

## Introduction

---

Shortly after the Australian takeover of German New Guinea in October 1914, a Herr Hornung, a German copra farmer, returned to his plantation to find it burned down and abandoned by his workers. While Hornung surveyed the wreckage, one of his former employees, a Melanesian, approached him and asked if it were true that the ‘natives’ now had permission to kill white Germans.<sup>1</sup> While this story was reported secondhand from Batavia to the German Colonial Office, it illustrates the feeling among local planters that the outbreak of war in Europe, triggering the takeover of Germany’s colonies, fundamentally challenged the existing colonial social structures. The First World War was not merely confined to the boundaries of Europe and was truly global in its reach. The story of the extension of what was primarily a European war into extra-European theatres and its real and imagined impact on the imperial world order can be narrated through the experiences of German civilian internees and prisoners of war taken from Germany’s overseas possessions by British and Dominion authorities during the First World War.<sup>2</sup>

The battlefields of the First World War outside Europe have often been regarded as a sideshow to the main theatre of war in the Western Front. While this was true with regard to the extent that the extra-European operations determined the outcome of the war, for the men and women whose lives were affected through expulsion from their homes, internment, and the confiscation of their property, the war outside Europe was an integral part of the global conflict. Colonial settlers’ multiple identities such as planters, traders, missionaries, and reservists meant the lines between who was to be classed as a civilian internee and who as a

<sup>1</sup> Bundesarchiv (BA), R1001/2615, Krieg in Deutsch-Neuguinea 1914–1918. Kaiserlich Deutsches Generalkolonialamt für Niederländisch-Indien Batavia, Bericht des Stationsleiters Schmaus, 14 April 1915. ‘Die Eingeborenen fragten ihn gleich, ob es wahr sei, dass die Eingeborenen jetzt die deutschen Weissen töten dürften’.

<sup>2</sup> The German colonies were Togo, Cameroon, German South-West Africa, German East Africa, New Guinea, Samoa, The Kiaochow Bay concession, China (with the port town referred to here by its older name of Tsingtao, although the modern Pinyin alliteration is Qingdao), and a number of islands in the Pacific.

2 Colonial Captivity during the First World War

military prisoner were often blurred, making it necessary here to discuss prisoners of war and civilian internees in tandem. The uprooting and imprisonment of so many civilians within Europe constituted an important aspect of the war's radical transformation of social relations and its destruction of common European values which is also applicable to the extra-European theatre.<sup>3</sup> The colonial theatres of the war, where previously racial roles and hierarchies had been more rigidly defined than in Europe, were characterised by social transformation influenced through the expansion of the European Great War into a global conflict.

The outbreak of the First World War is often seen as a departure from the relative European Great Power cooperation that facilitated a peace lasting from 1871. However, this masks the fact that the wider world, in the years before the war, was indeed a violent place. The Balkan Wars of 1912–1913 proved that not even Europe was immune from outbreaks of armed conflict. In the extra-European world, the First World War certainly marked a massive escalation in violence, but it was not a break from the norm. Previously, the Russo-Japanese War (1904–1905), and the Italo-Turkish War, in Libya (1911–1912), saw innovations in land and air warfare that were exported to the Western Front in 1914–1918.

One of the key innovations that previous extra-European conflicts contributed to the Great War in Europe was the concentration camp. The institution of *reconcentrados* was introduced by the Spanish military in Cuba during the Ten Years War (1868–1878) where civilians were concentrated in villages and towns under Spanish control, and the Boer War in South Africa (1899–1902) saw the first instances of 'white Europeans' interned in modern concentration camps. The Boer War camps to some extent mirrored compounds for African labour in South Africa diamond and gold mines. This reflected a refusal to recognise these prisoners as purely white; Lord Kitchener, British Chief of Staff during the Boer War, refused to recognise the Boers as European, referring to them instead as 'uncivilized Africander savages with only a thin white veneer'.<sup>4</sup> The abuses of Africans, as in King Leopold's Congo colony in the 1900s or during the brutal suppression of the Herero uprising in German South-West Africa (1904–1907), were well known to contemporaries and provided a common stock of public images of colonial violence, such as mutilation, which were drawn on in the popular understanding of the

<sup>3</sup> Matthew Stibbe, 'Civilian Internment in Europe: 1914–1920', *Immigrants and Minorities*, 26, 1/2 (March/July 2008), pp. 49–81, p. 49.

<sup>4</sup> See Ian Smith and Andreas Stucki, 'The Colonial Development of Concentration Camps (1868–1902)', *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 39, 3 (2011), pp. 417–437, p. 419.

fighting in the First World War.<sup>5</sup> Violence escalated in the colonial sphere with the outbreak of the First World War, but it was not new. One of the major differences, however, was that this violence was also being directed at Europeans.

Yet, in the longer term it was not the links between internment in the colonial sphere and the concentration camps of the Second World War that transformed the nature of twentieth-century internment. Rather, it was as, Robert Gerwarth and Stephan Malinowski argue, the radicalisation of society within Europe during the First World War that was the key factor in leading to the gates of Auschwitz.<sup>6</sup> Germany's colonial past provided the Nazis with lessons to learn not models to follow.<sup>7</sup> In terms of the origins of the Third Reich concentration camps, the Nazi party took its inspiration less from foreign precedents than from existing national disciplinary discourses and practices within the German prison system and the army.<sup>8</sup> This then raises some questions: To what narrative does the story of Europeans in captivity in the colonies belong? Does this narrative belong within a European context that has repercussions for internment in later conflicts there or is it to be confined to the colonial sphere? Can one separate the extra-European and European narratives? A concise answer for further interrogation is that internment, through international negotiations over treatment and exchange, and through reprisals against prisoners in the colonies for action taken against their counterparts in Europe, linked the extra-European and European theatres together.

<sup>5</sup> The abuses in King Leopold's Congo are also currently well-known thanks to the commercial success of Adam Hochschild's work. Adam Hochschild, *King Leopold's Ghost: A Story of Greed, Terror, and Heroism in Colonial Africa* (MacMillan, London, 1999).

<sup>6</sup> Robert Gerwarth and Stephan Malinowski, 'Hannah Arendt's Ghosts: Reflections on the Disputable Path from Windhoek to Auschwitz', *Central European History* 42, 2 (2009), pp. 279–300. A great deal of work has been done on Germany's abysmal treatment of Herero captives, in 1904–1907, and the influence this may have had on German moves to mass intern people in the Second World War. See 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, 3 (2005), pp. 429–464; Jürgen Zimmerer, 'Annihilation in Africa: The "Race War" in German Southwest Africa (1904–1908) and Its Significance for a Global History of Genocide', *Bulletin of the German Historical Institute*, 37 (Autumn 2005), pp. 51–57. Seven of the twenty-two articles in Michael Perraudin and Jürgen Zimmerer (eds.), *German Colonialism and National Identity* (Taylor and Francis, New York, 2011) are dedicated to the Herero genocide. See also David Olusoga and Casper W. Erichsen, *The Kaiser's Holocaust: Germany's Forgotten Genocide* (Faber and Faber, London, 2010).

<sup>7</sup> Bradley Naranch, 'Introduction: German Colonialism Made Simple', in Bradley Naranch and Geoff Eley (eds.), *German Colonialism in a Global Age* (Duke University Press, Durham, NC, and London, 2014), p. 16.

<sup>8</sup> Nikolaus Wachsmann, *KL: A History of the Nazi Concentration Camps* (Little and Brown, London, 2015), p. 61.

4 Colonial Captivity during the First World War

Five main themes frame the analysis of internment and the fall of Germany's colonies. First, the management of camps in the extra-European world was dependent on the centralised policy of the British Empire. This policy meant the transfer of European norms of camp management in terms of rules, rations, and even the physical layout of camps through fences and barracks were brought in line with European technical innovations.<sup>9</sup> A camp system that had initially been developed in what one could consider the experimental field of the colonial periphery was now being re-exported to the extra-European world.<sup>10</sup> Internment in the early twentieth century was marked by two major innovations. The initial spur was a technological revolution which allowed a certain synergy between the character of internment and scientific advances leading to a bureaucratisation of camp management, most notably in Britain, where during the First World War there were two competing governmental prisoner-of-war departments. Then, the camps themselves became emblematic of modern states and their ability to wage civilised (or uncivilised) warfare. This resulted in the establishment of the 'modern' European internment camp, physically symbolised through barbed wire fences and watchtowers, in the extra-European theatre.<sup>11</sup>

The second theme, the centralised nature of the camp system, brought Germans in captivity into close contact with the British inhabitants of Dominion and other colonial territories of the British Empire. These 'enemy' encounters aided the development of a strengthened British imperial identity. These encounters worked in tandem with the 'digger myth' that emerged in the second half of the war in response to the disaster at Gallipoli complimenting the 'Britannic' tradition to fit neatly with 'conservative imperial nationalism'.<sup>12</sup> While this was ultimately true for Australia and New Zealand, during the war there were tensions between London and the Dominions (and India), which were often at odds with one another over the treatment of prisoners of war and internees. However, the presence of German prisoners of war and civilian internees taken from within the Dominions and from the German colonies helped to consolidate a common British identity, one that was in opposition to

<sup>9</sup> Heather Jones, 'Kriegsgefangenenlager: Der moderne Staat und die Radikalisierung der Gefangenschaft im Ersten Weltkrieg', *Hamburger Edition*, 20, 4 (August/September 2011), pp. 61–65.

<sup>10</sup> Alan Kramer, 'Einleitung' in Bettina Greiner and Alan Kramer (eds.), *Die Welt Der Lager: Zur 'Erfolgsgeschichte' einer Institution* (Hamburger Edition, Hamburg, 2013), p. 17.

<sup>11</sup> Heather Jones, 'Eine Technologische Revolution? Der Erste Weltkrieg und die Radikalisierung des Kriegsgefangenenlagers', in Greiner and Kramer, *Die Welt Der Lager*, pp. 117–119.

<sup>12</sup> John Darwin, *The Empire Project: The Rise and Fall of the British World System 1830–1970* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2009), p. 342.

the German ‘other’.<sup>13</sup> The ensuing ‘enemy alien’ legislation in Britain and the empire has been seen as a ‘watershed’ in British imperial history and would contribute to the development of a purely British identity.<sup>14</sup> It is important to note here that this legislation not only targeted at bel-ligerents but also many black Britons who had no written proof of their identity, further cementing the racial equation of *Britishness* with the pos-session of white skin.<sup>15</sup>

The development of the camp system and the enhancing of a British imperial identity in opposition to a German one meant that the pris-oners had to reassess their position in the extra-European world. This marks the third theme. Because of the extension of the war into a colo-nial conflict, ‘whites’ were no longer identified as Europeans but were now singled out by nationality. The extension of the Great War to Africa challenged German settlers to rethink their relationship not just with fellow Europeans but also with the Reich.<sup>16</sup> The loss of the colonies and the colonial role reversal embodied in internment, and the inability of Germany to alleviate their suffering, all contributed to this reappraisal. Through internment and subsequent deportation, German colonial set-tlers were knocked down the social ladder. The imperial space of the camp viewed from without was certainly British, but, within the ‘contact zones’ of the camps, a particular German space could be created.<sup>17</sup> This book will reconstruct this narrative and address questions relating to imperial prestige, racial hierarchies, violence and reprisal, and the links between colonial and European internment.

The fourth theme connects to the idea of twentieth-century mobility and modernity, signified through the fluid camp system.<sup>18</sup> The British pol-icy of evacuating prisoners of war and civilian internees from the German colonies reversed, to a certain extent, the prewar routes of labour mobil-ity and migration. In the early 1900s there were controversial debates on

<sup>13</sup> Sebastian Conrad, *Globalisation and the Nation in Imperial Germany* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010), p. 20.

<sup>14</sup> John C. Bird, *The Control of Enemy Aliens in Great Britain 1914–1918* (Garland Publishing, New York, 1986), p. 345.

<sup>15</sup> Jacqueline Jenkinson, *Black 1919: Riots, Racism and Resistance in Imperial Britain* (Liverpool University Press, Liverpool, 2009), p. 5, p. 203.

<sup>16</sup> Daniel Steinbach, ‘Defending the Heimat: The Germans in South-West Africa and East Africa during the First World War’, in Heather Jones, Jennifer O’Brien, and Christoph Schmidt-Supprian (eds.), *Untold War: New Perspectives in the First World War* (Leiden, The Netherlands, and Boston, 2008), p. 180.

<sup>17</sup> Emily Rosenberg, ‘Transnational Currents in a Shrinking World’, in Emily Rosenberg (ed.), *A World Connecting: 1870–1945 (A History of the World)* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 2012), p. 819.

<sup>18</sup> For discussion on internment camps and modernity see the contributions in: Greiner and Kramer, *Die Welt Der Lager*.

6 Colonial Captivity during the First World War

the freedom of movement and boundaries and immigration limitation in Europe, South Africa, the United States, and Australia. Domestic German interest in these debates revealed a global consciousness that developed among political actors especially when these migratory flows were redirected back to Germany.<sup>19</sup> The establishment of a global internment network by the British during the First World War highlights the intertwining geographies of empire and modernity.<sup>20</sup> In addition, the treatment of prisoners of war was an essential aspect of twentieth century warfare, with reciprocal escalation and limitation of reprisals on both sides.<sup>21</sup>

Finally, the analysis of German prisoners of war and civilian internees from the German colonies shows that the colonial theatre, while not being decisive for the overall outcome of the war, was actually far from being a mere sideshow to the main event on the Western Front. Reprisal punishments (threatened or enacted) against prisoners of war and civilians in the colonial sphere were often the direct result of action taken against prisoners and civilians in Europe. The escalating waves of reprisals (exercised with ‘lethal stubbornness’) played a significant role in disfiguring the Great War and linked the colonial sphere of the war directly to the battlefields of Europe.<sup>22</sup> Inspections by the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and neutral governments were meant to allow for transparency in prisoner treatment. However, reports of the bad treatment of prisoners harmed British imperial prestige in the eyes of neutrals and might also lead to reprisals by Germany against its British captives. Internment in the extra-European theatre also provided the German government with fuel for propaganda to be used in Europe by harking back to a preexisting ‘colonial imagination’<sup>23</sup> that provided the imagery for what internment in the colonies was like, even if this image was at odds with reality.

With these factors in mind, the experience of captivity in the British Empire is presented as differing from, but linked to, the European narrative of internment. The prisoner experience in Europe was written and shaped mainly by former officers focusing on six ‘narrative

<sup>19</sup> Conrad, *Globalisation*, p. 9.

<sup>20</sup> Tony Ballantyne and Antoinette Burton, ‘Empires and the Reach of the Global’, in Emily Rosenberg (ed.), *A World Connecting: 1870-1945 (A History of the World)* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 2012), pp. 285–434, p. 297.

<sup>21</sup> Uta Hinz, ‘Humanität im Krieg? Internationales Rotes Kreuz und Kriegsgefangenenhilfe im Ersten Weltkrieg’, in Jochen Oltmer (ed.), *Kriegsgefangene in Europa des Ersten Weltkriegs* (Paderborn, Munich, 2006), p. 217. Horace Rumbold of the Foreign Office felt that a ‘policy of reprisals seems to pay with a nation of bullies like the Germans’. TNA FO383/110, 165279, 5 November 1915, Horace Rumbold, memorandum.

<sup>22</sup> Isabel Hull, *A Scrap of Paper: Breaking and Making International Law during the Great War* (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY, 2014), p. 278.

<sup>23</sup> Susanne Zantop, *Colonial Fantasies: Conquest, Family, and Nation in Precolonial Germany, 1770-1870* (Duke University Press, Durham, NC, 1997), p. 9.



event-scenarios', as summarised by Robert Doyle, which were precaptivity, capture, removal from the front, daily life in captivity, repatriation, and reflections on time lost.<sup>24</sup> The colonial narrative followed this basic outline but differs in that removal from the colonial theatre was a long and drawn-out process with an emphasis on transport and movement. The understanding of 'race' is a key element in forming the narrative of internment in the extra-European world. As Heather Jones argued, 'race' was a defining cultural paradigm that underpinned the hierarchies of European imperialism. The plural meaning of the term *race*, which encompassed both imperial and intra-European racial hierarchies, is crucial to understanding how Germany saw the colonial prisoners of war it had captured on the Western Front.<sup>25</sup> Notions of race before the First World War contained biological and national dimensions all influenced by 'social Darwinism' or 'social evolution'.<sup>26</sup> Internment and the loss of the colonies symbolised for German settlers a severe racial role reversal that fundamentally changed their position in colonial society. They were no longer fellow Europeans but were now 'enemy aliens', often under the watch of indigenous guards, and did not enjoy the rights and freedoms that gave European whites a superior social status. This role reversal is central to understanding captivity in the colonies.

Documenting a global narrative such as this book proposes, poses logistical challenges to the researcher. However, the British government's increasing centralised control over prisoners and internees means that there is a vast amount of primary source material in the British National Archives (TNA). The Foreign Office set up the Prisoners of War and Aliens Department in 1915 and continued its work until well into 1919. Within the Foreign Office it was one of four specific departments established at the outbreak of war to deal with the challenges of fighting a global conflict.<sup>27</sup> The hundreds of large bound volumes left behind by

<sup>24</sup> Alon Rachamimov, *POWs and the Great War: Captivity on the Eastern Front* (Berg, New York, 2002), p. 9. Rachamimov's analysis is taken from Robert C. Doyle, *Voices from Captivity: Interpreting the American POW Narrative* (Kansas University Press, Lawrence, 1994). This may be a somewhat crude summary as not all memoirs corresponded to these event scenarios.

<sup>25</sup> Heather Jones, 'Imperial Captivities: Colonial Prisoners in Germany and the Ottoman Empire', in Santanu Das (ed.), *Race, Empire and First World War Writing* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011), pp. 178–180, based on Annette Becker, *Oubliés de la Grande guerre: Humanitaire et culture de guerre, 1914–1918: populations occupées, déportés civils, prisonniers de guerre* (Noësis, Paris, 1998).

<sup>26</sup> Jones, 'Imperial Captivities', p. 178. Francisco Bethencourt, *Racisms, from the Crusades to the Twentieth Century* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2013), p. 301.

<sup>27</sup> The others were the War Department, Parliamentary Department, and Contraband Department. As the war went on, more departments were established to make an eventual total of eighteen emergency departments.

8 Colonial Captivity during the First World War

the department provide an invaluable insight, through inspections, petitions, and complaints, into how exactly camps across the globe were run and how they developed during the course of the war. Included within are extracts from diaries, letters, and postcards that were intercepted by and brought to the Foreign Office's attention by the censor. These documents enable a much greater understanding of how the prisoners viewed themselves and also highlight the fact that they often saw the war as very much an interruption of everyday business and expected normality to return after peace.

In addition, the British War Office established a Department of Prisoners of War in August 1914 under Lieutenant-General Sir Herbert Belfield. This department controlled the treatment of prisoners in Britain, regulated camp conditions, and, importantly, regulated the use of violence against captives.<sup>28</sup> While this department competed with the Foreign Office in control over prisoners in Europe taken on the Western Front, the Foreign Office's Prisoners of War and Aliens Department dealt specifically with inquiries into the treatment of enemy internees in captivity overseas. While the Colonial Office was not primarily concerned about prisoner treatment, its responsibility for property claims meant it had to deal with German inhabitants of the colonies and had a vested interest in the acquisition and security of Germany territory. It was predictable that the prisoners departments in the War Office and in the Foreign Office would come into conflict, mainly over responses to the treatment of British prisoners in Germany. Except in the cases of some officer prisoners, however, the Foreign Office maintained autonomy over the management of prisoners taken outside Europe and was able to ensure, as the war progressed, a more or less uniform treatment of prisoners by the Dominion governments.

Foreign Office primacy in prisoner affairs in the extra-European theatre was known to the prisoners, who sought to bypass the Dominion governments in their correspondence and questioned the legitimacy of independent policies enacted on them. Regular interdepartmental meetings were held between the Admiralty, Foreign, War, and Colonial offices to discuss and come to agreements over aspects of prisoner treatment. The four departments all had different concerns. The Admiralty was always keen to limit the amount of unnecessary shipping traffic, the War Office argued for the military necessity of the removal of Germans from territory taken, and the Colonial Office backed this up but were also reluctant to allow prisoners to be sent to areas such as India or South

<sup>28</sup> Heather Jones, *Violence Against Prisoners of War in the First World War: Britain, France, and Germany* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011), p. 16.



Africa where they might arouse sympathies from the local population. The Foreign Office's guiding view was that it was necessary to ensure the best possible treatment of German prisoners, as it was ever mindful of the threat of reprisals against British prisoners in German hands, and the reactions that any bad treatment of prisoners would cause among neutral countries.<sup>29</sup> This was especially true before the United States, which had been the liaison between Britain and Germany in regard to prisoners' affairs, joined the war.

Outside of Britain, the ICRC archives in Geneva house an extensive archive of correspondence and reports on prisoner camps. The ICRC were involved in the inspection of camps and also acted as go-betweens in establishing meetings and conferences between the belligerents. Independently of the ICRC, the German Red Cross at Hamburg and Frankfurt also kept detailed records of press reports on prisoners of war in the colonies currently held in the Bundesarchiv Berlin.<sup>30</sup> Apart from keeping cuttings from newspapers, the German Red Cross also catalogued their weekly reports on camps based on ICRC inspections and correspondence. They also provide letters and postcards from family members of prisoners and internees and through these well-catalogued files one can gain an appreciation of the global scale of internment in the First World War.

In Germany the most useful files lie in the Bundesarchiv in Berlin-Lichterfelde mainly the Reichskolonialamt (RKA), R1001. The RKA received copies of almost all correspondence relating to prisoners of war and civilian internees from the colonies. The RKA was the ministry most concerned with the colonial settlers, and did more than any other government department to compile files relating to their treatment. While the RKA ceased to exist after Germany's defeat, the files of the Deutsche Kolonialgesellschaft (DKG) luckily provide a guide to the postwar experiences of former internees. Theodor Seitz (Governor of German South-West Africa, 1910–1915) and Heinrich Schnee (Governor of German East Africa, 1912–1918), among other influential German colonialists, were key members of this organisation, and it was the first place that former prisoners and internees turned to when seeking advice on a return to their colonial homes, lodging complaints, or requesting financial aid.

<sup>29</sup> However, the Foreign Office Prisoners Department was certainly willing to reply to German reprisals with its own reprisals. Hull, *A Scrap of Paper*, p. 310.

<sup>30</sup> Both also published pamphlets for general sale. E.g., in April 1917 the Hamburg section published a map and the postal rules for all the known camps in Great Britain, Italy, Japan, and the extra-European world. Hamburgischer Landesverein vom Roten Kreuz, Ausschuß für Deutsche Kriegsgefangene, *Karte von Großbritannien, Italien, Japan und den überseeischen Ländern: in denen sich Kriegs- oder Zivilgefangene befinden sowie Bestimmungen über den Postverkehr* (Friedrichsen, Hamburg, 1917).

### **Examining Extra-European Internment and the Fall of Germany's Colonies**

The opening two chapters of this book will provide the geographical and literary road map for the subsequent thematic analysis. When looking at internment in the extra-European sphere through the prism of existing work on camps in Europe, the question also arises of how to mould the geographical context into a coherent narrative analysis, and to incorporate the unique issues geography raises that do not apply to the existing European case studies.<sup>31</sup> It is therefore important to reference literature dealing specifically with the war in Africa, the Pacific and indeed to global studies of the First World War. The absolute racial differences established in the German colonies and the role of imperial prestige being pivotal to this narrative, these fields of historical study will also need to be discussed. Finally, the transnational nature of internment in the extra-European theatre (with German citizens, not only from the Reich's colonies but also those living in British protectorates and Dominions, at its core) necessitates an engagement with transnational history (the history of the movement of peoples, ideas, technologies, and institutions across national, or colonial, boundaries).<sup>32</sup>

Violence, although sporadic, was the key prism through which German colonial settlers viewed the takeover of the colonies, and subsequent internment. Assessing how acts of violence, mainly perpetrated by authorities on the periphery, and the British reaction to them, helped shape policy towards prisoners and in turn created a more centralised prison administration will be necessary to fully understand the extra-European theatres of the war. Although the violence exhibited towards prisoners outside Europe paled in comparison to that inside Europe, the role reversal of the Germans from colonial administrators to captives was signified through violent processes and aspects of violence will return in subsequent chapters.

Incarceration or restriction of movement led to an increased awareness of a German national identity. The effects of internment on prisoner identities and the notion of the camp space have been explored through lenses supplied by philosophers and theorists such as Michel

<sup>31</sup> Three important texts on internment in Europe during the First World War are Jones, *Violence Against Prisoners*; Rachamimov, *POWs and the Great War*; and Matthew Stibbe, *British Civilian Internees in Germany: The Ruhleben Camp, 1914–18* (Manchester University Press, Manchester, UK, 2008).

<sup>32</sup> As opposed to German attitudes to racial differences in continental Europe, which were based on perceptions of a higher level of ethnic similarity and cultural common ground. Conrad, *Globalisation*, p. 177.