations of a Pastoral Society in Southwest Africa* (Colonge: Koppe, 2000), 21-22.

²³¹ *Ibid.*, 2.

²³² *Ibid.*

²³³ *Ibid.*, 3. This expansion of the SWANU political party may have been partially responsible for influencing Horst Drechsler to write his university thesis about the Herero and Nama genocide that would eventually become *Let Us Die Fighting*; however, further investigation into this hypothesis is needed. For more recent information regarding the SWANU party and its electoral history, particularly in the 2014 elections, see Electoral Commission of Namibia, *Performance Assessment and Post-Election Report: 2014 Namibian Presidential and National Assembly Elections* (Windhoek, Namibia: ECN, 2014).

²³⁴ Reinhart Kossler, “Facing a Fragmented Past: Memory, Culture, and Politics in Namibia,” *Journal of African Studies* 23, no. 2 (June 2007): 376. The Namibian government chose to initiate conflict on August 23, 1966 in order to honor Samuel Maherero and pay homage to his actions.

to increase awareness of the genocide and manage communal concerns amongst the Nama by celebrating the lives of Hendrik Witbooi, the leader of the tribe during the rebellion.²³⁵

Physical memorials to the genocide are far more numerous, and widespread, than ones dedicated to the Maji Maji Rebellion in East Africa. The most notable national memorial is known as Heroes Acre, near Windhoek. This monument honors significant individuals that fought against colonialism and contains tributes to numerous Herero and Nama leaders who fought in the rebellion, including Witbooi, Maherero, and Jacob Morenga—a Nama guerilla fighter.²³⁶ Monuments to the genocide are not only found in Namibia; there are also two monuments that honor the native victims of the genocide located in Bremen, Germany.²³⁷

Numbers

Finally, numbers may be a factor in explaining the prominence of the events in Namibia, whereas those in Tanzania are largely forgotten. Namibia, compared to Tanzania, saw many more German soldiers deployed in response to the uprising (20,000 in Southwest Africa compared to 2,000 in East Africa.) In Southwest Africa, the *Schutztruppe*—native Germans—made up an overwhelming number of colonial soldiers fighting against the Herero and Nama.²³⁸ The numbers were very different in the case of East Africa, as the majority of the colonial soldiers were not Germans; rather they were native Africans recruited into German service, auxiliaries, or mercenaries. Additionally, the death rate among these German soldiers may have

²³⁵ Ibid.

²³⁶ Silvio Marcus de Correa, “History, Memory, and commemorations: on genocide and colonial past,” *Revista Brasilia de Historia* 31, no. 61: 93-95. Streets in the capital city of Windhoek are also named after Herero and Nama fighters; and in 2008, the Namibian government collaborated with the government of Germany to increase the number of archival documents related to Namibian history, including the genocide, in its National Archives to be used by the public.

²³⁷ Ibid., 95.

²³⁸ Reinhard Kossler, *Namibia and Germany: Negotiating the Past* (Windhoek, Namibia: University of Namibia Press, 2015), 89. While the figures of the German death toll in these two events may seem surprisingly low, they are corroborated in other sources throughout the literature. To get a real sense of the impact such figures may have had on the German population, further investigation into media coverage, particularly newspapers, is needed.

influenced how the public, both in Germany and the settlers in these African regions, responded to these two concurrent events. The number of German soldiers who died in the campaigns against the Herero and Nama between 1904 and 1907 stands at 1,500. Comparatively, the total number of German soldiers who were killed during the Maji Maji Rebellion is only 15. With such a higher death rate in Namibia, Germans may have been much more aware of the unfolding calamity in Southwest Africa, where over 1,000 of their fellow compatriots died.

The number of German deaths may have influenced how the German settler population and those in Germany remembered these two rebellions; however, the number of tribes involved in each of these events may also have influenced the memorialization of these colonial crimes against humanity. In the case of Southwest Africa, which involved two tribes, the Herero, as has been seen, experienced a rebirth and revitalization of its leadership and lands. As a product of this revival, the Herero were able to gain increasing political influence as the decades passed, culminating with the establishment of their own political party. This political might allowed them to describe, and keep alive, the event of 1904 on a national level, resulting in national and international remembrance. In Tanzania, the story was drastically different. Instead of two tribes involved in resisting colonial expansion, the Maji Maji uprising involved nearly 30 individual tribes. These individual tribes, many of which experienced steep declines in both population and leadership figures after the war and subsequent famine, did not have a collectively strong voice, unlike the Herero. Add to this lack of voice the political disenfranchisement during the British colonial government and the further loss of political power with forced villagization during the 1970s, after Tanzanian independence, and the political power and collective voice these tribes have today is miniscule, compared to that of the Herero.

Explaining the history and the subsequent remembrance and memorialization of two events that have not received substantial public attention can prove to be difficult. How does one explain the origins of memorialization of the events in Namibia and Tanzania, and explain how and why the Herero and Nama genocide has received substantially more public visibility in recent years than the Maji Maji Rebellion? In recent years, genocide studies have increased exponentially, and with the tragedy in Namibia being a clear case of systematic, intentional destruction of two peoples, this has led it to being increasingly studied as the first case of genocide in the twentieth century; the Maji Maji rebellion in East Africa, meanwhile, has not been framed by modern scholars as such an event.²³⁹ Connections to the Holocaust, both structural connections—in the forms of concentration camps and medical experimentation—and personal connections—Eugen Fischer, Franz Ritter von Epp, and Heinrich Goering— have led to recent comparisons between the Holocaust and the Namibia rebellion, as well as substantial investigations into whether the Herero and Nama genocide set a precedent for the Holocaust. The Herero tragedy has also seen its physical aftermath, in the form of human remains spread around the globe, bringing foreign countries into literal contact with the genocide. The attack on the heart of the uprising in Tanzania, *maji*, through witchcraft eradication movements; and the political differences between the once powerful Ngoni tribe in Tanzania and the Herero in Namibia, with the former losing its power and identity through forced government social programs, and the latter reorganizing, and reestablishing its important cultural and political institutions that have allowed it to lead the call of remembrance and memorialization. These variables have led to increased global attention on the tragedy in Namibia, which has led

²³⁹ While the revolt in Tanzania has not been framed as a genocide, I do believe it should be. According to the UNGC: Induced famine that leads to “deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part,” meets the (modern) definition of genocide.

increased pressure on Germany to recognize the events in Namibia as genocide and a push for reparations. Well into the twenty-first century, the German government did not recognize the Herero and Nama uprising for what it was: genocide. However, after increased media attention over the storage of human remains in both New York and Germany, the German government, in July 2016, finally considered the events as genocidal in nature.²⁴⁰ Following on the heel of this recognition, in January 2017, the Association of The Ovaherero Genocide in the USA sued Germany in U.S court, demanding damages for the tragedy.²⁴¹ Shortly thereafter, the government of Namibia demanded \$30 billion in reparations.²⁴² As can be seen, recent events have begun to shine a light of much needed, and deserved, attention on these events. While the factors stated above have seemingly led the Namibian case to being covered, and remembered, more fully, the scholarship on both of these events have experienced a revival within the past five years and shows no signs of slowing as the reparations movements continue. The “Peace of the Graveyard,” as Paul Rohrbach emotionally described a desolate Namibia, is no longer so quiet; voices, calling for reparations, repatriations, and recognition, are steadily increasing in their furor and strength. One can only hope that the increased attention and focus on Namibia will influence reflection and action toward the other more widely forgotten rebellion in Tanzania.

²⁴⁰ Justin Huggler, “Germany to recognize Herero genocide and apologise to Namibia,” *The Guardian*, July 14, 2016.

²⁴¹ Lynsey Chutel, “Germany is being sued over its forgotten genocide,” *Quartz*, January 2017.

²⁴² Lynsey Chutel, “Namibia doesn’t want ‘aid’ to make up for Germany’s genocide—it wants \$30 billion,” *Quartz*, March 18, 2017. It should also be noted that Tanzania, as of February 2017, is also demanding reparations from Germany.

Bibliography

- Akiri, Mwita. "Magical Water Versus Bullets: The Maji Maji Uprising as a Religious Movement." *African Journal for Transformational Scholarship* 31, no.3 (2017): 31-39.
- Baronian, Marie-Aude, Stephan Besser, and Yolande Jansen, eds. *Diaspora and Memory: Figures of Displacement in Contemporary Literature, Arts, and Politics*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Rodopi, 2007.
- Baumslag, Naomi. *Murderous Medicine: Nazi Doctors, Human Experimentation, and Typhus*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2005.
- Becker, Felicitas. "Traders, 'Big Men' and Prophets: Political Continuity and Crisis in the Maji Maji Rebellion in Southeast Tanzania." *Journal of African History* 45 (2004):1-22.
- Berenbaum, Michael and Abraham Peck, eds. *The Holocaust and History: The Known, the Unknown, the Disputed, and the Reexamined*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1998.
- Bollig, M. and Jan-Bart Gewald, eds., *People, Cattle, Land: Transformations of a Pastoral Society in Southwest Africa*. Cologne: Koppe, 2000.
- Burnett, Errol. "Witchcraft in Tanzania: the good, bad, and the persecution." *CNN*, October 8, 2012.
- Conrad, Sebastian. *German Colonialism: A Short History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Correa, Silvio Marcus de. "History, Memory, and commemorations: on genocide and colonial past." *Revista Brasilia de Historia* 31, no. 61 (2011): 1-19.
- Clement, Gilbert and Kamana Gwassa. *The Outbreak and Development of the Maji Maji War 1905-1907*. Koln, Germany: Rudiger Koppe, 2005.
- Chutel, Lynsey. "Germany is being sued over its forgotten genocide." *Quartz*, January 2017.
- _____. "Namibia doesn't want 'aid' to make up for Germany's genocide—it wants \$30 billion." *Quartz*, March 18, 2017.
- Dedering, Tilman. "The German Herero War of 1904: Revisionism of Genocide of Imaginary Historiography?" *Journal of Southern African Studies* 19, no. 1 (March 1993): 80-88.
- Demulling, Katrina. "We Are One: The Emergence and Development of National Consciousness in Tanzania." PhD. diss., Boston University, 2005.
- Drechsler, Horst. *Let Us Die Fighting: the struggle of the Herero and Nama against German imperialism (1884-1915)*. New York: Lawrence Hill Books, 1981.
- Edwards, David. "Settlement, Livelihoods, and Identity in Southern Tanzania: A Comparative History of the Ngoni and Ndendeuli." PhD. diss., University of Edinburgh, 2003.

- Erichsen, Casper." "The angel of death has descended violently among them': Concentration camps and prisoners-of-war in Namibia, 1904-08," *African Studies Centre* 79 (2005): 1-179.
- Gaudi, Robert. *African Kaiser: General Paul von Lettow-Vorbeck and the Great War in Africa, 1914-1918*. New York: Caliber, 2017.
- Gewald, Jan-Bart. *Herero Heroes: A Socio-Political History of the Herero of Namibia, 1890-1923*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1999.
- _____. "Herero genocide in the twentieth century: Politics and memory." In *Rethinking Resistance: Revolt and Violence in African History*, edited by Gerrit Jan Abbink, Mirjam De Bruijn, and Klaas Van Walraven, 279- 304. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2003.
- Giblin, James and Jamie Monson, eds. *Maji Maji: Lifting the Fog of War*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2010.
- Great Britain. *Report on the Natives of South West Africa and their Treatment by Germany*. London: HMSO, 1918.
- Green, Reginald Herbold, Kimmo Kiljunen, and Marja-Liisa Kiljunen. *Namibia: The Last Colony*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall Press, 1982.
- Gross, Daniel. "The Troubling Origins Of The Skeletons In A New York Museum." *New Yorker*, January 24, 2018.
- Huggler, Justin. "Germany to recognize Herero genocide and apologise to Namibia." *The Guardian*, July 14, 2016
- Hull, Isabel V. *Absolute Destruction: Military Culture and the Practices of War in Imperial Germany*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006.
- _____. "The Measure of Atrocity: The German War against the Hereros Revisited." *German Historical Institute Bulletin* no. 37 (Fall 2005): 39-44.
- Iliffe, John. *A Modern History of Tanganyika*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- _____. "The Organization of the Maji Maji Rebellion." *Journal of African History* 8, no. 3 (1967): 495-512.
- Kossler, Reinhart. "Facing a Fragmented Past: Memory, Culture, and Politics in Namibia." *Journal of African Studies* 23, no. 2 (June 2007): 361-382.
- Kuss, Susanne. *German Colonial Wars and the Context of Military Violence*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2017.
- Langwick, Stacey. *Bodies, Politics, and Africa Healing: The Matter of Maladies in Tanzania*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2011.

- Large, David Clay. *Where Ghosts Walked: Munich's Road to the Third Reich*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1997.
- Lusane, Clarence. *Hitler's Black Victims: The Historical Experiences of Afro-Germans, European Blacks, Africans, and African Americans in the Nazi Era*. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Madley, Benjamin. "From Africa to Auschwitz: How German South West Africa Incubated Ideas and Methods Adopted and Developed by the Nazis in Eastern Europe." *European History Quarterly* 35, no. 3 (2005): 429-464.
- Mamdani, Mahmood. *When Victims Become Killers: Colonialism, Nativism, and the Genocide in Rwanda*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002.
- McClanahan, Tim. *East African Ecosystems and Their Conservation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Mesaki, Simeon. "Witchcraft and Witch-killings in Tanzania. PhD diss., University of Minnesota, 1993.
- _____. "Witchcraft and the law in Tanzania," *International Journal of Sociology and Anthropology* 1, no. 18 (2009):132-138.
- Olusoga, David. *The Kaiser's Holocaust: Germany's Forgotten Genocide and the Colonial Roots of Nazism*. London: Faber and Faber, 2010.
- "Over 1,000 skulls from Germany's colonies still sitting in Berlin." *DW*, November 23, 2016.
- Paux, Rene. *The German Colonies: What is to Become of Them?* London: Wightman, 1918.
- Poewe, Karla. *The Namibian Herero: A History of the Psychological Disintegration and Survival*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1985.
- Prein, Phillip. "Guns and Top Hats: African Resistance in German Southwest Africa, 1907-1915." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 20, no. 1 (March 1994): 99- 121.
- Redmond, Patrick M. *The Politics of Power in Sonoga Ngoni Society, 1860-1962*. Franklin Square, NY: Adams Press, 1985.
- Røkke, Mette. "Witch-Hunt in Contemporary Tanzania." Master's thesis, University of Tromsø, 2004.
- Rushohora, Nanacy. "Theorizing the Maji Maji—Landscape, Memory, and Agency." *Journal of African Cultural Heritage Studies* 1, no.1 (2017): 19-31.
- Schmidt, Heike. "(Re)Negotiating Marginality: The Maji Maji War and Its Aftermath in Southwestern Tanzania, ca. 1905-1916." *International Journal of African Historical Studies* 43, no.1 (2010): 27-62.
- Sunseri, Thaddeus. "Statist Narratives and Maji Maji Ellipses." *The International Journal of African Historical Studies* 33, no.3 (2000):567-584.

- Steinmetz, George. "The First Genocide of the 20th Century and its Postcolonial Afterlives: Germany and the Namibian Ovaherero." *Journal of the International Institute* 12, no. 2 (Winter 2005).
- Swantz, Marja-Liisa and Aili Mari Tripp. *What Went Right in Tanzania: People's Response to Directed Development*. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania: Dar es Salaam University Press, 1996.
- Totten, Samuel and William S. Parsons, eds. *Centuries of Genocide: Essays and Eyewitness Accounts*. 4th ed. Abington, UK: Routledge, 2012.
- The *Independent* Vol 56. Issue 2879, New York Feb 4, 1904.
- The Witchcraft Act, Ord. No. 45 of 1956.2 (1928).
- Walker, H.F.B. *A Doctors Diary in Damaraland*. London: Edward Arnold, 1917.
- Witbooi, Hendrik. *The Hendrik Witbooi Papers*. Translated by Annemarie Heywood and Eben Maasdorp. Windhoek, Namibia: National Archives of Namibia, 1996.
- Zimmerman, Andrew. "Adventures in the Skin Trade: German Anthropology and Colonial Corporeality." In *Worldly Provincialism: German Anthropology in the Age of Empire*, edited by H. Glenn Penny and Matti Bunzl, 156-179. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003.
-
- Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.