Work not Alms: The Bethel Mission to East Africa and German Protestant debates over Eugenics, 1880-1933

A Dissertation
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Edward N. Snyder

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Eric D. Weitz, Adviser

December, 2013

Copyright, Edward Nelson Snyder, 2013

Acknowledgements

There are many people to whom I am deeply indebted for helping me to complete this project. First and foremost, I would like to thank my adviser Eric Weitz. His thoughtful comments and keen eye for detail throughout this process were invaluable. The strengths of this project are the result of his guidance. I am also particularly grateful to Gary Cohen for reading multiple drafts of this project. Along with Eric he has been a constant source of encouragement throughout my graduate career. Leslie Morris, Alec Isaacman and Ron Aminzade have also read and provided valuable feedback. Before his untimely passing, Stephen Feinstein also offered valuable advice and always had a joke ready to make me laugh.

Over the course of this project I consulted several archives in Germany, the staffs of which were incredibly helpful. I would like to acknowledge especially the staff at the *Hauptarchiv Bethel* in Bielefeld for all of their help and encouragement. I cannot thank Friedrich Wilhelm Schabbon and Jochen Striewisch enough for helping track down every random citation I requested and ensuring that I had everything I needed in Bielefeld. Since my first visit to the archive as a timid undergraduate and now as the *Stammbenutzer* they have been an absolutely invaluable resource.

I would not have finished this project without the help of numerous people along the way. Larry Jones and Peter Böhm, my undergraduate advisors, colleagues and friends have been pillars of support and encouragement since my days as an undergraduate at Canisius College. I would not be where I am today without their steady guidance. While the rigors of graduate school can be tough, I was blessed to have the support of numerous friends along the way. I would like to thank Greg Halfond, Eric Roubinek, Eric Otremba, Will Cremer, Tim Smit, Leslie Schumacher, Adam Blackler, Anthony Cantor and especially Christopher Marshall for encouraging me in ways that are too numerous to describe. Over the course of researching and writing I also had several technological challenges, which I would not have solved without the eternal patience of Phil Voxland.

Finally, I would like to thank my wonderful wife, Mollie Madden. She read, commented on, and copy edited numerous drafts of this work. She also brought a much needed sense of order to my citations and references. I cannot express the value of her constant support throughout this project. Any remaining errors are, of course, my own.

Abstract

This dissertation examines the influence of Protestant missionaries in Africa on the development of Protestant poor relief policies in Germany during the period of 1850-1933. Specifically, it seeks to understand better how and why Protestants embraced eugenics during the early twentieth century. To this end it uses the famous Bethel institutions in Bielefeld as a case study. With both a foreign and domestic mission, Bethel provides the unique opportunity to study the interaction between the two in a single context. In *Globalization and the Nation in Imperial Germany*, Sebastian Conrad suggests that the Bethel missionaries were responsible for pushing the adoption of eugenic policies in Germany upon returning to Bielefeld after 1918. While Conrad's assertion that the foreign mission had an extensive influence on the development of Protestant social welfare policies, he misstates the role of the missionaries. Rather than advocating for the adoption of eugenic policies the Bethel missionaries formed the core pocket of opposition to eugenic ideas after 1918.

Prior to WWI Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, a nationalist, conservative pastor and director of the famous Bethel institutions in Bielefeld developed a philosophy of poor relief that stressed a strong work ethic, notions of responsibility, the importance of familial structures, and a mixture of Protestantism and German nationalism. His philosophy drew heavily on the pioneering work of Johann Wichern, the founder of the Inner Mission and the methods used by Protestant missionaries to western Africa during the early nineteenth century. His efforts were a response to the fears of German Protestants in the wake of the failed revolutions of 1848. They feared the potential impact of unemployed migrant workers on Germany's social and political stability. Living on the margins of society, Protestant reformers worried that they would become interested in radical ideologies like Communism and thus hostile to the church and the conservative monarchy.

The foreign mission was central to the formation and development of Bodelschwingh's philosophy. Even before arriving at Bethel in 1872, he had made a practical attempt to articulate his ideas as a missionary in Paris among working class Germans. At Bethel Bodelschwingh took his ideas further by founding an actual worker colony. The colony, located outside the city and using a highly regimented lifestyle, stressed the same philosophy he had articulated in Paris. Only after the performance of physical labor would one receive assistance. These colonies, because of their perceived potential to transform marginalized, disaffected individuals into loyal and productive members of society, were wildly popular with Protestant reformers and the Monarchy and therefore received substantial support from the state and gradually spread across the country. Given Bodelschwingh's success with the Inner Mission, colonial authorities, hoping he could use the same philosophy in Africa to transform Africans into loyal and productive colonial subjects, offered him control over the fledgling *Evangelische Mission nach Deutsch Ostafrika* (EMDOA). Thus, the EMDOA operated according to the exact same philosophy as the community in Germany.

As Bodelschwingh grew older, he gradually withdrew from the every day management of the community and focused his remaining efforts on building the mission in Africa. At Bethel, however, his philosophy came under assault. Modern, "scientific"

ideas like eugenics made inroads at Bethel, and by the mid 1920s they heavily influenced the care the institution provided. As for the foreign mission, Conrad maintains that the missionaries using Bodelschwingh's philosophy made racial judgments about the ability of Africans to work. These attitudes, he suggests, caused the missionaries who returned to Bielefeld in 1918 to favor a more biological understanding of poverty, thus opening the door wide for the implementation of eugenic policies like sterilization.

While Conrad is correct to assert that the returning missionaries were active participants in debates over social welfare in Germany after the war, his conclusion about their attitudes toward eugenics is incorrect. Rather, the missionaries returned from Africa in 1918 still devoted to Bodelschwingh's philosophy and were horrified to discover that Bethel's leadership was interested in adopting eugenic practices. Many of the missionaries transferred to Bethel's public relations center where they produced a steady stream of material that was highly critical of eugenic practices. Given their experience in Africa, which largely insulated them from the problems Bethel's leaders faced in Germany, the missionaries never experienced any challenges to their faith in Bodelschwingh's philosophy. Most notably, they never had to cope with the devastating food shortages that confronted those in Bielefeld during the war. Furthermore, these debates occur within the context of the professionalization of Bethel's medical staff, who increasingly supported eugenics. Thus the missionaries formed the one major pocket of resistance to eugenics at Bethel.

Ultimately, at least in the case of the Bethel mission, the colonies were not always "laboratories of modernity," contrary to Hannah Arendt's argument in *Origins of Totalitarianism*. Instead, the returning missionaries served as a conservative, moderating voice in debates over the Protestant administration of social welfare. At the same time, the case of Bethel also shows the complexities of the colonial legacy in Germany, therefore requiring a more nuanced view of the relationship between Germany's colonial history and the racial policies of the Third Reich.

TABLE of CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction 1

Chapter 2: The Development of Modern Protestant Social Welfare and the Origins of the Bodelschwingh Philosophy 65

Chapter 3: *Arbeitserziehung* and the Worker Colony: The Development of Bodelschwing's Philosophy 107

Chapter 4: *Arbeitserziehung* in the Bethel Mission in East Africa 150

Chapter 5: Bodelschwingh's Philosophy Challenged: Eugenics at Bethel 206

Chapter 6: Bodelschwingh's Philosophy Defended: The Bethel Missionaries and Eugenics, 1914–1933 258

Chapter 7: Conclusion 321

Bibliography 328

Chapter 1: Introduction

In 1890 the conservative Lutheran pastor Friedrich von Bodelschwingh made an agreement with the *Evangelische Mission nach Deutsch Ostafrika* (EMDOA) to supply the fledgling organization with missionaries trained at his *Nazareth* institution for *Diakonie* in Bielefeld. By the time he reached this decision, Bodelschwingh had already transformed his Bethel community from a small haven for young boys with epilepsy to one of Germany's premier centers for Protestant-run social welfare. At the heart of this transformation was a philosophy Bodelschwingh had developed as a missionary to German migrant worker communities in the slums of Paris that highlighted the work ethic, notions of responsibility, the centrality of religion, and strong familial structures as the keys to combating poverty successfully. After he assumed control over the EMDOA, there was little doubt that the same philosophy would also become the driving motor behind the mission's activities in East Africa. In this sense, the relationship between Bethel and the EMDOA would have a momentous impact on the future of both German missionary activity in Africa and social welfare in Germany.

After receiving their training in Bielefeld, the newly-minted missionaries departed for the German colony in East Africa and worked primarily in the Usambara highlands. Profoundly loyal to their teacher Bodelschwingh, they worked diligently to implement his philosophy in Africa as a sign of their deep devotion both to his worldview and to him personally. Yet while they worked in Africa, changes in Germany placed increasing pressure on Bethel's leadership to reduce the influence of Bodelschwingh's philosophy and embrace more modern, scientific forms of social welfare. While Bodelschwingh

fought against this transition, his death in 1910 opened the door to an influx of new ideas like eugenics. Furthermore Bodelschwingh's son and successor, Friedrich (Fritz) von Bodelschwingh Jr. displayed a greater willingness to consider the benefits of modern science as a way to distinguish his tenure as Bethel's director from that of his father's.

In addition to the structural changes following the elder Bodelschwingh's death, the devastating impact of the First World War also placed extraordinary pressure on Bethel's leadership to reconsider the applicability of the older philosophy. Horrified by the merciless effect of severe food shortages on Bethel's patient population, the community's leaders, led by the younger Bodelschwingh, began to consider seriously the benefits of modern scientific ideas like eugenics. Unlike the elder Bodelschwingh's philosophy, which prescribed therapeutic measures that stressed work and notions of responsibility to combat deviancy and poverty, eugenics appeared to be a silver bullet solution that would easily relieve social welfare providers of the responsibility for caring for future generations of the poor.

Yet not everyone within the greater Bethel community saw modern science as a miracle cure that would solve all of its problems in the wake of the war. Among the most adamant opponents of this shift were the missionaries who were forced to return to Bielefeld in 1918 following Germany's defeat in World War I. Given their experiences in East Africa, most notably at the station Lutindi, the Bethel missionaries were firmly convinced that Bodelschwingh's philosophy could help integrate Africans into the colonial state while transforming them into productive members of colonial society. Furthermore, their wartime experience was notably less traumatic than that of their colleagues in Germany. . As a result, they never felt the need to question their devotion

to Bodelschwingh's work-oriented philosophy and returned to Europe just as dedicated to it as when they had left for Africa years earlier. Horrified by the inroads modern science had made into the community during their absence, they formed the foundation of resistance at Bethel against the incorporation of science into the way Bethel practiced social welfare.

Using the Bethel institutions in Bielefeld this study examines how and why German Protestants embraced modern, scientific ideas like eugenics. In the process, it moves from the back-alleys of mid-nineteenth-century Paris to the Bethel institutions in the East Westphalian city of Bielefeld to the Usambara highlands in Tanganyika, the focal point of Bethel's missionary endeavors. It demonstrates clearly that Protestant social welfare in Germany developed across national borders in Europe and through the transferring of ideas between Europe and Africa. The development of Protestant social welfare in Germany was truly a transnational process. Although Protestant social welfare has been the subject of numerous historical inquiries, none of those studies examine the impact of actors outside Europe on its evolution. Therefore, the historiography misses a key component of the larger story.

By examining the impact of individuals in Germany's colonies on social welfare debates among German Protestants, this dissertation also questions the nature of Germany's colonial legacy. The Bethel missionaries returned to Europe just as devoted to Bodelschwingh's philosophy as when they left for Africa decades earlier. In this sense their experiences in Africa only reinforced the effectiveness of their larger theoretical approach to social welfare questions. As a result, the Bethel missionaries demonstrate that the colonies were not always laboratories of modernity and that those individuals

who spent time there did not automatically return with more radical ideas. In other words, the colonies were not a direct precursor to the radical, racial policies of the Third Reich.

Given this study's wide ranging scope, it is part of several distinct historiographies. Therefore, in the following sections of this introduction I will discuss the main bodies of literature to which this dissertation contributes. First, I will discuss the historiography of social welfare in modern Germany, an extremely large and complex body of literature. Therefore, I will focus specifically on the literature concerning poor relief in Germany. Within this context I will examine how this body of literature discusses the role of work as an aspect of poverty relief as well as the relationship between scientific ideas like eugenics and poor relief policies. A second, related body of literature is the historiography of Protestantism in modern Germany. Deeply concerned about the social dangers posed by modernization and industrialization, Protestants participated actively in social welfare debates; especially those concerning poor relief. In this section I will define what I mean by Protestant social welfare and pay particular attention to how local histories have treated the influence of eugenics and the mission within the larger Bethel community. Finally, this dissertation is also part of the larger historiography of German imperialism. In this respect, I will discuss how historians have treated the relationship between Germany and its colonies in Africa. An extremely important aspect of this historiography is the emerging literature on transnationalism. In addition to analyzing this new and growing body of literature, I will also explain how I understand the term transnational and how my work fits into this larger historiography.

Social Welfare: Poverty Relief at the Margins of History?

While the historiography of social welfare in modern Germany consists of a vast and rich body of literature, poverty relief as an aspect of social welfare was notably absent from the debates until the 1980s. Until the German sociologist Florian Tennstedt addressed the specific question of poor relief, studies of social welfare focused on subjects like unemployment insurance and workers' rights legislation.[1] What little attention scholars gave to poor relief during the interwar period came almost exclusively from those who were interested in the relationship between modern medicine and poverty.[2] According to E. P. Hennock, historian Hans Rothfels set this precedent in 1919 when he was commissioned to compile a collection of documents on social policy under Bismarck. In the process of defining the concept of social welfare he decided "that it was generally assumed that poor relief policy was no part of *Sozialpolitik*," and thus excluded it from the project.[3] Yet Rothfels never completed this massive undertaking. The only volume he produced from the project was a study of Theodor Lohmann and social policy in Germany.[4] When it began again anew in the 1950s as an expanded project that

---

[1] For examples see Karl Erich Born, *Staat und Sozialpolitik Seit Bismarks Sturz: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Innenpolitischen Entwicklung des Deutschen Reiches, 1890–1914* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1957); Ludwig Preller, *Sozial Politik in der Weimarer Republik* (Stuttgart: Franz Mittelbach Verlag, 1949); Friedrich Syrup and Otto Neuloh, *Hundert Jahre Staatliche Sozialpolitik: 1839–1939* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1957); Walter Vogel, *Bismarcks Arbeiter Versicherung: Ihre Entstehung im Kräftespiel der Zeit* (Braunschweig: Georg Westermann Verlag, 1951); Friedrich Kleeis, *Die Geschichte der sozialen Verischerung in Deutschland. Nachdruck Herausgegeben von Dieter Dowe mit einer Einleitung von Florian Tennstedt* (Berlin: Verlag J.H.W. Dietz Nachf. GmbH, 1981). Originally published in 1928, the second edition contains a useful introduction by Tennstedt that explains Kleeis' significance for the historiography of workers' insurance.

[2] Christoph Sachße and Florian Tennstedt, *Geschichte der Armenfürsorge in Deutschland, Band 1: Vom Spätmittelalter bis zum 1. Weltkrieg. Zweite, verbesserte und erweiterte Auflage* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1998), 17.

[3] Quoted in Florian Tennstedt and Heidi Winter, eds., *Quellensammlung zur Geschichte der Deutschen Sozialpolitik 1867 bis 1914. 1. Abteilung, Von der Reichsgründungszeit bis zur kaiserlichen Sozialbotschaft (1867-1881). 1. Band: Grundfragen Staatlicher Sozialpolitik. Die Diskussion der Arbeiterfrage auf Regierungsseite vom preussischen Verfassungskonflikt bis zur Reichstagswahl von 1881* (New York: Gustav Fischer Verlag, 1994), XLI.

[4] See Hans Rothfels, *Theodor Lohman und die Kampfjahre der staatlichen Sozialpolitik (1871–1905)* (Berlin: F. S. Mittler & Sohn, 1927).

encompassed the entire imperial period, the new editors largely followed Rothfels outline and decided to exclude poor relief from the project.[5]

The first major study to trace the historical development of poor relief in Germany from the late Middle Ages through the end of the Third Reich was the monumental *Geschichte der Armenfürsorge in Deutschland,* a three volume series by the German sociologists Christoph Sachße and Florian Tennstedt .Intended to be primarily a foundational reference book and document collection (or even textbook) for both students and scholars of social welfare, the series does an excellent job of synthesizing the historiography on poverty in German history while providing an extensive collection of important primary sources. As such however, it does not attempt to apply any theoretical model to the history or poverty relief and reads more like a chronicle than a monograph.

As far as understanding poverty, Sachße and Tennstedt want "to reformulate questions as to the origin of the workforce as the basis of the capitalist industrial economic system, and to present the role of poor relief in this context."[6] In this sense they are primarily concerned about poor relief as an aspect of state policy and its relationship to the working classes. They are notably less concerned with the impact of poor relief policies on recipients and social welfare providers who operated outside the realm of the state.

For example, despite the growing interest among Protestants in poverty relief during the mid to late nineteenth century, Sachße and Tennstedt mention organizations like the Inner Mission only briefly. "In practice Johann Hinrich Wichern distinguished between 'church' poor relief, bourgeois relief, and that provided by the state, and

[5] E.P. Hennock, *The Origin of the Welfare State in England and Germany, 1850–1914: Social Policies Compared* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 10.
[6] Sachße and Tennstedt, *Geschichte der Armenfürsorge in Deutschland*, *Band 1*, 16.

expected the state to remedy the economic and political class crisis through an active social and economic policy as well as to guarantee that it would not restrict the freedom to act of the diaconal community."[7] While they are correct that Protestants regularly expressed concern over the state encroaching in their sphere of activity, in practice reformers such as Bodelschwingh actively sought to collaborate with the state. Not only could collaboration with the state bring significant financial support for their initiatives, but Protestants like Bodelschwingh believed that it could also afford them the opportunity to influence the direction of state policies. Indeed, by the turn of the century Bodelschwingh became so involved in politics that he briefly held a seat in the Reichstag to influence directly debates over poor law reform.

Exploring this relationship would have greatly enhanced their discussion of work (labor) as an aspect of poor relief in nineteenth-century Germany. Although they regularly discuss the changing nature of work as an aspect of poor relief through the text, it is almost always as a matter of state policy. Sachße and Tennstedt note that while the work house had originated and thrived in England, the English model was less applicable to Germany for most of the nineteenth century. A successful network of work houses required a strong, central authority for administrative purposes, something Germany lacked.[8] In Germany as in England, the work houses were notoriously repressive and had a primarily punitive function.

Yet, within their discussion, Sachße and Tennstedt virtually ignore the Protestant movement to create a network of worker colonies across Germany. In contrast to the work house, they argue that worker colonies were characterized more by their stated goal

[7] Ibid., 231.
[8] Ibid., 248–49. Only Saxony and Schleswig-Holstein adopted the work house in significant numbers.

to rescue individuals who were otherwise completely lost and adrift. These colonies "appeared as closed institute for poor relief, which was previously rare in Germany."[9] Despite the extensive parliamentary debates to which the Protestant worker colonies were subject and the numerous examples of collaboration between Bodelschwingh and the monarchy to expand the colony network, Sachße and Tennstedt only briefly mention the Protestant-run worker colonies as an aspect of so-called closed poor relief.[10]

Even though they focused on poor relief exclusively as an aspect of state policy, Sachße and Tennstedt nevertheless succeeded in producing a landmark study that remains a foundational text more than thirty years after its initial publication. Although they largely eschewed a theoretical analysis of poverty relief, their work nevertheless spawned a variety of studies over the ensuing decades. In this sense, few texts have been more important in shaping the historiography of social welfare than this study.

Following the completion of their first volume, both Sachße and Tennstedt produced more specified studies that developed further individual aspects of *Geschichte der Armenfürsorge in Deutschland*. For example, their edited volume *Soziale Sicherheit und soziale Disziplinierung* elaborates on the concept of poor relief as a form of social discipline with a specific focus on the importance of work and the ability to work. While Sachße and Tennstedt still concentrate heavily on poor relief as an aspect of state policy, the volume nevertheless complicates the role of the state in the administration of poor relief.[11]

---

[9] Quoted in ibid., 255.
[10] Their assessment of the worker colonies consists of an unanalyzed quotation of Franz Eschle from 1903. In the subsequent documentation section, there is a similar, brief except from a 1908 *Festschrift* that makes passing reference to Bodelschwingh and the worker colonies.
[11] For an early discussion of women and poor relief provision see also Christoph Sachße, *Mütterlichkeit als Beruf: Sozialarbeit, Sozialreform und Frauenbewegung, 1871–1929* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1986), 49–124.

For example, looking at the late Medieval origins of modern poor relief, Otto Gerhard Oexle argues that Christian conceptions of work and morality heavily influenced the ways in which states determined who was a worthy recipient of aid.[12] The result was a process of systematic exclusion that would eventually lead to the development of an urban underclass in which an individual's only options for survival were either wage labor or begging.[13] By serving as missionaries among communities of poor people, Hartmut Dießenbacher argues that Protestants were also integral to the enforcement of poor relief laws. This was especially true during the nineteenth century with the creation of the Inner Mission.[14] "The Inner Mission of JH Wichern was planned as a cultural awakening of this movement, but then developed largely within the "works" and private welfare associations, which outlasted the cause."[15] Thus, Dießenbacher further challenges Sachße and Tennstedt's larger argument by showing that private charities like the Inner Mission were central players in the provision of poor relief during the nineteenth century.

The impact of these early efforts by Sachße and Tennstedt was that it highlighted the centrality of poor relief to the history of social welfare in Germany, and the glaring need for further study. Following the initial publication of *Geschichte der Armenfürsorge in Deutschland* in 1980, scholars produced a wealth of material that focused specifically on poor relief as a core aspect of social welfare policies during the

---

[12] Christoph Sachße and Florian Tennstedt, "Sicherheit und Disziplin: Eine Skizze zur Einführung," in *Soziale Sicherheit und soziale Disziplinierung*: *Beiträge zu einer historischen Theorie der Sozialpolitik*, ed. Christoph Sachße and Florian Tennstedt, 11–44 (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1986), 16.
[13] See Otto Gerhard Oexle, "Armut, Armutsbegriff und Armenfürsorge im Mittelalter," in *Soziale Sicherheit und soziale Disziplinierung*, 73–100.
[14] See Hartmut Dießenbacher, "Der Armenbesucher: Missionar im eigenen Land. Armenfürsorge und Familie in Deutschland um die Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts," in *Soziale Sicherheit und soziale Disziplinierung*, 209–44.
[15] Sachße and Tennstedt, "Sicherheit und Disziplin: Eine Skizze zur Einfhürung," 32–33.

Kaiserreich.[16] These studies not only examined the development and impact of poor relief policies within Germany, but also compared Germany with other European states-most notably England.

Gerhard Ritter's *Social Welfare in Germany and Britain: Origins and Development* built on Sachße and Tennstedt by comparing German state social welfare policies with those of Great Britain.[17] In addition to more traditional subjects of inquiry like pensions and unemployment insurance, Ritter also includes a fair amount of attention to the poor relief policies of each state. Thus, for the first time Ritter situates German poor relief policies in a larger European context. He notes that while the policies of both states emerged from the pressures created by industrialization, each had its own national peculiarities. Whereas the British government was motivated more by the specter of mass poverty, the German state had more pointed political motivations. Specifically, German conservatives sought to use social welfare policies like poor relief to weaken support for their political rivals.[18]

Just as Sachße and Tennstedt redefined the historiography of social welfare in Germany by placing poor relief at the center of their study, Detlev Peukert had a similar effect towards the end of the decade with respect to poor relief as an aspect of social discipline. On the face of it, *Grenzen der Sozial-disziplinierung* appears to be a logical extension of Sachße and Tennstedt's early research. While Peukert is also concerned with state policies during the *Kaiserreich* and Weimar eras, he moves the window of

---

[16] See for example Rüdiger vom Bruch, "Einleitung," in *'Weder Kommunismus noch Kapitalismus' Bürgerliche Sozialreform in Deutschland vom Vormärz bos zur Ära Adenauer*, edited by Rüdiger vom Bruch, 7–19 (Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1985), 11–13; Rüdiger vom Bruch, "Bürgerliche Sozialreform im deutschen Kaiserreich," in *Weder Kommunismus noch Kapitalismus'*, 61–217, here 99–111.
[17] Gerhard A. Ritter, *Social Welfare in Germany and Britain: Origins and Development*, translated by Kim Traynor (New York: Berg, 1986), 181.
[18] Ibid., 180.

scholarship by focusing on policies directed at an individual group of people – German youths.[19] Peukert is particularly interested in the fate of juvenile delinquents, so-called "rowdy" youths who were too old for school but no longer had the option of entering apprenticeships.[20] Because of a growing youth subculture, many of these young men drifted toward the periphery of mainstream society.[21] Around the turn of the century, changes in the criminal laws gave state governments the ability to remove these youths from their families and place them in reform schools. The goal of these new policies was to educate youths and thus move them back toward so-called normal society.

Yet, by focusing on the reform and re-integrative aspects of youth education policies, Peukert's study goes far beyond a social history in the same vein as that of Sachße and Tennstedt. He is far more interested in the disciplinary aspects of youth education and its ability to function as an effective form of social control. Imperial era reformers were keen to use education as a way to implement a larger vision of discipline social order.

> Regarding the mechanism of social policy, out of the problem of poverty came a question of order, the classification of recipients, as well as the proper granting of aid by the social authorities. In this context, social pedagogy taught order to the flashier young people and at the same time offered a proper substitute education, where the normal social authorities of family, church and school failed.[22]

These reformers, imbued with a sense of optimism and strong faith in what Perukert calls modernity, firmly believed they could use education to reform and re-integrate delinquent youths.

---

[19] Peukert discuses the lives of the recipients in a second, companion volume. See Detlev J. K. Peukert, *Jugend zwischen Krieg und Krise: Lebenswelten von Arbeiterungen in der Weimarer Republik* (Cologne: Bund, 1987).
[20] The German term Peukert uses is "halbstark."
[21] Detlev J. K. Peukert, *Grenzen der Sozial-disciplinierung: Aufstieg und Kriese der deutschen Jugendfürsorge von 1878 bis 1932* (Cologne: Bund, 1986), 20–22.
[22] Ibid., 306.

Yet, the reformers of the late nineteenth century failed to realize that Europe at the turn of the century faced a set of challenges that were fundamentally different than those faced by previous generations. Processes such as urbanization and industrialization had dramatic social ramifications that resulted in, among other things, the emergence of youth as a clearly delineated social stratum with its own unique set of grievances and concerns. When these forces combined with the political and economic turmoil of the early 1920's the reform schools became overwhelmed, thus causing reformers to question their earlier optimism. As a result, they began to doubt their ability to reintegrate delinquent youths. With fewer resources to support an education system whose effectiveness was now clearly in question, many social reformers began searching for alternative methods for dealing with Germany's population of wayward youths. According to Peukert, the social reformers who concentrated on educating and re-integrating delinquent youths considered themselves to be engaged in a process of social re-ordering that went hand in hand with their understanding of progress and the modern. With other forms of social welfare turning increasingly to modern science during the 1920s, it was only natural that the reformers interested in delinquent youths would also turn in the same direction.[23] If educational and therapeutic methods (such as those which emphasized work) were ineffective, social reformers were drawn to innovative scientific therapies because of their promise to eliminate the threat entirely.

This shift was significant, in part, because it painted delinquent youths as completely irredeemable. This rationale was only reinforced by a 1932 law that lowered the age of release to nineteen and stated that those youths who reformers did not believe

---

[23] Ibid., 307.

were capable of re-education did not have to be sent to school.[24] In effect, the state had completely given up on them. As Peukert contends, the decision to classify delinquent youths as irredeemable combined with the shift toward a method that promised to eradicate the problem at its root meant it was only a matter of time before the Nazi regime tried to remove delinquents from society entirely .[25]

In many respects, Peukert is just as significant for his contribution to the historiography of social welfare and poor relief as is Sachße and Tennstedt. He relates social welfare policies, specifically those aimed at the poor, as part of a larger process of social discipline and control. He not only discusses the significance of educational policies, but also why modern, scientific ideas became attractive alternative solutions when education appeared to fail. In this sense, Peukert's assessment of delinquent youths during the *Kaiserreich* and Weimar eras parallels the history of so-called vagabond migrant workers and the deviant poor. Faced with the perfect storm of crises and a shortage of resources, social workers lost faith in the reformative ability of education. Instead, they looked to more modern ideas, like science and medicine, as an ideal solution that could both reduce costs while eliminating the problem entirely. The strategies that Peukert's social reformers adopted to handle delinquent youths closely mimicked the way social workers at Bethel would change the way in which they treated the so-called deviant poor.

Following Peukert's lead, several prominent scholars returned to the question of poor relief with a focus on its regulatory and disciplinary aspects. Within this context, George Steinmetz's *Regulating the Social* examines the origins of German poor relief

---

[24] Ibid., 263–74.
[25] Ibid., 274–92.

policies as a way to understand the development of the welfare state as an institution.[26] In the process, he articulates a category called the social that exists between the state and civil society, "a realm of specifically trans-individual structures, identities, culture and social needs and risks."[27] Steinmetz is particularly interested in how the state used social welfare policies such as poor relief to "create orderly patterns of behavior" through the administration of specific strategies.

Like Peukert, Steinmetz contends that the development of poor relief programs was directly related to the problems created by industrialization.[28] The Poor Law of 1855 for example responded to growing liberal fears over increased rural to urban migration, much to the aggravation of agrarian interests. The real key to understanding poor relief for Steinmetz, however, came in the form of local policies, which best represented the fears and concerns of local leaders. "The modern system of poor relief was a mirror image of the values of the economic bourgeoisie; it stressed individual responsibility, self-monitoring, and the swift reintegration of the poor into labor markets, and it did this within a framework designed to minimize costs."[29] By stressing values like responsibility and work in a way that was cost-effective, bourgeois reformers hoped to eliminate the revolutionary potential of the impoverished.

As Steinmetz maintains, the best example of this process is the Elberfeld system, named after the city in which it was implemented, which codified these goals for the first

---

[26] For a discussion of the social and economic factors that shaped Prussian social welfare in the decades before German unification see Hermann Beck, *The Origins of the Authoritarian Welfare State in Prussia: Conservatives, Bureaucracy and the Social Question, 1815–70* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995).
[27] George Steinmetz, *Regulating the Social: The Welfare State and Local Politics in Imperial Germany* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993), 1.
[28] See also George Steinmetz, "The Myth of an Autonomous State: Industrialists, Junkers, and Social Policy in Imperial Germany," in *Society, Culture, and the State in Germany: 1870–1930*, ed. Geoff Eley, 257–318 (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1997).
[29] Ibid., 157.

time in 1853. In contrast to earlier forms of poor relief, Elberfeld emphasized temporary relief and focused on the care of individuals as opposed to groups. Thus it "signaled a generalized emphasis on personal rather than social factors in the diagnosis and resolution of poverty and on promoting a sense of individual responsibility among the poor."[30] Furthermore, the Elberfeld system, when compared to earlier forms of poor relief, was highly decentralized, relying on middle-class volunteers to monitor the behavior of the impoverished and to instill "the proper values" in them.[31]

While Steinmetz does not mention Bodelschwingh and the worker colonies explicitly, they are clearly a logical progression of the Elberfeld model. They emphasized similar values (the work ethic and personal responsibility), stressed individualized care, and distinguished between worthy and unworthy recipients. With entry remaining theoretically voluntary, they followed Elberfeld's aversion to mandatory confinement, thus appearing less odious than their English counterparts. Furthermore, Bodelschwingh's initiative conformed to Steinmetz's theory about the origins of German welfare policies. Beginning as a response to the growing fears of East Westphalians to an increased number of unemployed migrant workers in the region, Bodelschwingh's model was an attempt to get them off the highways by stressing values that would encourage them to establish themselves as productive members of a single community. Because of Bodelschwingh's reputation and popularity in the region, worker colonies became the established method of poor relief in Bielefeld and other regional cities by the 1890's, and would also become part of national poor relief reform in the years before World War I.

---

[30] Ibid., 158.
[31] Ibid., 158.

Thus they provide a perfect demonstration of how the fears of local elites could effectively shape policy on both a regional and national level.

In her *Welfare, Modernity and the Weimar State*, Young-Sun Hong examines the subsequent development of German poor relief during the Weimar era and the conflicts that it generated. While she credits Peukert for understanding poor relief as a "rationalizing, normalizing process," Hong also criticizes him for oversimplifying it.[32] Poor relief was not a "one dimensional process" through which a unified group of middle-class social reformers sought to exercise control. Rather, Hong contends that it was highly complex and resulted in the creation of numerous contradictions and conflicts. Specifically, "it led to the proliferation of welfare reform groups and social service providers whose political and religious cleavages mirrored those of German society itself and whose struggles to shape the process of social rationalization and normalization in their own image were the decisive factor in the process of state-formation in the welfare sector."[33] To this end, social reformers were just as interested in carving out their own sphere in social welfare provision as a way to pursue their own particular social visions.[34]

The welfare programs of Weimar, Hong contends, were the product of nearly a century of development. Among other private volunteer associations, she highlights the Christian churches and Johann Wichern's Inner Mission as particularly significant players in this process. Based on his experiences during the revolutions of 1848, Wichern was convinced that the political upheaval and poverty had its roots in the dissolution of familial bonds along with a growing sense of individualism and

---

[32] Young-Sun Hong, *Welfare, Modernity and the Weimar State, 1919–1933* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998), 4.
[33] Ibid., 5.
[34] Ibid., 6.

materialism. Successful welfare polic es, therefore, were those that emphasized the necessity of a strong patriarchal figure along with the "renewal of popular piety."[35] Wichern's ideas were countered most effectively by more liberal reformers who emphasized individualized forms of care along with the improvement of one's material condition. The competing development of these two ideas through the era of the *Kaiserreich* was largely responsible for the nature of social welfare during the Weimar Republic.

Weimar, however, offered many challenges to the visions of these private initiatives. No challenge was greater than the one posed by eugenics, which according to Hong questioned not only many of the central tenets of Christian based social welfare but also of Christian theology. This was especially true of Protestants, who by focusing more than Catholics on the relevance of sin to social welfare, were much more open to so-called negative eugenic measures. To this end, social welfare needed to care not only for individual bodies, but also "supra-national entities… which… enjoyed the same or even higher right to existence as individuals."[36] In this sense, social welfare measures that may have helped small groups of individuals would have had an even greater, negative impact on the larger community. Eugenics was particularly attractive to Protestants, Hong argues, because it offered a way to care for the larger entity.

Hong is absolutely correct to assert that Protestants had a much greater interest in eugenics than their Catholic counterparts and that this interest was rooted in a larger desire to care for the national body. However, she is incorrect to assert that this was the only reason why Protestants were interested in eugenics and that it did not begin until

---

[35] Ibid., 10.
[36] Ibid., 256.

1930—after the depression already began. As Bethel demonstrates, Protestants also took an interest in eugenics as part of a larger process of professionalization in the institution and because of practical concerns over the community's financial state. Eugenics theoretically promised to reduce the number of individuals who would need care in the future. Furthermore, this process began well before 1930. Although they had not yet accepted it as a legitimate tool, doctors at Bethel were already discussing eugenics before 1910. They began to discuss seriously its application as early as 1918 with the end of World War I. Eugenics, therefore, has a much more extensive history among Protestant social reforms than that which Hong allows.

Most recently, Larry Frohman has challenged the thesis of poverty relief as a form of social discipline by insisting that the model has its limits. Histories of poor relief, such as those by Peukert and Steinmetz, have "been based on the assumption that the essential features… can best be understood by studying the attitudes and policies toward idlers and vagrants, and [they have] portrayed social assistance primarily as a mechanisms for the production and exclusion of social marginality."[37] Yet, Frohman maintains that when one examines the policies directed at deserving poor, one can see that they had the exact opposite intent – they were processes of "social inclusion." Hence, the impoverished could also be active participants in the poor relief process as they "renegotiated the terms of membership in the community, the notions of honor and morality on which this community rested, the social hierarchies through which it was structured, and the rights…

[37] Larry Frohman, *Poor Relief and Welfare in Germany from the Reformation to World War I* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 2.

associated therewith."[38] In this sense, poor relief policies had both an inclusionary and exclusionary component.

Throughout his study, Frohman focuses heavily on notions of work and responsibility as core aspects of poor relief since the Reformation. He argues that "the most important factor in determining whether persons merited assistance was their demonstrated attitude toward work."[39] Those who could demonstrate a strong history of regular employment were deemed deserving, while those who could not were shunned as vagrants. Formulated in the aftermath of the Reformation, this was a distinction that held through the early twentieth century. "To be without work" was "the greatest risk" for wage laborers during the imperial era because it threatened both their income and their ability to receive assistance.[40] Social reformers viewed unemployment as a moral failing and therefore used it as an excuse both to deny assistance and push an individual to the periphery of society.

Following unification however, Frohman maintains that the way social reformers understood the origins of poverty changed dramatically, thus resulting in a corresponding shift in the nature of care they provided. The prevailing belief among many social reformers, especially those affiliated with the Inner Mission, was that poverty was a moral failing and therefore assistance had to focus on the individual recipient. It was this mentality that provided the ideological momentum behind Bodelschwingh's worker colony initiative. Yet, while the worker colonies were able to exercise a minimal impact

---

[38] Ibid., 4.
[39] Ibid., 17.
[40] Ibid., 158.

on the material condition of the poor individual, "the very beliefs that accounted for their original popularity also led to their eventual marginalization."[41]

According to Frohman, one of Protestantism's primary problems regarding social welfare was that it failed to grasp the changing nature of poverty. By the end of the nineteenth century, social reformers primarily came to see poverty as the result of larger social and material conditions. Therefore, they naturally focused on preventative measures that would improve one's physical existence rather than moral reform. Thus, by refusing to adapt, Protestants like Bodelschwingh engineered their own irrelevance.

While Frohman's assessment of poor relief during the imperial era correctly highlights the limits of the social discipline paradigm, he is too quick to dismiss Protestant welfare providers as oblivious to the changing world around them. As early as the 1848, the Inner Mission's founder, Johann Wichern, believed that both poverty and political discontent were rooted in the deteriorating living conditions of the working classes. In order to prevent another episode like 1848, Wichern believed Protestants needed to take a more active interest in the material conditions of working-class families.[42] Having come of age during the same period, Bodelschwingh held similar ideas. For him, *Arbeitserziehung* was not just a way to effect moral reform, but also a way to bring about more lasting material and social changes. He formed these ideas as a missionary in Paris during the 1850s and later tried to institute them in the worker colonies.

***

[41] Ibid., 164.
[42] For more on Wichern see Gerhard Wehr, *Herausforderung der Liebe—Johann Hinrich Wichern und die Innere Mission* (Stuttgart: Verlagshandlung der Diakonie, 1983); see also Dietrich Sattler, *Anwalt der Armen—Missionar der Kirche: Johann Hinrich Wichern* (Hamburg: Agentur des Rauen Hauses, 2007).

Like the historiography of social welfare in modern Germany, the body of literature on Protestant charities and relief organizations is rich and extensive. With their own publishing houses many of these organizations funded and produced a seemingly endless stream of literature both to document their own histories as well as generate public support for their missions. Two of the most prolific organizations in this respect were the Inner Mission and the Bethel institutions.

As part of his effort to expand Bethel's reach beyond East Westphalia, Bodelschwingh created a press agency at the institution. This department produced a wide variety of material about Bethel, from brief descriptive pamphlets (typically sixteen small pages) to longer, in-depth books (usually no longer than 150 pages).[43] While these pieces are vital to understanding the values and issues that were important to Bethel's leadership they are relatively useless as critical analyses. They typically described uncontroversial events at the community (Sedan Day celebrations, Christmas festivities, and after 1890 stories from the mission in Africa) that would resonate with their primarily conservative, middle-class base of support. Furthermore, because the anecdotes tended to be popular with their supporters, Bethel's leadership repeated the same (or very similar) stories at regular intervals. This tendency is especially true for the material that dealt with the worker colonies and biographies of Bodelschwingh.

Of much greater value to understanding social welfare policies at Bethel are the numerous position pieces and journals Bodelschwingh helped produce to lobby political and public support for specific issues championed by the community. Although they present a highly idealized depiction of life at Bethel, they also make clearly articulated

---

[43] For an example of the former see the *Bote von Bethel* series for a general description of Bethel. These pamphlets typically contained two brief articles about life in the community and were sent to donors as an acknowledgment of their gift.

arguments in support of expanding Bodelschwingh's worker colony network.[44] Typically thirty pages in length, this genre is vital to understanding the intellectual and religious underpinnings of the larger worker colony initiative, in part because it targeted specific audiences. For example, the journal *Der Wanderer* dealt with issues of particular concern to people interested in expanding the worker colony into a national network. At the same time, in the early 1900s Bodelschwingh launched a new journal entitled *Beth-El* that featured comparatively more academic material to appeal to a more educated audience.[45]

In general, this type of literature dominates the material on Bethel (and the Inner Mission) through the end of World War II. The major exception to this local monopoly on church history was the work of the theologian and historian Martin Gerhardt. During the 1920s and early 1930s he produced massive biographies of Johann Hinrich Wichern and Theodore Fliedner before taking a position in church history at the University of Göttingen in 1938.[46] Upon losing that position as a result of denazification efforts in 1945, he received a contract to write a comprehensive history of the Inner Mission in honor of its 100th anniversary in 1948, and began a monumental two volume biography of Friedrich von Bodelscheingh.[47] While all of Gerhardt's studies are tediously researched,

---

[44] For example see Gustav von Bodelschwingh, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, Ein Lebensbild*, 12th Edition (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1949 [First Edition, 1922]).

[45] Many of the articles from these journals written by Bodelschwingh have since been reprinted in two collected volumes. See Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, *Ausgewählte Schriften: 1. Veröffentlichungen aus den Jahren 1858 bis 1871*, edited by Alfred Adam (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1955); Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, *Ausgewählte Schriften: 2. Veröffentlichungen aus den Jahren 1872 bis 1910* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1964).

[46] Martin Gerhardt, *Johann Hinrich Wichern, ein Lebensbild*, 3 vols (Hamburg: Agentur des Rauhen Huses, 1927–1931); Martin Gerhardt, *Theodor Fliedner: ein Lebensbild,* 2 vols (Düsseldorf: Verlag der Buchhandlung der Diakonissen-anstalt, 1933–1937).

[47] Martin Gerhardt, *Eine Jahrhundert Innere Mission: Die Geschichte des Central-Ausschusses für die Innere Mission der Deutschen Evangelischen Kirche*, 2 vols (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1948); Martin Gerhardt, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh: Ein Lebensbild aus der deutschen Kirchengeschichte, 1. Band, Werden und Reisen* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlag der Anstalt Bethel, 1950); Martin Gerhardt,

and in many cases remain fundamental texts of Protestant church history, they are of limited use to the contemporary historian. Gerhardt's biography of Bodelschwingh, for example, repeats many of the same anecdotes one finds in the early literature from the Bethel press. Therefore, they lack a critical analysis of their subjects and avoid any topic that could be considered controversial.

The first study to confront controversial subject matter was Wilhelm Brand's 1967 biography of the younger Bodelschwingh.[48] Although he is largely apologetic, Brandt nevertheless confronts many of the more controversial aspects of Bodelschwingh's life. He acknowledges that Bodelschwingh was hostile and suspicious of the Weimar Republic, and that he had a very complicated relationship with the Nazi state.[49] To this end he provides a relatively detailed discussion of Bodelschwingh's brief tenure as the first Reich Bishop of the Lutheran Church in Germany as well as his conflict with the regime over the mass murder of people with disabilities (Operation T4).[50]

However, when assessing Bodelschwingh's response to Operation T4 (and by extension Nazi eugenic policies), Brandt paints a largely idealistic picture of Bodelschwingh as an opponent of eugenics and staunch opponent of the mass murder of the disabled. In so doing, he runs counter to the evidence presented by a fairly extensive collection of documents that show Bodelschwingh was not only open to eugenic policies like sterilization, but in many cases actively enthusiastic. Furthermore, subsequent

---

Friedrich von Bodelschwingh: Ein Lebensbild aus der deutschen Kirchengeschichte, 2. Band, Das Werk/Erste Hälfte (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1952); Martin Gerhardt and Alfred Adam, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh: Ein Lebensbild aus der deutschen Kirchengeschichte, 2. Band, Das Werk/Zweite Hälfte* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1958).

[48] Brandt was a colleague of Bodelschwingh's at Bethel.

[49] Wilhelm Brandt, *Friedrich v. Bodelschwingh, 1877–1946: Nachfolger und Gestalter* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1967), 177-86.

[50] Brandt, *Friedrich v. Bodelschwingh,* 113–42, 186–211.

evidence has also demonstrated that Bodelschwingh's response to so-called Nazi euthanasia was complicated and in some cases bordered on outright collaboration.[51] Nevertheless, Brandt deserves credit for being the first person within the Bethel press to raise the difficult question of Bethel's relationship to eugenics.

Brandt's biography, which is still the only comprehensive biography of the younger Bodelschwingh, was the first study published by the local Bethel press to raise the question of eugenics at Bethel. It also came during a period that began to see a greater interest in Protestant Church history by professionally trained historians with a much more critical eye than their local (and at times amateur) predecessors. Largely, this interest was part of a greater determination by historians of Germany not to ignore the experiences of individual groups of people. Germany was more than a monolithic society driven by political elites. To this end, among other subjects professional historians turned their attention to the German Churches, especially the *Kirchenkampf* of the early 1930s.[52]

In the case of Protestant communities in Germany, the studies that resulted from this shift demonstrated that in many cases Protestants were so disillusioned by defeat in 1918 and so hostile to the resulting republic, that many were open to accommodating a group like the Nazis if it meant the end of the republic.[53] Although his magisterial two-volume study is focused primarily on the Third Reich, Klaus Scholder devotes almost

[51] See Gerhard Schorsch, "Aktive Sabotage," *Der Ring* 10 (1983): 8; Hans-Walter Schmuhl, *Ärzte in der Anstalt Bethel: 1870–1945*, ed. Matthias Benad (Bielefeld: Bethel Verlag, 1998), 53.
[52] On church history as an aspect of social history see Wolfgang Schieder, "Religionsgeschichte als Sozialgeschichte. Einleitende Bemerkungen zur Forschungsproblematik," in *Religion und Gesellschaft im 19. Jahrhundert*, ed. Wolfgang Schieder, 291–98 (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1993) ; Wolfgang Schieder, "Kirchengeschichte aus der Sicht des Historikers," *Neue Züricher Zeitung* 146, no. 47 (June 1980); Rudolf von Thadden, "Kirchengeschichte als Gesellschaftsgeschichte," *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 9 (1983): 598–614.
[53] See for example Shelley Baranowski, *The Sanctity of Rural Life: Nobility, Protestantism and Nazism in Weimar Prussia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

one-third of massive, 700-page volume on the German Church Struggle during the Third Reich to the period before 1933. Given their hostility to the Weimar Republic, he argues that radical conservatism had become increasingly popular among many Protestants, which made them open to accommodating Hitler in 1933.[54]

Yet, for all the attention Scholder gives the Protestant churches during the inter-war era, he largely ignores the developments within the Protestant-affiliated socialassociations like the Inner Mission. Excluding Gerhardt's two-volume history of the Inner Mission, the first professional history of the organization did not appear until 1989 when Jochen-Christoph Kaiser wrote an extremely well-researched history of the institution from 1914–1945.[55] To be sure, Kaiser's study is not a comprehensive survey of the period in the tradition of Gerhardt's study. Instead, he structures it "to selected, central and particular problems."[56] Specifically, Kaiser is interested in a 1931/32 scandal that brought the Inner Mission to the brink of financial ruin and the "ecumenical external contacts" of the organization's central committee.[57] Based on the study's thematic and chronological organization, it is also clear that Kaiser views the Inner Mission's activity during the Nazi Era as a clear break from its history before 1933.

For example, Kaiser devotes a fair amount of attention to the question of eugenics within Protestant institutions before and after 1933. He correctly argues that Protestant welfare providers, including Bodelschwingh, were concerned about potential future costs and were therefore interested in eugenics measures like sterilization and euthanasia as a

---

[54] For more see Klaus Scholder, *The Churches and the Third Reich, Volume One: 1918–1934, Preliminary History and the Time of Illusions*, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988); see also J. R. C. Wright, *"Above Parties: "The Political Attitudes of the German Protestant Church Leadership, 1918–1933* (London: Oxford University Press, 1974).
[55] Jochen-Christoph Kaiser, *Sozialer Protestantismus im 20. Jahrhundert: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Inneren Mission, 1914–1945* (München: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1989).
[56] Ibid., 17.
[57] Ibid., 17–18.

way to limit them.[58] Although he discusses early eugenic debates within the Inner Mission before 1933, they are framed almost exclusively as a prelude to Nazi eugenic policies. This is problematic on two levels. First, given Kaiser's belief that 1933 marked a fundamental break with the past for the Inner Mission, it would stand to reason that earlier eugenic debates among Protestants would have little to no bearing on post-1933 policies. Second, the widespread presence of eugenic ideas by the late 1920's (which Kaiser correctly identifies as the "spirit of the times") indicates that Protestants held a complex understanding of eugenics that ultimately shaped their approach to Nazi policies. Thus, many Protestants had already made up their minds about eugenics by 1933. Those who advocated eugenic policies willingly collaborated with the Nazi regime on implementing its 1933 compulsory sterilization law.

Nevertheless, Kaiser's work is extremely important because it is the first one to situate firmly the German churches within the larger scope of German social history. It spawned a wealth of studies that went beyond mere church politics to explore how the Christian churches participated in larger social debates, such as those concerning social welfare practices. Kaiser himself contributed to this rapidly growing body of literature with an excellent volume on the participation of Christians in larger social political debates during the *Kaiserreich*. As he noted, while the 1980s saw a proliferation in the number of general studies on social welfare and poor relief policies during the *Kaiserreich*, they were largely general and remained focused almost exclusively on state

[58] Ibid., 316–21.

policy.[59] Such an approach, however, failed to acknowledge the dramatic influence German Protestants exercised on the development of state policies.

When applied specifically to poor relief, Kaiser maintains that Protestant groups tended to remain focused on the past. Rather than acknowledge that German society was changing rapidly, and that poor relief policies needed to adapt accordingly, Protestants insisted on pursuing policies similar to those articulated by Johann Wichern a generation earlier.[60] The lone exception to this trend, according to Ewald Frie, was Bodelschwingh, who understood the need for adaptation and compromise in a society that was growing increasingly complex.[61]

Echoing Kaiser, Theodor Strohm and Jörg Thierfelder note that while scholars have demonstrated a renewed interest in German social welfare policies, that focus was skewed heavily towards the Third Reich. As a result there was a notable lack of material exclusively on the origins of these policies during the *Kaiserreich*. Furthermore, the historiography of Protestant-based social welfare policies largely ignored the leading institutions and individuals responsible for the development of these ideas.[62] *Diakonie im Deutschen Kaiserreich*, therefore, shines a long overdue spotlight on Protestant social welfare through the end of World War I.

---

[59] The only notable outgrowth of these general studies was a wealth of regional histories. For more see Jochen-Christoph Kaiser, Wilfried Loth, (eds., *Soziale Reform im Kaiserreich: Protestantismus, Katholizismus und Sozialpolitik* (Stuttgart: W. Kholhammer, 1997), 9.
[60] See Jochen-Christoph Kaiser, "Protestantismus und Sozialpolitik: Der Ertrag der 1890er Jahre," in *Soziale Reform im Kaiserreich*, ed. Kaiser and Loth, 94–113.
[61] Ewald Frie, "Fürsorgepolitik zwischen Kirche und Staat. Wandererarmenhilfe in Preussen," in *Soziale Reform im Kaiserreich*, ed. Kaiser and Loth, 114–27. See also Ewald Frie, *Wohlfahrtsstaat und Provinz: Fürsorgepolitik des Provinzialverbandes Westfalen und des Landes Sachsen 1880–1930* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöning, 1993).
[62] Jörg Thierfelder, "Einführung in den Band 'Diakonie im Deutschen Kaiserreich," *Diakonie im Deutschen Kaiserreich (1871–1918): Neuere Beiträge aus der diakoniegeschichtlichen Forschung*, ed. Theodor Strohm and Jörg Thierfelder, 9–17 (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter Heidelberg, 1995), 9.

As one of the largest social welfare institutions in Germany, Bethel was a critical player in the development of Protestant *Diakonie* during the *Kaiserreich.* Bethel not only grew to become a massive network of hospitals, but also into one of German Protestantism's leading centers for social welfare training and education. This function is the focus of Anke Marholdt's contribution, which not only traces the origins of this role but also argues that Bethel's academy quickly developed a dual purpose of training social workers for Germany and missionaries in preparation for their service in East Africa. This was especially true following the elder Bodelschwingh's death in 1910 when Walther Trittelvitz assumed responsibility for the theological school. "In this way, future pastors should be offered an introduction to the science of the mission, and the training of future missionaries, who studied as guests at the Theological School since 1907, was also ensured." [63] In 1912 Bethel's leaders created a special institute for the mission within the theological school especially to prepare future missionaries in the Bethel understanding of social welfare. Thus, in addition to tracing the origins of the Bethel theological school and its role in training social workers for the community, Marholdt clearly shows that from the very beginning the domestic and foreign missions were intimately connected in the minds of Bethel's leaders.

Volumes like those of Kaiser, Scheffler, Thierfelder and Strohm are important because they all highlight the importance of Protestant contributions to German social welfare. Yet, with a couple exceptions, they relegate Bodelschwingh to a figure of secondary importance. It is for this reason that the wealth of regional and local histories

[63] Anke Marholdt, "Diakonie und theologische Ausbildung. Die Initiativen Friedrich von Bodelschwinghs (1831–1910) und ihre Entwicklung bis 1914" in *Diakonie im Deutschen Kaiserreich*, ed. Thierfelder and Strohm, 396–420, 416.

that emerged in the wake of these early volumes are key to understanding Bethel's unique contribution to the development of Protestant social welfare.

Central to the growth of this literature is the work of the *Bethel Forschungsstelle*, located at the Bethel *Theologische Hochschule* on the Bethel campus under the direction of Matthias Benad. Over the past fifteen years the institute has produced a number of volumes on the development of Bethel's various initiatives, with a special emphasis on poor relief and the origins of the worker colony network. Written primarily by professionally trained social historians, the literature produced by the *Bethel Forschungsstelle* is a stark difference from that which was produced by the Bethel press a century earlier. Not only do the contributors to these volumes provide a critical assessment of Bodelschwingh's social welfare philosophy, but they also situate Bethel's work within a larger national context.[64] By focusing on the role of the Bethel missionaries from Africa to social welfare debates within the institute, this dissertation builds on the significance of these studies by placing Bethel into an international context.

More recently, the volume *Bethel-Eckardtsheim* employed the same formula to trace the development of Bethel's first worker colony Wilhelmsdorf from its creation in 1882 to the present day. It shows how Bodelschwingh's philosophy and greater concerns about the social/political impact of poverty influenced everything from the specific location of the colony to the terminology Bethel's leaders used to refer to unemployed

[64] See, for example Jochen-Christoph Kaiser, "Fritz von Bodelschwingh als Diakoniepolitiker," in *Friedrich v. Bodelschwingh d. J. und die Betheler Anstalten: Frömmigkeit und Weltgestaltung*, ed. Matthias Benad, 38–53 (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1997); Matthias Benad and Kerstin Winkler, eds., *Bethels Mission (2): Bethel im Spannungsfeld von Erweckungsfrömmigkeit und öffentlicher Fürsorge. Beiträge zur Geschichte der v. Bodelschwinghschen Anstalten Bethel,* Beiträge zur Westfälischen Kirchengeschichte, vol. 20 (Bielefeld: Luther-Verlag, 2001). See especially the contributions by Jochen-Christoph Kaiser, Jürgen Scheffler, Matthias Benad, Hans-Ulrich Grundmann, and Helmut Rosemann.

migrant workers.[65] Jürgen Scheffler's history of the Wilhelmsdorf colony is particularly beneficial in this respect because he not only shows how the worker colony was a response to the social dangers posed by German industrialization and the corresponding upheaval in the labor market, but also argues that the initiative at Bethel eventually became the basis for a nation-wide network of colonies. Bodelschwingh used Wilhelmsdorf as a springboard to lobby the state for significant reforms to poor relief provision, even using it as a signature issue to enter politics as a member of the Prussian *Landtag*. Thus, Scheffler properly highlights Bodelschwingh as a central figure in the development of German poor relief policies.[66]

In a similar vein, over the course of five chapters, Hans-Walter Schmuhl examines the expansion of Wilhelmsdorf from a single worker colony to a larger constellation of institutions known collectively as Eckardtsheim from 1882 until the end of World War II. As one of the leading Protestant-run centers for poor relief in Germany, Eckardtsheim is important to understanding how larger traumas like World War I altered Protestant social-welfare practices. To this end, Schmuhl does an excellent job of showing not only the devastating impact of the war on Bethel, but also how that

---

[65] See Matthias Benad, "Religiöse Grundlagen," in *Bethel-Eckardtsheim: Von der Gründung der ersten deutschen Arbeiterkolonie bis zur Auflösung als Teilanstalt (1882–2001)*, ed. Matthias Benad and Hans-Walter Schmuhl, 36–70 (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2006); Wolfgang-Motzkau-Valeton, "Zur Geographie," in *Bethel-Eckardtsheim*, 92–106; Reinhard Neumann, "Die Senne und das Militär," in *Bethel-Eckardtsheim*, 107–14.

[66] Jürgen Scheffler, "Die Arbeiterkolonie Wilhelmsdorf (1882 bis 1970)," in *Bethel-Eckardtsheim*, 115–40. In addition to the aforementioned articles, see also Jürgen Scheffler, "Die Anstalt Bethel und die 'Brüder von der Landstrasse': Anstalts-Diakonie und Wohlfahrtspflege am Beispiel der Wandererfürsorge," in *Bethels Mission (2): Bethel im Spannungsfeld von Erweckungsfrömmigkeit und öffentlicher Fürsorge*, ed. Matthias Benad and Kerstin Winkler, Beiträge zur Westfälischen Kirchengeschichte 20, ed. Bernd Hey, Matthias Benad, Martin Brecht, Wilhelm Neuser and Martin Stiewe, 197–224 (Bielefeld: Luther Verlag, 2001).

experience is central to explaining its leadership's interest in incorporating scientific ideas like eugenics during the 1920s.[67]

***

Eugenics and the social policies it inspired are certainly an integral part of the history of social welfare and poor relief. Yet unlike many other aspects of poor relief, eugenics gained a special notoriety because of its history during the Third Reich. Eugenic ideas were the primary inspiration behind the Nazi compulsory sterilization law of 1934 and Operation T4 (1939-41), the mass murder of the disabled.[68] For this reason, eugenics has inspired a body of literature that is fundamentally different than that on social welfare. While the legacy of Nazism is present to some degree in much of the historiography of social welfare, it hangs as a much larger specter over the literature on eugenics.

In many respects, the historiography of eugenics parallels that of the much larger *Sonderweg* debate, which is by now well known. Argued most eloquently by Hans-Ulrich Wehler, it emphasized the *Kaiserreich* as a prelude to the Third Reich. While several historians managed to put a few chinks in its armor, the *Sonderweg* remained the dominant framework of interpretation until it was torn down effectively by David

---

[67] See Helmut Türpitz and Hans-Walter Schmuhl, "Von der Arbeiterkolonie Wilhelmsdorf in der Senne zur Zweiganstalt Eckardtsheim (1882 bis 1914)," in *Bethel-Eckardtsheim*, 428–37; see also the contributions by Hans-Walter Schmuhl in *Bethel-Eckardtsheim*, 438–508.

[68] For more detailed histories see Henry Friedlander, *The Origins of Nazi Genocide: From Euthanasia to the Final Solution* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997); Michael Burleigh, *Death and Deliverance: Euthanasia in Germany, 1900–1945* (London: Pan Macmillan, 2002); Götz Aly, Peter Chroust, Christian Pross, and Belinda Cooper, *Cleansing the Fatherland: Nazi Medicine and Racial Hygiene* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994); Giesela Bock, *Zwangssterilisation im Nationalsozialismus: Studien zur Rassenpolitik und Frauenpolitik* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1986); Ernst Klee, "*Euthanasie" im NS-Staat: die Vernichtung lebensunwerten Lebens* (Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer, 1983); Hans-Walter Schmuhl, *Grenzüberschreitungen: das Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut für Anthropologie, menschliche Erblehre und Eugenik 1927–1945* (Göttingen: Wallstein-Verlag, 2005); Hans-Walter Schmuhl, *Rassenhygiene, Nationalsozialismus, Euthanasie. Von der Verhütung zur Vernichtung 'lebensunwerten Lebens', 1840–1945* (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1987).

Blackbourn and Geoff Eley.[69] The result was a renewed interest in the period before 1933 as something more than a prelude to Hitler and Nazism. The historiography of eugenics largely parallels the larger body of literature discussing the *Sonderweg* thesis. Whereas much of the early literature proceeds from the position that racial hygiene (as eugenics was known in Germany) was destined to lead to the policies championed by the Nazis, more recent studies present a much more complex picture of the history of eugenics in Germany.

In this vein, Robert Proctor and Paul Weindling insist that eugenics and racial hygiene are the vital link that connects pre 1914 social welfare policies with those of the Nazis. In his massive survey of eugenics and racial science, Weindling argues that the fundamental aim of scientists and racial thinkers toward a "type of biologically based collectivism" can be traced from early eugenic thought in the nineteenth century through the Nazi era.[70] At the same time, he also highlights the role of the war in sharpening calls for state intervention in health care to preserve the quality and purity of the German population. Proctor also draws continuities between eugenics during the Wilhelmine era and the Third Reich in his study *Racial Hygiene.* Although the book focuses primarily on medicine during the Third Reich, Proctor nevertheless illustrates the increasingly larger role racial thinking came to play in social welfare after the war. He argues that from the

---

[69] David Blackbourn and Geoff Eley, *The Peculiarities of German History: Bourgeois Society and Politics in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Oxford University Press: New York, 1989, 1984). For the current state of this debate see Sven Oliver Müller and Cornelius Torp, eds., *Imperial Germany Revisited: Continuing Debates and New Perspectives* (New York: Berghan, 2011).

[70] Paul Weindling, *Health, Race, and German Politics between National Unification and Nazism, 1870–1945*, Cambridge History of Medicine (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 578.

late nineteenth century through the rise of the Nazi party, racial thinking had permeated all aspects of German medicine.[71]

In contrast to Weindling and Proctor, German historians Peter Weingart, Jürgen Kroll and Kurt Bayertz provide a much more nuanced understanding of the history of eugenics in Germany. Rather than view eugenics as the original point of departure on a journey that was destined to culminate in the racial policies implemented by the Nazis, they view it as part of a larger European wide attempt by states to manage their populations. Weingart, Kroll and Bayertz argue that this trend can be traced back to the eighteenth century within the context of "mercantilistic and cameralistic thought" when populations became an "economically significant resource."[72] Eugenics, which evolved one hundred years later, was a scientific attempt to continue the process of organizing and controlling populations for the benefit of the state. At the same time, in order to emphasize further that the Third Reich was merely one episode in the history of eugenics, and not its culmination, Weingart, Kroll and Bayertz also extend their analysis through the postwar period.[73]

Of course any history of eugenics in Germany is intimately entwined with that of the Christian Churches. Both Catholics and Protestants were deeply concerned with poor relief policies and both Churches ran extensive hospital networks. Furthermore, when the Nazi regime began to implement ideas like sterilization and so-called euthanasia, the fiercest protests originated from within these institutions. Yet as recent scholarship has

---

[71] Robert N. Proctor, *Racial Hygiene: Medicine Under the Nazis* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988).
[72] Peter Weingart, Jürgen Kroll and Kurt Bayertz, *Rasse, Blut und Gene: Geschichte der Eugenik und Rassenhygiene in Deutschland* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1992, 1988), 17.
[73] See also Edward Ross Dickinson, "Biopolitics, Fascism, Democracy: "Some Reflections on Our Discourse About 'Modernity,'" *Central European History* 37, no. 1 (2004): 1–48.

clearly demonstrated, the directors of many church-run hospitals, especially those run by Protestants, were also fascinated by eugenics and eager to implement specific policies such as sterilization.

Compared to their Protestant counterparts, Roman Catholic social workers were largely cool toward eugenic policies. While there were individual Catholics, notably Hermann Muckermann, a former Jesuit and a leader of the section for eugenic studies at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute, who openly advocated eugenic ideas, most Catholics remained deeply skeptical. The 1930 papal encyclical *Casti Connubii* argued that the right of families to have children preceded the right of states to control their populations. Therefore, Catholics viewed sterilization as a violation of this position. Despite their theoretical opposition however, most Catholic social workers focused their efforts after 1933 against direct participation in carrying out sterilization rather than opposing the policy as a whole.[74]

In contrast to the Catholics, Kurt Nowak, the first professional historian to address Protestant attitudes to eugenics, demonstrates that German Protestants, including Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, had a keen interest in sterilization well before Hitler took power.[75] Furthermore, he also correctly argues that one major reason Protestants, more so than Catholics, were interested in eugenics was because they tended to be staunchly nationalistic. For them, using procedures like sterilization on so-called "inferior" was a "service to the Volk."[76] Even though he does not explore these attitudes in any depth,

---

[74] See Michael Burleigh, *Ethics and Extermination: Reflections on Nazi Genocide* (New York: Cambridge University Press,1997), 130–41; Nowak, *"Euthanasie" und Sterilisierung im "Dritten Reich": Die Konfrontation der evangelischen und katholischen Kirche mit dem Gesetz zur Verhütung erbkranken Nachwuchses und der "Euthanasie"-Aktion* (Halle (Saale): VEB Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1977), 106–20.
[75] Nowak, *"Euthanasie und Sterilisierung im "Dritten Reich"*, 94.
[76] Ibid., 93.

Nowak nevertheless established fairly early that German Protestants had an interest in eugenics that pre-dated 1933 and created the framework for future investigation into the role Protestants played in the development of Nazi eugenic policies.

Perhaps no historian has done more to flesh out Nowak's framework and situate German Protestants within the larger discussion of eugenics in modern Germany than the prolific Hans-Walter Schmuhl. His thoroughly researched *Rassenhygiene, Nationalsozialismus, Euthanasie* examines Nazi euthanasia as the horrific culmination of eugenic thinking in Germany.[77] Acknowledging the importance of the churches to this discussion, he devotes a fair amount of attention to the responses of German Catholics and Protestants to Nazi eugenic ideas. His analysis of the Inner Mission focuses specifically on the Bethel institutions and demonstrates that their leaders, including Bodelschwingh, were either complicit or bended too easily to the demands of the regime.[78]

While his study of Euthanasia remains very influential and relevant in the historiography of Nazi eugenic policies, it is his smaller and more numerous studies of the Bethel institutions that are more important to understanding how and why German Protestants were fascinated with eugenics.[79] Building off his initial discussion of Bethel's reaction to Nazi euthanasia, Schmuhl pays particular attention to the ways in which Bethel's inner dynamic changed during the early twentieth century. As the

---

[77] Hans-Walter Schmuhl, *Rassenhygiene, Nationalsozialismus, Euthanasie: Von der Verhütung zur Vernichtung "lebensunwerten Lebens," 1890–1945* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987).
[78] Ibid., 305–54; For his discussion of Bethel see especially 327–44.
[79] See especially Hans-Walter Schmuhl, "Fritz v. Bodelschwingh, die Ärzte und der medizinische Fortschritt", in *Friedrich v. Bodelschwingh d. J. und die Betheler Anstalten: Frömmigkeit und Weltgestaltung*, ed. Matthias Benad, 101–17 (Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1997); Hans-Walter Schmuhl, *Ärzte in der Anstalt Bethel: 1870–1945*, ed. Matthias Benad (Bielefeld: Bethel Verlag, 1998), 7–44; Hans-Walter Schmuhl, *Ärzte in der Westfälischen Diakonissenanstalt Sarepta, 1890–1970*, ed. Matthias Benad (Bielefeld: Bethel-Verlag, 2001), 7–21; 28–34.

institution grew under Bodelschwingh's guidance, so too did the pressure to hire more professionally trained physicians. Over time, these physicians fought for greater prestige and influence within the institution, which in turn reduced the influence of Bodelshchwingh's philosophy.[80]

Schmuhl's studies are complemented by the work of Sabine Scheiermacher, who explores the growth of eugenics in the Inner Mission during the 1920s and early 1930s. In addition to the factors discussed by Shmuhl, Scheiermacher emphasizes the pressures created by the economic crises as central to explaining Protestant open-mindedness toward eugenics. She notes that Bodelschwingh became a particularly vocal advocate of eugenic policies like sterilization as a way to compliment the Inner Mission's spiritual purpose.. Yet the debate, especially at Bethel, was much more complicated than for what Schmuhl and his contemporaries allow. In trying to understand why Protestants embraced eugenics, they implicitly give the impression that there was little to no pushback against this process. One of the main goals of this study is to show that such an impression is incorrect. Upon returning from East Africa in 1918, the Bethel missionaries devoted a large part of their postwar domestic mission to contesting the influx of science at Bethel. Having gained control over Bethel's public relations center, they produced a large amount of publicity material during the 1920s and early 1930s that portrayed scientific ideas like eugenics as entirely foreign to the Bethel ethos. Therefore, German Protestants were hardly uniformly in favor of incorporating eugenic practices into their social work.

***

[80] Schmuhl, "Fritz v. Bodelschwingh, die Ärzte und der medizinische Fortschritt," 108.

The historiographies of social welfare and racial thinking in modern Germany clearly established that ideas like eugenics were prevalent well before the Nazis took power in 1933. Yet, it is nevertheless striking how little attention these studies pay to the role of imperialism and the colonies in shaping German attitudes towards racial science and eugenics. Although most scholars note that racial inequality was a central feature of eugenic thought, they do not examine how the colonial experience influenced German thoughts on racial hygiene. At the same time, those studies dealing with the wave of welfare reforms during the Weimar republic do not consider the influence of social work performed by missionaries abroad. This dissertation contends that with both domestic and foreign missions, Bethel demonstrates how returning missionaries from Africa participated extensively in the social welfare reform debates of the Weimar period. In this sense, it is also a contribution to the growing body of literature on German imperialism and its historical legacies.

The early historiography of German imperialism was shaped heavily by the ground breaking work of Hans-Ulrich Wehler in the 1960's, which argued that imperialism was guided by the axiom *Primat der Innenpolitik* (primacy of domestic politics).[81] In other words, Wehler argued that German foreign affairs could best be understood by concentrating on domestic politics. As a result, the majority of early scholarship on German imperialism focuses on the domestic objectives of Bismarck and the role of radical nationalist pressure groups in spurring the government into being more aggressive in the scramble for colonies.[82]

---

[81] See Hans-Ulrich Wehler, *Bismarck und der Imperialismus* (Berlin: Kiepenheuer and Witsch, 1969).
[82] For a critique of Wehler's position see Geoff Eley, *Reshaping the German Right: Radical Nationalism and Political Change after Bismarck* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980).

While historians used the question of imperialism to evaluate Bismarck's domestic policies and the role of radical nationalist organizations in influencing the government's decisions, scant attention has been paid to the actual colonies until only recently. For years, German colonial policies in Africa received more attention from historians of Africa than from those of Germany.[83] In the case of East Africa, John Iliffe was the only major historian to examine German colonial policies in Tanzania and their impact on Tanzanians. In his landmark *A Modern History of Tanganyika*, Iliffe went far beyond a simple discussion of the political impact of German rule. He was one of the first historians to examine the labor question and the impact of German recruitment policies on East Africans. He was also the first historian to note the devastating impact of ecological disaster on East Africa, which he claimed was the result of "Tanganyika's incorporation into the world's disease environment."[84]

Despite the strength and positive reception of Iliffe's work, it did not lead to a sustained interest in Germany's former colonies.[85] Not until the mid-1990s, when historians gained access to a windfall of German archival material, did the question of German imperialism once again become a focus of study for historians of Germany. The major exceptions were the work of Horst Gründer and Klaus J. Bade.[86] Unlike Wehler,

---

[83] For an earlier, high political history of German colonial policies see Helmuth Stoecker, ed., *German Imperialism in Africa: From the Beginnings until the Second World War*, translated by Bernd Zöllner (Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey: Humanities Press International, INC., 1986 (1977).

[84] John Iliffe, *A Modern History of Tanganyika* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 88–167, here 123; See also M. H. Y. Kaniki, ed., *Tanzania Under Colonial Rule* (London: Longman Group, 1979).

[85] For a more detailed discussion of the early historiography of German imperialism in East Africa see Juhani Koponen, *Development for Exploitation: German colonial policies in Mainland Tanzania, 1884–1914* (Hamburg: Lit Verlag, 1995), 11–22.

[86] Horst Gründer, *Geschichte der deutschen Kolonien* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh Verlag, 1985); Klaus J. Bade, *Friedrich Fabri und der Imperialismus in der Bismarckzeit* (Freiburg: Atlantis, 1975); Klaus J. Bade, *Imperialismus und Kolonialmission: kaiserliches Deutschland und koloniales Imperium* (Wiesbaden: Steiner Verlag, 1982). For other studies during this period see also Ralph A. Austen, *Northwest Tanzania under German and British Rule; Colonial Policy and Tribal Politics, 1889–1939* (New

Gründer was interested in exploring how Germany's colonies operated. While his *Geschichte der Deutschen Kolonien* begins with a discussion of domestic politics and Bismarck's motivation for acquiring colonies, it focuses more on exploring the attitude of German colonial authorizes toward the native inhabitants of the colonies, the question of labor in the colonies, and the role of missionaries.[87] Thus, by displaying an interest in the actual colonies, Gründer advanced the historical discussion well beyond Wehler's *Primat der Innenpolitik.*

Beginning in the mid-1990s, historians once again returned to Germany's colonial history. This first major historian to publish in this new wave of scholarship was the Finnish scholar Juhani Koponen, who argued that in order to exploit Tanzanian resources, German colonial authorities did a significant amount of work to build and develop local infrastructure. Within this context, he maintains that their primary concern was consistently labor recruitment, a problem they never really solved. Among the reasons German authorities gave for their failure to recruit workers was that Africans were naturally lazy and therefore needed to be taught how to work. In this respect he argues that missionaries were vital allies in the German struggle to exploit the colony because they strongly emphasized the importance of working at the mission.[88]

Although the subsequent body of scholarship explored the myriad of ways in which Germany and its colonies in Africa interacted with each other, the theme of labor

---

Haven: Yale University Press, 1968); Prosser Grifford and William Roger Louis, eds., *Britain and Germany in Africa: Imperial Rivalry and Colonial Rule* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967).

[87] See also Horst Gründer, *Christliche Mission und deutscher Imperialismus. Eine politische Geschichte ihrer Beziehung während der deustschen Kolonialzeit, 1884-1914 unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Afrika und Chinas* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöning Verlag, 1982).

[88] Koponen, *Development for Exploitation*, 321–59.

(or lack thereof) in the colonies was one of the more predominant subjects of inquiry.[89] By virtue of its rich source base and its attempt to analyze the question from the perspectives of both African laborers as well as the German colonial authorities, Thaddeus Sunseri's *Vilimani* stands out as one of the most accomplished studies in this regard.[90] He argues effectively not only that Africans were active participants in the colonial labor market, using various resistance strategies to negotiate more favorable terms of employment, but that by virtue of the pressure placed on the colonial authority by advocates of plantation based cotton production, the labor question remained one of "the two most pressing issues in the political economy of German East Africa in the last decade of German colonial rule."[91]

As a work of African history, *Vilimani* is primarily concerned with demonstrating that Africans were not passive victims of German policies, but that they were able to shape actively the terms of their employment through the sheer lack of workers and through various forms of resistance. Sunseri argues that in order to lure workers from rival plantations, German planters not only provided better wages but also reduced their

---

[89] For examples of scholarship from this period by historians of Germany see Lora Wildenthal, *German Women for Empire: 1884–1945* (Durham, NC; Duke University Press, 2001); Andrew Zimmerman, *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2001). For examples of work by historians of Africa see Jonathon Glassman, *Feasts and Riot: Revelry, Rebellion, and Popular Consciousness on the Swahili Coast, 1856–1888* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1995). Thddeus Sunseri, "Majimaji and the Millenium: Abrahamic Sources and the Creation of a Tanzanian Resistance Tradition," *History in Africa* 26 (1999): 365–78; Thaddeus Sunseri, "Famine and Wild Pigs: Gender Struggles and the Outbreak of the Majimaji War in Uzaramo (Tanzania)," *The Journal of African History* 38, no. 2 (1997): 235–59; Jamie Monson, "Relocating Maji Maji: The Politics of Alliance and Authority in the Southern Highlands of Tanzania, 1870–1918," *Journal of African History* 39, no. 1 (1998): 95–120.

[90] On the question of labor in East Africa see also Jan-Georg Deutsch, *Emancipation without Abolition in German East Africa c. 1884-1914* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2006); Thaddeus Sunseri, *Wielding the Ax: State Forestry and Social Conflict in Tanzania, 1820–2000* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2009).

[91] Thaddeus Sunseri, *Vilimani: Labor Migration and Rural Change in Early Colonial Tanzania* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2002), 2.

use of violence as a form of discipline. German planters were notorious for their use of violence, which discouraged Africans from seeking employment as plantation laborers.[92]

Part of the reason why German planters began offering better terms was because Africans successfully resisted other attempts to force them to the plantations. Various forms of compulsion, such as taxation, proved ineffective. At the same time, rampant abuse forced many people to resist by simply fleeing the plantations.[93] Thus, by discussing the ways in which Africans exercised their agency within the colonial labor regime, Sunseri also does an excellent job of highlighting the limits and flaws of the German colonial economy.

Yet, in his discussion of the various ways in which Germans tried to recruit African laborers, Sunseri never discusses the participation of missionaries in these efforts. By placing Bodelschwingh's philosophy of *Arbeitserziehung* at the heart of their mission in the Usambara highlands, the Bethel missionaries were considered to be a valuable ally in the effort to force Africans to comply with German labor demands. Even though the missionaries were extremely hesitant to work too closely with the planters, whose focus on profits trumped any interest they had in facilitating moral reform, some colonial officials nevertheless held out hope that by focusing on inner-reform the missionaries could succeed where the colonial authority had repeatedly failed. Even though they were also largely ineffective, Sunseri never discusses the entry of Protestant missionaries into these debates or the reasons why their efforts failed.

Because missionaries interacted with local populations on a much more intimate level than colonial administrators, they have occupied a special place within the

[92] Ibid., 54–55.
[93] Ibid., 62–71.

historiography of European colonialisms. Often, their histories can tell us just as much about the lives of native peoples as they can about the actions and motivations of colonists. For years, however, their histories were of limited value to the critical historian. While missionaries published an extraordinary amount of material, their publications were frequently hagiographic and apologetic.[94] They almost never treated their experiences critically. Even more recent studies of this nature, such as Gustav Menzel's incredibly detailed and well researched account of the Bethel Mission, fail to provide any critical analysis of the Mission and its work in East Africa.[95]

The first major critical study of German missionaries in East Africa by a professionally trained historian was Marcia Wright's *German Missions in Tanganyika* (1971).[96] Despite its relatively limited source base, Wright's study is still valuable and relevant to contemporary discussions on German missionaries. It was one of the first to acknowledge that the histories of missionaries and the communities in which they worked are closely entwined, and that the two cannot be treated as separate and distinct subjects of analysis. At the same time, more than forty years after its initial publication it remains

---

[94] For example, see Hildegard Waltenberg, *Lutindi, die Stadt auf dem Berge* (Bielefeld: H. Waltenberg, 1997); Ernst Johanssen, *Führung und Erfahrung in 40 jährigem Missionsdienst*, 3 volumes (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1934); Curt Ronicke, *Afrika Ruft! Ein Gang über die Felder der Bethelmission in Ostafrika* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, n.d.); Walter Trittelvitz, *Nicht so langsam! Missionserinnerungen an Vater Bodelschwingh* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1929); Paul Döring, *Morgendämmerung in Deutsch-Ostafrika: Ein Rundgang durch die ostafrikanische Mission* (Berlin: Verlag Martin Warneck, 1901), 76–68; Gustav von Bodelschwingh, *Friedrich v. Bodelschwingh: Ein Lebensbild*, 12th edition (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1949), 261–62.

[95] Gustav Menzel, *Die Bethel-Mission: Aus 100 Jahren Missionsgeschichte* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1986); Menzel served with the Rheinisch Mission. For his study on the Rheinisch Mission see Gustav Menzel, *Die Rheinisch Mission: Aus 100 Jahren Missionsgeschichte* (Wuppertal: Verlag der Vereinigten Evangelischen Mission, 1978).

[96] Marcia Wright, *German Missions in Tanganyika: 1891–1941: Lutherans and Moravians in the Southern Highlands* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971). In a similar vein to Wright's study, see also Horst Gründer, *Christliche Mission und deutscher Imperialismus: Eine politische Geschichte ihrer Beziehungen während der deutschen Kolonialzeit (1884–1914) under besonderer Berücksichtigung Afrikas und Chinas* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1982), 215–16.
For other works by Marcia Wright see also *Strategies of Slaves and Women: Life Stories from East Central Africa* (New York: L. Barber Press, 1993).

one of the few studies of German missionaries written in English. While Wright's history barely scratches the surface, it is nevertheless valuable because it explores not only how missionaries interacted with African communities, but also how the different German missionary organizations interacted with each other.

Wright stressed that missionary histories were vital to understanding the larger history of European colonization because the stories of missionaries were tightly entwined with those of the communities in which they lived. The importance of this relationship was developed even further through the magisterial work of John and Jean Comaroff on the activities of British, Protestant missionaries in Southern Africa. In their two-volume study *Of Revelation and Revolution*, the Comaroffs examine the role played by missionaries in the larger colonizing project. In so doing, they demonstrate the elaborate and extensive processes of exchange that occurred as missionaries colonized the "consciousness" of the Africans they encountered by drawing them into conversations where Africans encountered concepts and ideas used by the Europeans.[97] The ground-breaking work by the Comaroffs has led to a wealth of studies exploring the myriad of ways in which British missionaries interacted with African societies.[98]

Sadly, the Comaroffs' thesis has not led to a similar proliferation in the study of German missionaries in Africa. Not until most recently have the activities of German missionaries in Africa been the subject of critical inquiry. Just like the scholarship on Protestant administered social welfare, the main impetus behind the study of German

---

[97] See John Comaroff, Jean Comaroff, *Of Revelation and Revolution: Christianity, Colonialism and Consciousness in South Africa, Vol. 1* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991); John and Jean Comaroff, *Of Revelation and Revolution: The Dialectics of Modernity on a South African Frontier, Vol. 2* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997).

[98] For examples of the few of these studies that have been published, see Derek Peterson, *Creative Writing: Translation, Bookkeeping and the Work of Imagination in Colonial Kenya* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2004); Paul Stuart Landau, *The Realm of the Word: Language, Gender and Christianity in a Southern African Kingdom* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1995).

missionaries in East Africa has been the *Bethel Forschungsstelle* in Bielefeld. Its multivolume series on Bethel's various missions highlights the mission to East Africa and the relevance of the African mission to the larger goals of the community. While the essays are primarily focused on the European aspect of the mission, their extensive source base and critical approach distinguish them from the mission stories published at generations earlier.[99] At the same time, they also make a greater effort to tie the history of the colonial missions into the larger context of European history. For example, by examining how Bethel portrayed itself in publicity material, Ingo Stucke maintains that the mission to East Africa was central to the image that Bethel's leaders painted of the community back in Europe. Even as the community underwent astounding transformation during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, the mission to Africa was a nearly constant presence on which Bethel's leaders could rely to portray an image of stability.[100] Because of the mission's centrality to the larger identity of Bethel in Germany, Stucke argues that by extension it exercised a significant influence on the community in Bielefeld.

The most extensive analysis of the Bethel Mission, however, comes in the work of Thorsten Altena, whose contributions to the Bethel volumes form the basis of his

---

[99] See especially Thorsten Altena, "Grenzüberschreitungen: Zum Beziehungsgeflecht von Innerer und Äußerer Mission in den Anfangsjahren der Bethel-Mission," in *Bethels Mission (3) Mutterhaus, Mission und Pflege*, ed. Matthias Benad and Vicco von Bülow, 147–70 (Bielefeld: Luther-Verlag, 2003); Ingo Stucke, "Bethel-Gemeinde und Bethel-Mission: Rückwirkungen und Einflüsse der Äusseren Mission auf die diakonische "corporate identity" Bethels 1906–1946," in *Bethels Mission (3) Mutterhaus, Mission und Pflege*, ed. Matthias Benad and Vicco von Bülow, 171–252 (Bielefeld: Luther-Verlag, 2003); Thorsten Altena, "Missionare und Einheimische Gesellschaft: Zur Kulturbegegnung der Bethel-Mission in Deutsch-Ostafrika 1890-1916," in *Bethels Mission (1): Zwischen Epileptischenpflege und Heidenbekehrung. Beiträge zur Geschichte der v. Bodelschwinghschen Anstalten Bethel*, ed. Matthias Benad, 1–74 (Bielefeld: Luther Verlag, 2003); Hans-Walter Schmuhl, "Die Bethel-Mission in Ruanda (1907–1916): Informelle Kolonialherrschaft, sakrales Königtum und christliche Mission," in *Bethels Mission (1): Zwischen Epileptischenpflege und Heidenbekehrung. Beiträge zur Geschichte der v. Bodelschwinghschen Anstalten Bethel*, ed. Matthias Benad, 177–203 (Bielefeld: Luther Verlag, 2003)
[99] Menzel, *Die Bethel Mission*, 168–69.
[100] Stucke, "Bethel-Gemeinde und Bethel-Mission," 175.

comprehensive study of missionaries in East Africa, *Ein Hauflein Christen Mitten in Der Heidenwelt Des Dunklen Erdteils«: Zum Selbst- Und Fremdverstandnis Protestantischer Missionare Im Kolonialen*.[101] Examining all the major mission organizations in German colonial Africa, Altena's study is by far the most detailed and comprehensive study of German Protestant missionaries in Africa. With a particular interest in the backgrounds of missionaries and how that shaped their work in Africa, Altena clearly demonstrates the value of missionaries to the larger subject of colonial histories.[102] Their stories show how Europeans perceived Africans in a variety of ways and by no means adopted a singular colonial outlook. Thus, Altena stresses the importance of smaller local histories to understanding the larger process of colonialization.

These recent studies clearly demonstrate the centrality of missionary histories not only to the larger historiography of German imperialism, but also to the history of Modern Germany. Yet, the scholarship produced by the *Bethel Forschungsstelle* barely scratches the surface of the myriad of ways in which religion (in general), and missionaries (in particular) influenced modern European history. Through the arguments made by Stucke and Altena, it is clear that the missionaries in Africa influenced developments back in Bielefeld. Yet, their impact went far beyond shaping European perceptions of the colonies and the internal politics of Bethel.

The extent to which the colonies affected Europe is one of the primary questions raised by a new group of German historians. Led by Sebastian Conrad, Jürgen Osterhammel, and Andreas Eckert, they situate the history of German colonialism in the

---

[101] Thorsten Altena, *Ein Hauflein Christen Mitten in Der Heidenwelt Des Dunklen Erdteils: Zum Selbst- Und Fremdverstandnis Protestantischer Missionare Im Kolonialen* (Münster: Waxmann, 2003).
[102] Ibid., 5.

larger context of global history and globalization.[103] To this end, they argue that through its colonial empire, Germany was part of a much larger global network that had dramatic repercussions in Germany. In this sense, Germany's colonial project was part of a larger "pan-European project" in which Germany collaborated not only with other European powers, but also incorporated ideas from North America.[104] As Andrew Zimmerman describes, German colonial leaders took an active interest in the methods of cotton farmers in Alabama with the goal of using the approach as a model for their own network of plantations in Togo.[105] Although it was a failure, the interest demonstrates the extent to which German colonial leaders looked beyond Germany for ideas to develop their colonies.

In his *Globalisation and the Nation in Imperial Germany*, Conrad applies this approach to the Bodelschwingh's philosophy with an examination of the role of *Arbeitserziehung* in Bethel and its mission to Africa. He argues that the idea developed through a process of transfers between East Westphalia and East Africa, and that the interest Bethel's leaders displayed in eugenics resulted from the experiences of the missionaries in Africa.[106] Although, as this dissertation will demonstrate, Conrad reaches the wrong conclusion in the end, he is nevertheless correct to assert that those with experience outside Europe exercised incredible influence on processes within the metropole.

---

[103] Sebastian Conrad, *German Colonialism: A Short History*, trans. Sorcha O'Hagan (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012); Jürgen Osterhammel, *Kolonialismus: Geschichte, Formen, Folgen* (München: C. H. Beck Verlag, 2003); Andreas Eckert, *Kolonialismus* (Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer Verlag, 2006).
[104] Conrad, *German Colonialism*, 14.
[105] Andrew Zimmerman, *Alabama in Africa: Booker T. Washington, the German Empire, and the Globalization of the New South* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010).
[106] Sebastian Conrad, *Globalisation and the Nation in Imperial Germany*, trans. Sorcha O'Hagan (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 77–143.

Ultimately, this dissertation follows in the footsteps of Conrad, Osterhammel and Eckert as it builds on this dynamic body of literature by examining the influence of missionaries in East Africa on the development of Protestant social welfare. Using the idea of *Arbeitserziehung,* this dissertation argues that it developed across national boundaries and that individuals with experience in the colonies helped to shape the process. Thus, it argues that Protestant social welfare in Germany clearly developed within a larger global network.

***

Traditionally, historians have viewed the decades before World War I as a period of heightened nationalist tensions and abrupt transformations. Yet as the historian Sebastian Conrad noted, "the late nineteenth century was an era of worldwide interaction and exchange."[107] To this end, some historians have sought to move beyond the nation state as a category of analysis in order to understand better larger processes, institutions and ideas. The development of this new approach to studying history, called transnational history, has dramatically transformed the way scholars approach the study of modern Europe. Nowhere is this more evident than in the study of European imperialism.

As Jürgen Kocka and Heinz-Gerhard Haupt note, transnational history has its roots in the larger context of comparative history. Yet while the comparative approach "separates the units of comparison" in order to uncover similarities and differences, transnational approaches "stress the connections, the continuity, the belonging-together, the hybridity of observable spaces or analytical units and reject distinguishing them

[107] Sebastian Conrad, *Globalisation and the Nation in Imperial Germany*, trans. Sorcha O'Hagan (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 1; see also Sebastian Conrad and Dominic Sachsenmaier, "Introduction: Competing Visions of World Order: Global Moments and Movements, 1880s–1930s," in *Competing Visions of World Order: Global Moments and Movements, 1880s–1930s*, ed. Sebastian Conrad and Dominic Sachsenmaier, 1–25 (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

clearly."[108] At the same time, while scholarly engagement with the concept of transnationalism is still a relatively recent phenomenon of the past decade, the concept was first articulated by the French scholar Michel Espagne in the mid-1990s.[109] Interested in the relationship between Germany and France within the larger context of European history, Espagne insisted that the mere comparison of processes within nation states was insufficient. Instead, one needed to focus on the process of transfer across national boundaries in order to gain a more fruitful perspective.

Espagne's larger point about the need to focus on the history of transfers proved to be the basis of a dynamic roundtable discussion in the German journal *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* that sought to establish the potentials and limits of transnational history. In this context, the contributions by Jürgen Osterhammel and Sebastian Conrad stand out as particularly thoughtful. Although he does not call for the total abandonment of the nation as a category of analysis, Osterhammel builds off of Espagne's call for more transfer history by urging scholars not to limit themselves to European comparisons.[110] Rather, transnational studies can greatly enhance our understanding of processes between states that are geographically distant from one another; especially European and non-European

[108] Jürgen Kocka and Heinz-Gerhard Haupt, "Comparison and Beyond: Traditions, Scope and Perspectives of Comparative History," in *Comparative and Transnational History: Central European Approaches and New Perspectives*, ed. Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka, 1–30 (New York: Berghan Books, 2009), 20.

[109] Hartmut Kaelble, "Between Comparison and Transfers – and What Now? A French-German Debate," in *Comparative and Transnational History: Central European Approaches and New Perspectives*, ed. Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka, 33–38 (New York: Berghan Books, 2009), 33–34. This essay originally appeared as "Die Debatte über Vergleich und Transfer und was jetzt?" in Geschichte.transnational (Forum), http://geschichte-transnational-clioonline.net/forum/id=574&type=diskussionen, 8 February 2005. See also Michel Espagne, "Kulturtransfer und Fachgeschichte der Geisteswissenschaften," *Comparativ* 10 (2000): 42–61; Michel Espagne, "Sur les limites du comparatisme en histoire culturelle," *Genèses* 17 (1994): 112–21.

[110] See Jürgen Osterhammel, "Transnationale Gesellschaftsgeschichte: Erweiterung oder Alternative?", *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 27 (2001): 464–79. For a more detailed discussion of transnationalism see Jürgen Osterhammel, *Geschichtswissenschaft jenseits des Nationalstaats. Studien zu Beziehungsgeschichte und Zivilisationsvergleich* (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 2001).

nations. "To look beyond Germany or even beyond Europe does not necessarily mean forfeiting one's own scholarly integrity and entering the extremely ambitious world of universal synthesis."[111]

No historian has done more to advocate a transnational approach to German history than Sebastian Conrad. In his contribution to the *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* forum he insists that a transnational approach to the study of history is absolutely essential to painting a more complete picture of European history. "Without consideration for intercultural and colonial experiences within historical study, the understanding of German/European history necessarily remains partial and incomplete."[112] In his estimation, this is particularly applicable to the history of European nations and their colonies. "In this way, it is widely neglected that the emergence and development of modern societies in Europe are constitutively bound to their colonial interventions."[113] This is especially true of Germany. Although the duration of German colonialism was relatively short when compared to that of other European colonial powers that does not mean its impact on German society was any smaller.

Domestically, colonialism had a dramatic impact on German politics and cultural practices during the last decade of the nineteenth century.[114] Popular associations and pressure groups formed to push the government to take a more active and prominent role

---

[111] Jürgen Osterhammel, "A 'Transnational' History of Society: Continuity or New Departure?," in *Comparative and Transnational History: Central European Approaches and New Perspectives*, ed. Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka, 39–51 (New York: Berghan Books, 2009), 49. This is a revised and translated version of Osterhammel's article in *Geschichte und Gesellschaft.*

[112] Sebastian Conrad, "Double Marginalization: A Plea for a Transnational Perspective on German History," in *Comparative and Transnational History: Central European Approaches and New Perspectives*, ed. Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka, 52–76 (New York: Berghan Books, 2009), 53. For the original see Sebastian Conrad, "Doppelte Marginalisierung. Plädoyer für eine transnationale Perspektive auf die deutsche Geschichte," *Geschichte & Gesellschaft* 28 (2002): 145–69.

[113] Ibid., 55.

[114] Ibid., 63–64.

in colonization.[115] At the same time colonialism captured the public's imagination, leading to a marked increase in the popularity of museums and so-called *Völkerschauen.*[116] These institutions, half museum and half zoo, featured individuals brought to Germany from the colonies and placed in exhibits meant to mimic their homelands for the entertainment of Germans.

Even more important for Conrad is the potential opportunities transnationalism offers as a way to explore the idea of colonies as laboratories of modernity. "The colonial situation appeared here in many ways as an ideal testing ground for implementing large scale reform plans and societal interventions."[117] Reformers could implement their visions in the colonies without having to worry about the potential resistance from Europeans. If the experiment worked, the plan could then be implemented on a wider scale back in Europe. Conrad discusses urban planners as one group that seized upon the colonies as a space in which they could implement their visions for city planning.[118]

Of course not all the European experiments were so harmless. As Hannah Arendt famously posited in her landmark *Origins of Totalitarianism*, the use of the concentration camp as a tool to separate and sort people had its origins in British colonial policies in South Africa and India.[119] While Arendt never empirically linked colonial practices with those of the Nazis, the assertion has nevertheless spawned a flood of studies seeking to

---

[115] See for example, Roger Chickering, *We Men Who Feel Most German. A Cultural Study of the Pan-German League, 1886–1914* (Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1984).
[116] See especially Andrew Zimmerman, *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 15–37.
[117] Conrad, "Double Marginalization," 59.
[118] Ibid., 60. For examples see Gwendolyn Wright, "Tradition in the Service of Modernity. Architecture and Urbanism in French Colonial Policy, 1900–1930," *Journal of Modern History* 59 (1987): 291–316; Gwendolyn Wright, *The Politics of Design in French Colonial Urbanism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).
[119] Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (New York: Harcourt, 1994), 440.

make connections between the Herero Genocide in German Southwest Africa (Namibia) and the Holocaust.[120] Conrad himself tries to make a similar connection by linking the Bethel Mission's use of *Arbeitserziehung* in East Africa to the subsequent growth in popularity of eugenics after 1918.[121] However, like Arendt he does not provide any firm empirical link between the Bethel Missionaries and the subsequent growth of eugenics in Germany.

The roundtable in *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* spurred a dramatic wave of discussion among historians about not only what transnationalism means, but how it could be applied practically in the form of an empirical study. Conrad and Osterhammel continued to build on their contributions to the *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* forum with their thought provoking *Das Kaiserreich transnational*, a volume that used the German nation state as a space to analyze actions and processes that included Germany as part of a larger network.[122] They are keen to point out that none of the contributions to the project view the German state as an "actor," but rather as a space in which action and experiences take place.[123]

In 2006, the website H-German created a forum for transnational history and solicited position papers from several prominent scholars as a foundation for the discussion. Of the contributions, those by Konrad H. Jarausch and Young-Sun Hong

---

[120] See Robert Gerwarth and Stephan Malinowski, "Der Holocaust als 'kolonialer Genozid'? Europäische Kolonialgewalt und nationalsozialistischer Vernichtungskrieg," *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 33 (2007): 439–66; Jürgen Zimmerer, *Von Windhuk nach Auschwitz? Beiträge zum Verhältnis von Kolonialismus und Holocaust* (Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2011).
[121] Sebastian Conrad, *Globalization and the Nation in Imperial Germany*, 77–143.
[122] Sebastian Conrad and Jürgen Osterhammel, eds., *Das Kaiserreich transnational: Deutschland in der Welt 1871–1914* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006). See also Jürgen Osterhammel, *Die Verwandlung der Welt: Eine Geschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (München: C H Beck, 2011)
[123] Sebastian Conrad and Jürgen Osterhammel, "Einleitung," in *Das Kaiserreich transnational: Deutschland in der Welt 1871–1914*, ed. Sebastian Conrad and Jürgen Osterhammel, 7–27 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 15.

stand out for the questions they raise about both the potential and limits of transnationalism. As Jarausch notes in his essay, one of the main flaws of transnational debates is the "vagueness" of the "rhetoric."[124] Proponents often have very different understandings of what transnational means, in part because the idea of the nation also has many different meanings. Therefore, before one can produce works of transnational history, one must clearly define what the term exactly means. To this end, Jarausch urges historians to adopt a more flexible understanding of transnationalism and its application to history. It "ought to be understood neither as a particular method nor as a fixed subject matter, but rather… as a fresh perspective, a set of questions to be asked about the past that cut across the nation state."[125] In a similar vein, Hong is skeptical about the overall applicability of transnationalism. Aside from a limited number of topics, "it has proven much more difficult to identify other factors that would yield comparative gains in knowledge."[126] Furthermore, many of the scholars who claim to do transnational history fail to address some of the larger underlying ideological questions about Germany's (and Europe's) larger relationship with the world.

Hong's larger concern about the applicability of transnational history certainly seems to be valid. Despite ongoing discussion about the meaning of transnationalism and why historians should apply it to their work, there are relatively few empirical studies outside of immigration history and those dealing with "hybrid identities" that demonstrate how these ideas can be translated into practice.[127] Again, the historian

---

[124] Konrad H. Jarausch, "Reflections on Transnational History," (2006). For a more detailed discussion of transnationalism by Jaruausch see also Konrad H. Jarausch, "Zeitgeschichte zwischen Nation und Europa: Eine transnationale Herausforderung," *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* B 39 (2004): 3–10.
[125] Jarausch, "Reflections on Transnational History."
[126] Young-sun Hong, "The Challenge of Transnational History," (2006)
[127] Hong, "The Challenge of Transnational History."

leading the charge in this respect is Sebastian Conrad. In addition to his superb monograph on Imperial Germany and globalization, Conrad also adopted a comparative/transnational approach to examine the similarities in the writing of history in postwar Germany and Japan.[128] Just as noteworthy is his survey of German colonialism.[129] In a very brief space, Conrad provides a thoughtful discussion of the entire German colonial empire with a specific emphasis on the ideas and processes that developed within that context. In this context he distinguishes the transnational aspect of his work by showing how these ideas affected both the colony and the metropole.

Some of the most challenging questions posed about transnationalism have come from scholars who are open to the idea, but want to ensure that it is utilized appropriately and in such a way that it opens up new and otherwise inaccessible doors of knowledge. Yet there are other historians who outright reject the notion of transnationalism as a novel and fundamentally new way of approaching history. Hans-Ulrich Wehler has been particularly critical of transnational histories for not being nearly as influential as scholars make them out to be. For example, he claims that historians have "grotesquely overemphasized" the influence of women settlers in SW Africa on gender structures in Germany.[130] In a nation of sixty four million people he argues that three hundred women in Africa were not nearly as influential as some historians contend. At the same time, citing themes like industrialization, imperialism and the development of the proletariat

[128] Sebastian Conrad, *The Quest for the Lost Nation: Writing History in Germany and Japan in the American Century*, translated by Alan Nothnagle (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010).
[129] Sebastian Conrad, *German Colonialism: A Short History,* trans. Sorcha O'Hagan (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012).
[130] Hans-Ulrich Wehler, "Transnationale Geschichte – die neue Königsweg historischer Forschung?" in *Transnationale Geschichte: Themen, Tendenzen und Theorien*, ed. Gunilla Budde, Sebastian Conrad, and Oliver Janz, 161–74 (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 2006), 164.

class, Wehler also insists that the idea of transnationalism is not nearly as new and unique as recent advocates claim.

To support his point about the flaws of transnational history, Wehler seizes upon Conrad's analysis of the Bethel Mission in East Africa, and his assertion that its use of *Arbeitserziehung* is a possible link between German colonial experiences and later Nazi eugenic policies, in order to demonstrate the flaws of transnational history. While the claim sounds good, Conrad never provides any concrete evidence to link the two. For Wehler, the lack of evidence is a sign that the larger argument is "not plausible," which in turn represents a "fundamental problem" with the larger transnational approach.[131] In the hopes of establishing larger connections between colonies and the metropole, transnational histories make claims that are unsustainable.

On one level, Wehler is correct. As this dissertation will argue, empirical evidence ultimately does not support Conrad's belief that the Bethel Mission's use of *Arbeitserziehung* in Africa helps to connect the colonial experience with later Nazi racial policies. In fact, the Bethel missionaries returned home as staunch opponents of eugenic ideas. Yet, even though Conrad's conclusion is flawed the larger point behind his argument nevertheless holds true; Bethel missionaries had a significant influence on postwar debates over eugenics among German Protestants. Bethel missionaries returned from Africa in 1918 as staunch opponents of eugenics and advocated forcefully against their introduction at Bethel.

In this sense, this dissertation engages with the larger concerns raised by transnational historians. Looking at the use of work in the development of poor relief policies in Germany, I contend that this process cannot be understood properly until one

[131] Ibid., 169.

looks at the influence of the colonial experience on shaping Protestant attitudes to eugenics. Missionary experiences both in Europe and in Africa had a significant impact on shaping the defining aspects of Bodelschwingh's greater philosophy. When the Bethel missionaries traveled to East Africa, their work and greater goals were heavily influenced by Bodelschwingh. Their interaction with the Shambala in local villages only reinforced their belief that biology did not inform one's capacity to work. At the same time they adamantly believed Bodelschwingh's philosophy was central to their efforts at building stable communities of Christian converts in Usambara. Upon retruning to Europe in 1918, they actively drew on this experience to argue against the adoption of eugenic practices at Bethel. Thus the Bethel missionaries exemplify the extent to which Germany was situated in a larger global network at the turn of the century, and how that relationship shaped developments within Germany.

Sources and Methodology

This dissertation uses both a comparative and transnational approach to examine the development of Protestant attitudes to social welfare (in particular poor relief policies) and eugenics in Germany during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It is comparative in the sense that it analyzes the attitudes of Protestants who served both in Germany and those in Africa to understand better how German Protestants became so receptive to the use of eugenics after 1918. I argue that those individuals who remained in Germany throughout their careers had fundamentally different experiences than those who joined the Mission and served in Africa, and that those experiences were integral to the formation of their views on eugenics.

At the same time, this dissertation also adopts a transnational approach. In the same vein as Sebastian Conrad, I contend that any study of social welfare that focuses solely on Germany (or even Europe) remains incomplete. Protestant ideas about social welfare were heavily informed by formative experiences outside of Germany. Johann Wichern, the founder of the Inner Mission, was profoundly affected by the dramatic impact of the 1848 revolutions across Europe. Friedrich von Bodelschwingh's philosophy was influenced heavily by Protestant missionary practices in Africa during the early nineteenth century as well as his own experience as a missionary in Paris. Furthermore, when missionaries from Bethel went to East Africa during the 1890s, they took Bodelschiwngh's philosophy with them and used it to mold Africans into loyal subjects of the German Empire. In this sense, they viewed Africans in the mission communities like the clients of the worker colonies. Upon returning to Europe in 1918, the Bethel missionaries returned to Germany just as devoted to Bodelschwingh's philosophy as when they left for Africa. They were horrified to discover that, in an attempt to remain relevant among social welfare providers in Germany, Bethel's leaders were seriously considering incorporating modern scientific methods like eugenics into their work. As a result, the returning missionaries formed the core resistance against eugenics in the Bethel community. Thus, I contend that this study is also transnational because the social welfare policies that emerged at Bethel during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were shaped by a combination of Bethel's work in Germany and the missionaries' experiences in Africa. Nothing in the experiences of the missionaries in Africa gave them any reason to abandon the work ethic when they returned to Germany. Because it examines the attitudes of actors in very different geographical settings, this

study utilizes a variety of sources. I began my archival research at the Federal Archives in Berlin-Lichterfelde, which is the main repository for material on social welfare debates at the federal level as well as the papers of the German colonial authority. These files were extremely helpful in understanding how Bethel's local concerns fit into larger federal discussions. On a domestic level they indicated the extent of federal support for Bodelschwingh's worker colony network, and in a colonial context they provided a better understanding of how Bethel's use of *Arbeitserziehung* related to larger colonial debates over the recruitment of workers.

Yet, the holdings of the Federal Archives were also of limited usefulness to the greater questions posed by the study. They contain almost no correspondence from Bodelschwingh and Bethel's leaders. This material is concentrated almost exclusively in the Main Archive of the von Bodelschwingh Institutions at Bethel (*Hauptarchiv der von Bodelschwinghschen Anstalten Bethel*) in Bielefeld and the United Evangelical Mission Archive (*Vereinte Evangelische Missionsarchiv*) in Wuppertal. The archive at Bethel is the main repository for material on the Bethel institutions. In addition to the personal correspondence of the Bodelschwingh family, it also contains numerous personnel files as well as material on the development of the worker colony at Wilhelmsdorf. Together, its holdings provide an excellent understanding of the central role played by *Arbeitserziehung* within the community as well as the reasons why eugenics made in-roads into the community.

When the missionaries returned from Africa after World War I, the vast majority of them went to work in Bethel's public relations office (Dankort). The office provided them with the best opportunity to continue their mission domestically as well as the

possibility of a quick exit if and when the time came for them to return to Africa. It was from this office that the missionaries carried out their campaign against eugenics at Bethel. The archival holdings from the Dankort, therefore, are the best source from which to understand the arguments made by the missionaries against eugenics and in defense of Bodelschwingh's philosophy.

As a part of this campaign, the missionaries in the Dankort pioneered a Protestant film industry at Bethel to spread their ideas in a new and dynamic manner. The Bethel archive is the sole repository of material on the activity of Bethel's film service. In addition to promotional materials and correspondence from the missionaries involved with the production of films it also contains the books and scripts for a number of the films produced by the institute, including those intended to portray Bethel's mission to the wider public. These books clearly indicate what values the missionaries wanted to stress and how they wanted to portray the use of modern science within the institution.

While the Bethel Archive contains some material on the mission in Africa, the lion share of material is contained in the Mission archive at Wuppertal. The archive at Wuppertal contains extensive personnel files on all of the Bethel missionaries which include correspondence with Europe and personal journals. Furthermore the archive at Wuppertal also contains large files on each of the individual mission stations. Taken together, these files provide the best understanding of how the missionaries in Africa thought about Bodelschwingh's philosophy and tried to incorporate it into the larger activity of the mission.

Equally important to the completion of this study are a wide variety of published primary sources. In his effort to lobby federal authorities to support his worker colony

initiative, Bodelschwingh was a prolific writer and published a seemingly endless stream of promotional material on the benefits of the worker colony. In addition to individual essays, he oversaw the publication of a journal (*Die Arbeiter-Kolonie/Der Wanderer*) in support of his position. Together, these publications are the best insight into how Bodelschwingh and his followers sought to use *Arbeitserziehung* within the Bethel institutions.

In order to maintain a strong level of support from the general population, Bethel also produced a variety of promotional pamphlets and journals. In this respect the serials *Bote von Bethel* and *Beth-El* stand out as particularly important for this study. Whenever someone made a financial donation to Bethel they received a copy of *Bote von Bethel* as an acknowledgement of their gift. Hoping to encourage future donations, the fifteen-page pamphlet contained a collection of stories about every facet of Bethel's mission. While at times repetitive (supporters liked to hear similar stories), the pamphlet clearly demonstrates how Bodelschwingh used his philosophy in the public promotion of the institution. In contrast to *Bote von Bethel*, *Beth-El* contained more extensive and intellectually challenging articles. Its articles engaged with questions surrounding the theoretical goals of Bethel's domestic mission as well as the attitudes and thoughts of missionaries in Africa about their experiences abroad.

Even more valuable for this study, however, is the wealth of material published by missionaries. The missionaries knew very early that the survival of their mission depended on the financial support of people back in Germany. To this end it was essential to raise public awareness about the mission it its activities. In order to help familiarize Germans with the mission, missionaries went to great lengths to tie their work

with that of the larger community back in Bielefeld. In this context they regularly discussed the importance of work as an aspect of their interaction with Africans. In addition to the numerous promotional volumes, the missionaries also produced two pamphlet series, *Licht im Dunkel* and *Lutindi Bote*, that were modeled heavily after the *Bote von Bethel* series.

Although the missionaries left Africa after World War I, that did not stop them from publishing new material about the Bethel mission. In addition to the traditional promotional volumes, several missionaries also compiled memoirs (both published and unpublished) about their experiences in Africa. These memoirs are invaluable resources as they not only provide a clear picture of the devotion missionaries had to Bodelschwingh's philosophy but also because they shed light (along with private correspondence) on how the missionaries understood their interactions with Africans.

While many of these published sources were widely accessible at the time of their publication, the ravages of time and war have greatly reduced their availability today. To this end, the libraries at the Bethel Main Archive, the *Staatsbibliothek* (Berlin), and the library at the *Archiv des Diakonischen Werkes* in Berlin-Dahlem were extremely valuable for their extensive holdings.

In the following chapter, this dissertation begins by exploring the evolution of Protestant social thought through the first half of the nineteenth century. It pays particular attention to the challenges for German Protestants posed by industrialization and the failed revolutions of 1848. An examination of this period demonstrates the extent to which Protestant social reformers were shell-shocked by the violence and upheaval of the era, and contends that these fears formed the impetus behind the formation of the

Innere Mission by Johann Wichern and the determination of social reformers to reintegrate disaffected members of the working class. Furthermore, through a discussion of Wichern's early interest in African missions and Bodelschwingh's service as a missionary in Paris during the 1850s, it also argues that Protestant social welfare policies were a transnational process as early as the first half of the nineteenth century.

Chapters three and four explore the development of Bodelschwingh's philosophy at Bethel through the early twentieth century. Building off of the previous chapter, they examine Bodelschwingh's deep concern with the growth of unemployed migrant workers and his determination to solve the problem with the establishment of worker colonies. Based on Bodelschwingh's experiences in Paris, the worker colonies were secluded labor camps that stressed Bodelschwingh's philosophy of work, responsibility, family and religion. After assuming control over the *Evangelische Mission nach Deutsch Ost Africa*, Bodelschwingh used the same philosophy that he developed in Germany.

Taken together, these chapters demonstrate the close connections between the domestic and foreign components of the mission. The missionaries in Africa were trained in the same manner as the social workers who stayed in Bielefeld, and worked to model their methods and mission stations after the community in Bethel. To this end I focus my attention most extensively on the station Lutindi, which more than any other station was intended to replicate Bethel. Furthermore, in both instances Bodelschwingh's philosophy was intended to transform individuals on the fringes of the greater German empire into loyal and productive members of the state. Thus, these chapters demonstrate that Bodelschwingh's larger social welfare philosophy was formed through experiences across two distinct geographic spaces.

The larger question with which this dissertation is concerned is the development of German Protestant attitudes to eugenics. From where, ultimately, did the impetus come to embrace eugenic policies, and what role did missionaries returning from Africa play in this process? Chapter five examines the evolution of Bodelschwingh's philosophy at the Bethel campus in Bielefeld from the early 1900s through the Nazi assumption of power in 1933. It argues that as the elder Bodelschwingh grew older and gradually withdrew from daily activities at Bethel, his son Friedrich von Bodelschwingh Jr., pursued a new course that stressed professionalization and a greater openness to modern science. This was a process that only grew stronger during the postwar era. At the same time, it argues that the devastating experiences of those who remained in Bethel from 1914-1918 caused Bethel's leaders to question the applicability and effectiveness of Bodelschwingh's traditional philosophy. Thus, the combination of increased professionalization and the challenges posed by World War I created a perfect storm in which Bethel's leaders suddenly became very open to adopting eugenic measures at Bethel. For them, it appeared to be a silver bullet solution to all their problems. Eugenic measures like sterilization could both reduce future social welfare costs while also eliminating future generations of people who would potentially harm the overall health of the national body.

What, then, about the missionaries? Chapter six looks at the activities of the missionaries in Germany after World War I, and in contrast to Conrad's perspective, argues that their worldviews remained largely unchanged by their experiences abroad. They returned just as committed to Bodelschwingh's larger social project as when they first left for Africa. The chapter begins by discussing their war time experiences, arguing

that they did not suffer to the same extent as those who remained in Germany. Thus, they never experienced anything that challenged their worldview. Upon returning to Germany, they remained deeply devoted to Bodelschwingh's ideas. Robbed of their mission communities in Africa, they devoted themselves to carrying out a *Heimatsmission* among communities of German Protestants that stressed the continued relevance of Bodelschwingh's philosophy and explicitly argued against the adoption of modern scientific ideas. They did this not only through extensive written publication but also by utilizing the new technology of film to pioneer a Protestant film industry.

Therefore, taken together, chapters five and six clearly demonstrate the benefit of adopting a transnational approach to the development of Protestant social welfare. They show that the Bethel missionaries, whose world view was shaped by their experiences in Africa, played an integral role in the postwar debates about eugenics as the only group at Bethel that actively protested the introduction of scientific treatments within the community. With nearly total control over the Bethel public relations department, they were also a group that was capable of exercising extensive influence in debates among German Protestants.

In his criticism of transnational histories, Hans-Ulrich Wehler argues that proponents of transnational history "grossly exaggerate" their claims in the attempt to make their stories appear more relevant to the history of modern Germany. Yet, as the case of Bethel demonstrates, the development of Bodelschwingh's philosophy of social welfare was transnational at its very core. His work in Bielefeld was heavily influenced by Protestant missionary work during the early nineteenth century as well as his work as a young missionary in Paris. Furthermore, the mission to East Africa was not only

central to the crystallization and preservation of Bodelschwingh's philosophy, but by virtue of their control over the Bethel Dankort they were able to reach large audiences around the world. In this sense it is by no means incorrect to argue that the history of Protestant social welfare in Germany is fundamentally incomplete until one gazes well beyond the borders of Europe.

Chapter 2: The Development of Modern Protestant Social Welfare and the Origins of the Bodelschwingh Philosophy

On 22 September 1848 Johann Hinrich Wichern, a Protestant social reformer from Hamburg, addressed the Protestant *Kirchentag* in Wittenberg on the question of social reform within the church. In what would become the most important speech of his career, Wichern painted a disturbing picture of the state of religious belief among Germany's working classes as he urged German Protestants to take a more vigorous, direct approach to the question of social reform. As revolutions broke out across Europe, Wichern spoke passionately about how ideologies like Communism were rapidly gaining influence over German workers, encouraging them to engage in "damnable, satanic agitation." While many workers "meekly let themselves be duped" by these new ideologies, Wichern argued that after attending rallies and meetings, these previously good, Protestant workers started to curse the monarchy and the Church. Unless Protestants awoke to the stark danger posed by Communism and radically changed the way they approached social reform, Wichern feared that the church would lose the working classes forever.[132]

As Wichern's speech in 1848 clearly illustrates, German Protestants were deeply concerned about the social impact of the revolutions. At the same time, they understood that the laws and institutions that structured poor relief during the previous century were inadequate for the needs of a rapidly changing society. As Germany industrialized and people migrated to cities in search of work, a variety of groups pressured the state to

---

[132] Johann Hincrich Wichern, "Address on Friday, September 22, 1848," in *The Spirituality of the German Awakening*, ed. David Crowner and Gerald Christianson (New York: Paulist Press, 2003), 274.

create new legislation and institutions that could provide tangible aid to those people who were in the greatest danger of being overwhelmed by the tide of industrialization.

As Wichern was busy trying to mobilize German Protestants in response to the perceived threat posed by Communism and revolution, a young Friedrich von Bodelschwingh was deciding how we he could best serve the Lutheran church. While he wanted to become a missionary to Africa, his health posed to great a risk for such an adventure. Instead he settled for serving as a missionary to migrant German workers in Paris. Horrified by the poverty in which they lived, he quickly came to embrace many of the same principles that Wichern espoused. He believed that Protestant leaders needed to create closer bonds with their parishioners, and they needed to stress values like the work ethic, responsibility, and the importance of the church.

During the first half of the nineteenth century, German poor relief underwent further change as nascent industrialization and the resulting increased mobility of workers placed new strains on the way institutions like the churches and the state cared for the destitute. Furthermore, the failed revolutions of 1848 altered the way many Germans approached social questions like poverty. Horribly shaken by the revolutions, German Protestants believed that problems such as vagrancy resulted from a fundamental lack of religion in society. As a result, reformers like Wichern urged Protestants not only to preach to the impoverished urban masses, but to move in among them and help materially. Wichern's work ultimately reached its apex with the creation of the Inner Mission, an umbrella organization designed to coordinate the administration of Protestant social welfare across the German Confederation.

Following a brief discussion of the history and development of poor relief in continental Europe before 1800, this chapter will situate Protestant poor relief programs within the larger context of mid-nineteenth-century Germany. By focusing on the revolutions of 1848 and the impact of industrialization, it will contend that social reformers saw both revolution and increasing secularism as new dangers posed by poverty. To this end, the Revolutions scared Protestant leaders like Wichern to the point where they became convinced a new approach to poor relief provision was needed to prevent the outbreak of further revolution. This new approach stressed values like work and religion as a way to prevent new ideologies like Communism from seducing marginalized individuals.

After discussing the early efforts by Protestant leaders like Wichern, this chapter will conclude with an examination of Bodelschwingh's first encounter with urban poverty as a missionary in Paris. It will show that Bodelschwingh actively drew from Protestant missionary traditions in Africa as he first experimented with many of the ideas that would later go on to form the core aspects of his social welfare philosophy in Bielefeld during the decades before World War I. Thus, this chapter will firmly root Bodelschwingh's social welfare philosophy in the larger context of nineteenth-century poor relief. At the same time, by stressing the importance of missions to both Wichern and Bodelschwingh, it will show how missionary work in Africa played a key role in the development of Protestant social welfare policies from the very beginning. Later, after Bodelschwingh fully realized his social welfare vision at Bethel, he would assume control of a fledgling mission in East Africa to implement his ideas in the colonies.

Ultimately, these missionaries would play a vital role defending his philosophy after World War I when its viability was questioned by his successors.

***

Although the concept of work had a profound impact on the social welfare reforms of the nineteenth century, it was by no means a new innovation. In ancient Greece, people believed that hard work and productive farms were the basis for a successful society.[133] Even when one owned land, idleness and laziness begat poverty, as one did not make productive use of the land. As the poet Hesiod wrote: "Hunger is a completely fitting companion for shiftless men."[134] In a similar vein, early Christians also stressed the importance of hard work and the relationship between idleness and poverty.[135] They especially emphasized the writings of the Apostle Paul, who said: "For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat."[136] These attitudes would be vital to the creation of a close relationship between religious identity and the ability to work, especially among Protestants. The theology of both Luther and Calvin stressed the importance of hard work and order.[137] By the nineteenth century German Protestants were convinced that a strong Protestant faith was impossible without a corresponding work ethic.

---

[133] See especially Alison Burford, *Land and Labor in the Greek World* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993); see also Timothy Howe, *Pastoral Politics: Animals, Agriculture, and Society in Ancient Greece*, Publications of the Association of Ancient Historians, volume 9 (Claremont, California: Regina Books, 2008).

[134] Hesiod, "Works and Days," in *The Poems of Hesiod*, trans. R. M. Frazier, 91–142 (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1983), 111.

[135] Otto Gerhard Oexle, "Armut, Armutsbegriff und Armenfürsorge im Mittelalter," in *Soziale Sicherheit und Soziale Disziplinierung*, ed. Florian Tennstedt and Christoph Sachße, 73–100 (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1986), 73–75.

[136] 2 Thess. 3: 10. See also Bruce W. Longenecker, *Remember the Poor: Paul, Poverty and the Greco-Roman World* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company: 2010).

[137] The literature on this topic is vast. See most importantly Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. Talcott Parsons (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958). See also Gilbert C. Meilaender, ed., *Working: Its Meaning and its Limits* (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame

During the Middle Ages, the term poverty took on a variety of meanings and became somewhat ambiguous. While it described a person's material condition, it could be applied to any social class. Thus a priest, knight or peasant could all be described as poor when "perceived to be suffering something with regard to the normal condition of his or her respective social position."[138] Generally speaking, however, medieval Europeans distinguished between the so-called worthy (e.g. widows and orphans) and un-worthy poor. (e.g. able bodied beggars, and vagabonds).[139] The former were deserving of assistance, almost always provided by religious charities, the later were not.[140]

The understanding of poverty continued until 1348, when the Black Death first reached the shores of Europe, fundamentally changing the way Europeans administered social aid. Medieval historian Otto Gerhard Oexle writes that "The attention with which the authorities since the mid-fourteenth century observed the plague and the social problems caused by it, has recently rightly been characterized "as the crucial starting point" for all subsequent measures in the field of health monitoring."[141] This was especially true for the relationship between large landowners and the peasants who worked the land. As a result of the plague's staggering death rates, peasants suddenly found themselves in a position of power to renegotiate better wages and working

---

Press, 2000), 104-25; Jere Cohen, *Protestantism and Capitalism: The Mechanisms of Influence* (New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 2002); Ulrich H. J. Körtner, "Calvinism and Capitalism," in *John Calvin's Impact on Church and Society*, *1509–2009,* ed. Martin Ernst Hirzel and Martin Sallmann (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2009), 159–74.

[138] Carter Lindberg, *Beyond Charity: Reformation Initiatives for the Poor* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 19. For a selection of primary source material see 173–85.

[139] For more see Volker Hunecke, "Ueberlegungen zur Geschichte der Armut im vorindustriellen Europa," *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 9 (1982): 480–512.

[140] For more on this distinction during the late Middle Ages see Franz Irsigler, "Bettler und Dirnen in der staedtischen Gesellschaft des 14.-16. Jahrhunderts," in *Aspects of Poverty in Early Modern Europe*, vol. 2, edited by Thomas Riis, 179–91 (Odense: Odense University Press, 1986).

[141] Otto Gerhard Oexle, "Armut, Armutsbegriff und Armenfürsorge im Mittelalter," in *Soziale Sicherheit und Soziale Disziplinierung*, ed. Florian Tennstedt and Christoph Sachße (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1986), 88.

conditions.[142] Yet, in the process, they also redefined the relationship between work and poverty.[143] Both the English King Edward III (June, 1349) and the French King Jean II (February, 1350) issued proclamations explicitly stating they would not tolerate the persistent begging and idleness of otherwise healthy men. Edward's edict not only threatened beggars with imprisonment, but also prescribed punishments for those people caught providing alms to beggars.[144]

Within the German-speaking lands, Joel Harrington argues that the city of Nuremberg was the "undisputed pioneer" of late medieval poor law reform.[145] Determined to see that charity reached those who were most in need, in 1370 the city passed the first begging ordinance in the Holy Roman Empire, requiring beggars to receive governmental permission in order to seek help within the city's limits. In 1478 the city passed a "more ambitious" ordinance that became a "central precept that would guide all poor and begging policy for the next three centuries."[146] Like the earlier ordinance, it acknowledged the need to care for local beggars. However, it expressed concern that as the city continued to expand, it would be harder to identify people who genuinely needed charity.[147] Because the act of giving alms was "praiseworthy,

---

[142] For example see Norman F. Cantor, *In the Wake of the Plague: The Black Death and the World It Made* (New York: The Free Press, 2001), 63–100; Bronislaw Geremek, *Poverty: A History* (Cambridge: Blackwell, 1994), 73–119.

[143] Ibid., 88; see also J. M. W. Bean, "The Black Death: The Crisis and its Social and Economic Consequences," in *The Black Death: The Impact of the Fourteenth-Century Plague*, ed. Daniel Williman, 23-38 (Binghamton, New York: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1982); Norman F. Cantor, *In the Wake of the Plague: The Black Death and the World it Made* (New York: Free Press, 2001)

[144] Otto Gerhard Oexle, "Armut, Armutsbegriff und Armenfürsorge im Mittelalter," in *Soziale Sicherheit und Soziale Disziplinierung*, ed. Florian Tennstedt and Christoph Sachße (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1986), 89; Geremek, *Poverty*, 82–83.

[145] Joel F. Harrington, "Escape from the Great Confinement: The Genealogy of a German Workhouse" *Journal of Modern History* 71, no. 2 (1999): 308–45, at 320.

[146] Ibid., 320.

[147] Text reprinted in Sachße and Tennstedt, *Geschichte der Armenfürsorge in Deutschland Band I: Vom Spätmittelalter bis zum 1. Weltkrieg* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer GmbH, 1998), 64–66.

meritorious and virtuous," it was even more important to ensure that charity only went to those most in need.[148]

The goal of the 1478 ordinance was not only to prevent undeserving people who were not native to Nuremberg from taking advantage of the city's charity. People capable of working were told that they would no longer be permitted to "sit lazily in front of the churches begging on workdays, but rather they should… perform other work that they are capable of doing."[149] At the same time, the council also expressed an interest in preventing poverty. The ordinance stated that the children of beggars should be taught a trade or useful skill as a way to get them off the streets, thus removing them from the cycle of poverty. Thus many of the elements central to modern forms of poor relief were already present in late medieval Nuremberg and other German-speaking cities.[150]

Although contemporary historians have de-emphasized the Reformation's influence on the ways in which Europeans delivered poor relief, it was nevertheless important for the way it reframed the social question. As Larry Frohman observes, the creation of the term vagrancy during the fifteenth century "marked the crystallization" of the social question for early modern Europeans.[151] So-called vagrants were not only seen as morally deviant, but also as criminals and potentially major threats to social order.[152] In central Europe, marauding bands of soldiers aggressively sought help in the countryside during the Thirty Years War.[153] Therefore, social reformers made a point of trying to integrate restrictions on begging into their larger program of social reform.

---

[148] Ibid., 64–66.
[149] Ibid., 64–66.
[150] See especially Robert Jütte, *Poverty and Deviance in Early Modern Europe* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 100–10.
[151] Larry Frohman, *Poor Relief and Welfare in Germany from the Reformation to World War I* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 16.
[152] Jütte, *Poverty and Deviance in Early Modern Europe*, 146–50.
[153] Frohman, *Poor Relief and Welfare in Germany*, 38.

Work, specifically the ability to do work, became a criterion for distinguishing between the deserving (those who were willing to work) and the undeserving (those unwilling to work) poor.[154] Only those who could demonstrate, through evidence of regular employment, a history of a consistently strong work ethic would be rewarded with charity when necessary.

At the same time, in an attempt to discourage vagrancy, early modern social reformers devised a variety of strategies to marginalize deviant individuals. In some cases this was as simple as social stigmatization. Authorities publicly distinguished between the deserving and undeserving poor in an attempt to demonstrate that the deviant poor had no place in society. Yet other reformers believed that, because of the threat they posed to social order, more drastic measures were needed to control the vagabonds. Many authorities believed that deviancy resulted from idleness, and that vagrants had to be confined to a location that stressed hard and regular labor. Such a solution would simultaneously protect the rest of the population and rehabilitate the deviant individual.[155]

To this end, the sixteenth century saw the creation of the workhouse, an innovation that would eventually dominate European poor relief through the early nineteenth century. While the first workhouse, London's Bridewell institution, appeared in 1555, it was the first continental institution in Amsterdam, founded forty years later in 1596, which had a greater impact on the German lands.[156] One could find the first German work houses (the Bremen workhouse opened in 1609) almost exclusively in cities that belonged to the Hanseatic League. Not only were Hansa cities richer than

[154] Ibid., 16.
[155] Jütte, *Poverty and Deviance in Early Modern Europe*, 158–77.
[156] Frohman, *Poor Relief and Welfare in Germany*, 35; Sachße and Tennstedt, *Geschichte der Armenfürsorge I*, 113; For more on vagrancy in early modern England see A.L. Beier, *Masterless Men: The Vagrancy Problem in England, 1560–1640* (New York: Routlege, 1985).

average, enabling them to fund larger projects, but their close trading relationship with Amsterdam exposed them to ideas such as the work house much earlier than other German cities.

Like other western Europeans, Germans found the workhouse attractive because it could both rehabilitate and discipline the deviant poor. Reformers believed that they could cure laziness (and by extension eliminate vagrancy) by placing inmates in a heavily regulated environment that emphasized near constant activity. The typical workday began at five in the morning and ended at eight in the evening. During this time workers received only brief meal breaks.[157] As Frohman also notes, the labor performed was "monotonous, physically demanding, and performed under unhealthy conditions, often intentionally so."[158] In Amsterdam, for example, "recalcitrant workers" were confined to a basement that was then subsequently flooded with water. The only way individuals could avoid drowning was to work a hand pump.[159] Thus they became acclimated to regular work while also learning that physical labor was key to survival. Yet there was also a more practical reason why administrators focused on physical labor. Although the primary goal of the workhouse was to reform the character of the inmate, they also needed to ensure that the house was a profitable venture. Therefore, the economic goals of the institution frequently superseded the pedagogical goals, and the greater purpose of *Arbeitserziehung* was lost in an attempt to turn a profit.[160]

For the next two hundred years, through the late eighteenth century, German poor relief changed very little. Authorities remained focused on restricting and marginalizing

---

[157] Ibid., 118. For a reprinted "*Hausordnung*" of a work house see Sachße and Tennstedt, *Geschichte der Armenfürsorge I*, 164–67.
[158] Frohman, *Poor Relief and Welfare in Germany*, 39.
[159] Geremek, *Poverty*, 219.
[160] Frohman, *Poor Relief and Welfare in Germany*, 40.

the deviant poor through a "monotonous repetition of prohibitions on begging." At the same time the workhouse remained the predominant institution to combat poverty.[161] Yet, by the turn of the nineteenth century, with the development of the industrial revolution, some welfare providers came to view poor relief as not only immoral but also unnecessary. Within the context of a free labor market, anyone could theoretically find a job, meaning that only the truly lazy would remain without work. [162]

Yet industrialization and the changes it brought to the labor market would eventually result in several major social and political changes that would converge to form a massive crisis by the middle of the nineteenth century. The first development concerned the dramatic population growth in the German speaking lands. The German population in 1750 stood roughly between 16-18 million people. By 1800 it had increased to 22-24 million, and by 1900 it had more than doubled to 56 million. The population grew faster than the economy, producing severe social and economic strains.[163] This rapid growth, combined with the need so search for work in factories, resulted in a major demographic shift as large numbers of people moved from rural to urban areas in search of work in the factories.[164]

As these new arrivals quickly discovered though, life in the city was harsh and brutal, even in the best of times. In periods of economic distress, conditions were almost unbearable. As Sachße and Tennstedt indicate, urban life during the first half of the

---

[161] Ibid., 41.
[162] Ibid., 51.
[163] Sachße and Tennstedt, *Geschichte der Armenfürsorge I*, 181.
[164] Andrew Lees and Lynn Hollen Lees, *Cities and the Making of Modern Europe, 1750–1914* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 48–49. For more on the growth of cities before 1800 see especially Jan de Vries, *European Urbanization: 1500–1800* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1984). For rural to urban migration in nineteenth century Germany see Steve Hochstadt, *Mobility and Modernity: Migration in Germany, 1820–1989* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999), 107–216; James H. Jackson Jr., *Migration and Urbanization in the Ruhr Valley, 1821–1914* (Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1997).

nineteenth century was absolutely miserable. "The life of the people was constant hunger."[165] While the economic environment in Germany following the Napoleonic wars was generally poor, it was particularly devastating for the German textile industry. Using the advantage they had built up over the previous decades, the English textile manufacturers successfully destroyed their German competition following Napoleon's defeat in 1815.[166] This development had a particularly detrimental effect on the cities because unemployment skyrocketed. At the same time, the cities lacked any type of comprehensive poor relief network to ease the burdens of those who now found themselves hungry and unemployed.

Gradually, the problems in the cities spilled over into the surrounding rural areas as people searched desperately for food. At first though, the rural population remained insulated from the growing chaos and panic in the cities. Throughout the early 1800's, rural people did not notice a marked increase in the number of beggars arriving from the cities and, therefore, maintained their traditional institutions of poor relief. These institutions operated on the premise that it was the duty of a community to care for its own poor residents, but that it was not obligated to assist outsiders. As Sachße and Tennstedt indicate though, the concurrent expansion of the German rail network provided an unprecedented challenge to this method of assistance. Unable to find aid in the cities, these so-called "Losleute had increased significantly through the construction of railways and boulevards, as well as the improvement of agriculture in recent years." One estimate stated that this group had grown to one-fifth of the total population, and they easily

---

[165] Sachße and Tennstedt, *Geschichte der Armenfürsorge I*,192.
[166] Ibid., 190.

overwhelmed the outdated relief structures of the villages.[167] As a result, villages refused to provide the poor with any help whatsoever. As far as rural villagers were concerned, the newly arrived poor individuals would not contribute anything to the community economically and, therefore, would only be a financial burden.[168] Therefore, local authorities immediately sent them back to the city with no assistance.

The inadequacies of German poverty relief during the early nineteenth century are best illustrated by the Prussian example. In 1794, the Prussian state took responsibility for poor relief through the *Allgemeines Landrecht,* which remained the foundation of Prussian poor relief through the mid-1800s. Yet, despite its willingness to regulate poor relief, it made local communities responsible for provision. Adopting the *Heimatprinzip*, the 1794 law stated that it was the obligation of "the community of origin" to care for an impoverished individual. While the law did stipulate that residency in single community for three years would also entitle an individual to assistance, the fluidity of the labor market made it very difficult for individuals to meet this requirement. Furthermore, smaller towns and villages frequently found themselves overwhelmed by the costs of caring for individuals while they determined who was responsible for providing assistance.[169] The law also had the effect of firmly separating poverty from "all its previous religious significance." Instead of poverty as "a fate determined by God," the *Allgemeines Landrecht* held that it resulted from personal defects possessed by the poor themselves. Thus, the able bodied poor were stigmatized as deviant and unworthy of aid

---

[167] Ibid., 202.
[168] Ibid., 202.
[169] Fritz Dross, "Health Care Provision and Poor Relief in Enlightenment and 19[tth] Century Prussia," in *Health Care and Poor Relief in 18th Century Northern Europe,* ed. Ole Peter Grell, Andrew Cunningham, and Robert Jütte, 69–119 (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2002), 74–75.

as communities concentrated their efforts on caring for the sick poor with the goal of re-integrating them into the work force. [170]

Ultimately, the combination of increased mobility, higher unemployment, and the dire living conditions in cities rendered the German poor relief system nearly totally ineffective. Although a series of subsequent laws tried to adapt poor relief administration to meet these challenges, it was clear that a more substantial overhaul was needed. Unable to obtain assistance in their communities of residence, the unemployed poor increasingly rode the rails in search of help by the middle of the century. As Tennstedt and Sachße note, the expansion of the German rail network ultimately had the effect of "channeling" the "internal migration of workers" so that the vast majority of poor people ended up concentrated in suburbs just outside the major industrial cities.[171] The conditions in these suburbs were frequently deplorable and only served to further harm the prospects of the unemployed, as living just outside the cities prevented them from formally meeting the three-year residency requirement to receive poor relief from a local community. By 1848, there were approximately one million unemployed workers in this predicament.[172]

For its part, the state did not do much to improve materially the lot of the impoverished. By discriminating against the poor and refusing to provide them with assistance it hoped to make jobs attractive at lower wages. Wages were so low that a large portion of the working population lived on the edge of poverty.[173] Furthermore, in order to force workers to accept low paying jobs, the amounts given to aid recipients

---

[170] Ibid., 75–76.
[171] Sachße and Tennstedt, *Geschichte der Armenfürsorge I,* 205.
[172] Ibid., 207.
[173] Ibid., 208.

were purposely left lower than working wages. When the state finally loosened restrictions on mobility in 1842, it simultaneously undercut an individual's ability to seek assistance by allowing municipalities to judge whether or not one was worthy of assistance, should the individual end up needing help.[174] In this sense, they were both "judge and witness in their own case."[175]

As Larry Frohman notes, both reformers and civil authorities during the Vormärz era were primarily concerned with the root causes of poverty and its potential social consequences. Rather than actually help the poor, the poor relief laws were intended to reduce criminal activity and protect smaller towns from poor migrant workers.[176] They viewed the "culture of pauperism" as the "antithesis of civil society."[177] In addition to being a public burden, the poor were also ostracized as immoral criminals who threatened social stability and cohesion. Indeed, conservative social reformers would hold them primarily responsible for the revolutionary turmoil during the middle of the century.[178] Numerous articles and journals repeatedly drove home this point as they emphasized the moral failings of the poor. For example, in 1846, the Brockhaus *Conversations-Lexikon* noted that paupers had "no prospects of improvement," despite the amount of work they did. It went on to state that this group "only sinks deeper and deeper into lethargy and brutality, temptation, drink and animalistic vices of all kinds, that supplies a constantly

---

[174] Dross, "Health Care Provision and Poor Relief in Enlightenment and 19[tth] Century Prussia," 77–78.
[175] Wilhelm Roscher, *System der Armenpflege und Armenpolitik; ein hand-und Lesebuch fur Geschaftsmanner und Studierende* (Stuttgart: F. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger, 1906), 129–31.
[176] Frohman, *Poor Relief and Welfare in Germany from the Reformation to World War I*, 60.
[177] Ibid., 60.
[178] For an extended discussion of the historiography of pauperism during the nineteenth century in Germany see the introduction of Hermann Beck, *The Origins of the Authoritarian Welfare State in Prussia: Conservatives, Bureaucracy, and the Social Question, 1815–70* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1995).

increasing number of recruits to the poorhouses, workhouses, and jails…"[179] While the state would naturally take the lead in articulating any policies to combat pauperism, it became clear that, given the moral nature of the threat, it could not do this alone. If the root cause of poverty was moral deviancy, the state would need significant help to rehabilitate and reintegrate the poor back into society.[180]

***

While there were many different organizations and institutions that dedicated themselves to solving this problem and reintegrating the poor, German Protestants distinguished themselves as some of the most committed to the project. Their ideas and strategies in the years leading up to the 1848 revolutions would have an immense impact on the work of Protestant reformers from the latter half of the century such as Friedrich von Bodelschwingh. It is impossible to understand Bodelschwingh's motivation and philosophy without first situating him within the greater context of the nineteenth-century Awakening movement and the larger discussion about poverty.

The Napoleonic wars caused a significant shift within German Protestantism. Just as the wars stimulated a surge in German nationalism and calls for German unity, they also initiated a religious awakening for German Protestants. In addition to popular displays of faith, theology and the relationship between church and state, the awakening movement had a particularly strong impact on Protestant social concerns.[181] As William O. Shanahan explains in his book *German Protestants face the Social Question*, the German Awakening was a "blend of Pietism and doctrinal Protestantism" that resembled

---

[179] "Pauperismus," *Bockhaus' Conversations-Lexicon der Gegenwart*, (Leipzig, 1840), IV: 65, cited in Larry Frohman, *Poor Relief in Welfare in Germany from the Reformation to World War I,* 62.
[180] Frohman, *Poor Relief and Welfare in Germany from the Reformation to World War I*, 64.
[181] William O. Shanahan, *German Protestants face the Social Question, Volume I: The Conservative Phase, 1815–1871* (Notre Dame, Indiana: Notre Dame University Press, 1954), 57.

the Great Awakening of eighteenth-century America.[182] Among the most the most important aspects of the Awakening was an emphasis on the idea of "inner life" and the importance of one's own individual creativity and piety.[183] Devoted individuals were capable of accomplishing remarkable feats. Furthermore, Shanahan notes that the movement's interest in idealism and its connection to the Napoleonic wars were also significant because they "united church orthodoxy with political conservatism."[184] This relationship would play a vital role later in the century by tying Protestantism's social welfare agenda to the interests of the empire.

One way in which Protestants developed their inner piety was by focusing their attention on the poor and the marginalized. They sought to express their faith through participation in charities, schools, orphanages, voluntary organizations and overseas missions. As Protestants' interest in voluntary organizations increased, so did the prospect of eventually creating an organized Christian Social movement to combat growing alienation from Christianity and the perceived threat of the poor.

The Awakening played a vital role in stimulating Protestant interest in social work because of the emphasis the movement placed on actively applying religious faith to solving material problems. Awakened Protestants were particularly interested in performing tasks that the smaller, territorial churches were either unable or unwilling to perform. Among the most significant of these tasks was a strong interest in undertaking overseas missions. The *Baseler Missionsgesellschaft*, for example, was founded in 1815 as an outgrowth of the German Society for Christianity (Deutsche

---

[182] Ibid., 58.
[183] Ibid., 59. For a more extensive discussion of the Awakening and its relationship to the Enlightenment see Shanahan, *German Protestants Face the Social Question*, 57–61.
[184] Ibid., 59.

Christentumgesellschaft).[185] Made up of prominent Swiss and German Protestants who identified closely with the pietism, the mission was part of their larger attempt "to give visible, outward expression of their religious beliefs."[186] By 1830, the Basel Mission's success had inspired successfully other German Protestant communities to establish their own mission societies.

This early interest in and enthusiasm for overseas missionary activity was important to the subsequent development of later Protestant social welfare initiatives because for the first time it directly exposed participants to the dire living conditions of many people and the extent to which suffering dominated their lives. Thus, Protestants placed a renewed emphasis on improving the material conditions of those they sought to help. In this respect, Shanahan argues that these mission societies "marked the transition, both in theology and in the popular understanding, from a moral-aesthetic Christianity toward a practical-active Christianity intent upon realizing the Kingdom of God."[187] Therefore, it is impossible to understand the efforts of nineteenth-century Protestant reformers without first acknowledging the efforts of early Protestant missionaries and the emphasis they placed on improving material conditions. It was only after missionaries made German Protestants aware of the suffering people experienced overseas that Germans turned their attention to combating the material and social deprivations caused by industrialization at home.

---

[185] Ibid., 63.

[186] Jon Miller, *Missionary Zeal and Institutional Control: Organizational Contradictions in the Basel Mission on the Gold Coast, 1828–1917* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003), 13–14. See also Paul Eppler, *Geschichte der Basler Mission: 1815–1899* (Basel: Verlag der Missionsbuchhandlung, 1900), 1–19.

[187] Shanahan, *German Protestants Face the Social Question,* 61.

Eventually, the ideas of Pietistic Protestantism in Southwest Germany migrated northward into the Rhineland. In 1836, Theodor Fliedner, a Lutheran Pastor who achieved prominence as "the most ardent champion of women's social work" during the first half of the nineteenth century, founded a training center for nurses in the Düsseldorf surburb of Kaiserswerth.[188] In addition to providing women with an opportunity to demonstrate their ability to perform charity work, Fliedner's initiative embodied the ideas espoused by awakened Protestants. Innfluenced by his encounters with common criminals and lower-class people while traveling through Europe, Fliedner founded the Rhine-Westphalian Prison Society in 1827 to rehabilitate criminals. The women trained at Kaiserswerth would work in hospitals and care for the sick, poor, and other victims of industrialization. Ultimately, Fliedner's initiatives would have a strong influence on subsequent Protestant attempts to aid the poor and unemployed later in the century.[189]

While Fliedner was one of the earliest Protestant reformers to explore the social possibilities of the Awakening, no one embodied the full potential of the Christian social gospel more than Johann Hinrich Wichern. A Lutheran reformer from the northern trading center of Hamburg, Wichern not only played the leading role in organizing the Inner Mission, a national umbrella network of Protestant social reform initiatives, he also shaped to a large degree the agenda of Protestant social welfare reformers for the next century.[190]

---

[188] Ibid., 68. For more information on Theodor Fliedner consult Martin Gerhardt, *Theodor Fliedner: Ein Lebensbild* (Düsseldorf: Verlag der Buchhandlung der Diakonissen-anstalt, 1933–1937), 2 volumes.
[189] Shanahan, *German Protestants Face the Social Question*, 68–69.
[190] For a concise biography of Wichern see Gerhard Wehr, *Herausforderung der Liebe – Johann Hinrich Wichern und die Inner Mission* (Stuttgart: Verlagshandlung der Diakonie, 1983).

Born in 1808, Wichern experienced "bitter poverty" as the son of a translator and notary.[191] This experience intensified following the death of Wichern's father in 1823. Fifteen-year-old Wichern suddenly found himself responsible for helping his mother support six children.[192] This would have a significant impact on his later work, as Wichern's youth made him acutely aware of the material conditions in which many families lived. Wichern's theological studies further shaped this awareness. Clearly a product of the Awakening, he adamantly believed in the priesthood of all believers and was committed to strengthening a church held together by nothing more than "simple, popular devotion."[193] Wichern devoted himself, through his emphasis of Christian Socialism, to creating a German Evangelical *Volkskirche* comprised of people who were worshippers as well as active participants. These ideas would ultimately form the foundation for Wichern's charitable endeavors.

After leaving to study theology in Berlin, Wichern returned to Hamburg in 1831. By this point, Hamburg had grown dramatically and become a center of crime, poverty and hopelessness. He worked under the guidance of Pastor Johann Wilhelm Rautenberg, who took a deep interest in Hamburg's poor. Rautenberg believed strongly in visiting the poorer members of his parish and encouraged Wichern to do the same. When Wichern became superintendant in 1832, he "took his role as parish visitor seriously, with far-reaching consequences."[194]

---

[191] Erich Their, *Die Kirche und die soziale Frage: Von Wichern bis Friedrich Neumann, Eine Untersuchung über die Bezhiehung zwischen politischen Vorgängen und kirchlichen Reformen* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1950), 11.
[192] David Crowner and Gerald Christianson, eds., trans., *The Spirituality of the German Awakening* (New York: Paulist Press, 2003), 230.
[193] Shanahan, *German Protestants Face the Social Question*, 72.
[194] Crowner and Christianson, *The Spirituality of the German Awakening*, 231.

Wichern was struck not only by the poverty in his community but also by the number of people who had turned away from the church. Determined to reverse this trend, he made a point of regularly visiting the poorer families of his parish and kept extensive notes on his observations. For example, he wrote the following about one such visit:

> The place has a hallway and small room. In the corner a pile of straw, on it a sack of straw and rags, under the rags a seventy-three-year-old man with a horrible chest illness so that he could hardly talk, no underwear, no pillow – a picture of wretchedness and heartrending misery. The wife… wearing only a cotton blouse and skirt, and simply nothing else on her body – without any undergarments. Even the cotton things she was wearing were so ragged so that you could see her skin. The same for a grown-up girl… and a big guy… and two boys… and a girl… All without underwear, pale figures, chattering from hunger and cold. They were all talking at once, their lips overflowing with complaints about their misery… They hadn't had a fire in the fireplace for a long time?[195]

After numerous such experiences, Wichern was determined to improve materially the lot of Hamburg's poor.

Like many of his contemporaries, Wichern firmly believed that the political and economic problems of the early nineteenth century were symptomatic of a greater spiritual crisis caused by the growth of radical ideologies like Communism as well as the appeal of Enlightenment ideas. He understood Communism primarily as a social, not political, ideology.

> Communism is by its very nature not a political but a social phenomenon, and it is easily for by the state constitution and has actually no pure interest in claiming rights concerning personal property ... for itself. So... the communist systems initially want nothing to do with politics.[196]

---

[195] Wichern, quoted in Crowner and Christianson, *The Spirituality of the German Awakening*, 231–32. For the original see Johann Hinrich Wichern, "Hamburgs wahres und geheimes Voksleben," in *Johann Hinrich Wichern: Sämtliche Werke*, *Band 4, 1. Teil: Schriften zur Sozialpädagogik: Rauhes Haus und Johannesstift*, ed. Peter Meinhold (Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1958), 42.

[196] Johann Hinrich Wichern, "Kommunismus und die Hilfe gegen ihn (1848)," in *Johann Hinrich Wichern: Sämtliche Werke. Band I: Die Kirche und ihr Soziales Handeln (Grundsätzliches und Allgemeines*, ed. Peter Meinhold (Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1962), 133.

Wichern was deeply concerned about the impact Communism had on working-class communities in the growing cities. He feared that as the ideology became entrenched among the working classes it would systematically destroy familial bonds, as well as encourage families to turn away from Christianity and abandon any loyalty they felt to the conservative monarchy.

> Since the state, the church, the family (marriage) and social relations with their rights protect and preserve these goods, so communism cannot help it: it must in the end ... disolve these forms of common life, the church and its desecrate the holy goods…[197]

Wichern was certain that the growing popularity of Communism and the corresponding decline in church participation were largely to blame for the social problems that culminated in the 1848 revolutions.

Therefore, it is not surprising that, like many of his contemporaries, Wichern specifically focused on helping families and children as the best way to combat the problems posed by industrialization. "…only by separating them from their environment" did Wichern believe he could re-integrate children into society and thus eliminate any future threat they would pose."[198] To this end, on September 12, 1833, Wichern founded Das Rauhe Haus (The Rough House) in Hamburg as a refuge for children living in poverty. In his inaugural address at the home Wichern explained why he believed his initiative was vital to combating poverty in the city. He said: Whoever ventures into this circle of people, in spite of any displeasure and disgust, and experiences with the senses what is happening here, or whoever believes those who have such experiences daily, will no longer care to question the necessity of an institution for the rescue of the coming

---

[197] Ibid., 133.
[198] Crowner and Christianson, *The Spirituality of the German Awakening*, 232.

generation."[199] He described the family as "the natural, moral circle in which the good in the human spirit is situated, and in which it ought to be tended and protected."[200] However, rather than the strong support of close knit families, these children lived in an environment riddled by "alcoholism, prostitution, illegitimacy, poverty, despair and suicide."[201]

Wichern believed that, above all else, the children of Hamburg needed a close knit community where they could take refuge from the dangers of the street. To this end, the Raue Haus was to provide young boys with the opportunity to live together in communities of twelve where they could learn notions of responsibility.[202] In the process, this arrangement would also provide the boys with a substitute family structure, while also stressing Protestant values.[203] Thus, institutions like the Raue Haus could restore the social bonds within working-class families that had been dramatically weakened by the changes in living conditions brought on by industrialization. It was the changes in urban life, Wichern insisted, that resulted in the growth of alcoholism and prostitution along with a decline in church attendance within working-class communities. In order to demonstrate his commitment to the cause and lead by example Wichern moved into the Raue Haus in October, 1833 to serve as a house-father. By living among the children he hoped that he could not only help to steer them toward being more active participants in church life, but that he could also direct them to specific trades and a life

---

[199] Wichern, quoted in Crowner and Christianson, *The Spirituality of the German Awakening*, 233. For the original see Johann Hinrich Wichern, "Ansprache auf der Gründungsversammlung des Rauhen Hauses vom 12. September 1833 in Hamburg," in *Johann Hinrich Wichern: Sämtliche Werke*, *Band 4, 1. Teil*, 101.
[200] Ibid., 104.
[201] Crowner and Christianson, *The Spirituality of the German Awakening*, 233.
[202] Ibid., 233.
[203] Wichern, quoted in Crowner and Christianson, *The Spirituality of the German Awakening*, 233. For the original see Johann Hinrich Wichern, "Ansprache auf der Gründungsversammlung des Rauhen Hauses vom 12. September 1833 in Hamburg," in *Johann Hinrich Wichern: Sämtliche Werke*, *Band 4, 1. Teil*, 107–08.

of steady work. The combination of religion, the development of a strong work ethic, along with his presence as a responsible father figure, Wichern hoped, would be enough to reintegrate these children into mainstream society.

The Raue Haus attracted a considerable amount of positive attention from Protestant reformer, and as a result Wichern began to consider the possibility of expanding his initiative beyond northern Germany. Therefore, in May 1834 he initiated a program called the Brothers of the Raue Haus through which he invited other young men to live in the community and serve as mentors for the younger boys. Then, after having spent time under his tutelage, Wichern encouraged these men to serve other Protestant projects like city missions, missions to the poor, and the seamen's missions.[204] As Wichern's philosophy spread beyond Hamburg it would have a notable influence on the attitudes and ideas of later Protestant reformers. Bodelschwingh, for example, organized his worker colonies along very similar lines by stressing the importance of religious life and responsibility. Furthermore, like the Raue Haus, the colonies were organized under a strict patriarchal hierarchy. Viewing the migrant poor as children in need of guidance much in the same way that Wichern looked at the boys in his house, Bodelschwingh believed that these factors were essential to reintegrating the unemployed back into society.

***

The more time Wichern spent working with impoverished children, the more concerned he became about the attitudes of working-class families to organized religion. In his mind, their rejection of the church was the root cause of their poverty and marginalization. Furthermore, Wichern was convinced that this growing estrangement

---

[204] Crowner and Christianson, *The Spirituality of the German Awakening*, 234.

from the church was one of the primary factors behind the 1848 revolutions, which was nothing short of "traumatic" for him.[205] As a result, he adamantly insisted that Protestants needed to reorganize and more aggressively pursue social welfare initiatives in order to win working-class families back to the church. To this end he drew heavily on the ideas of the Awakening as he urged Protestants to participate more actively in charitable associations. Unlike established, territorial churches, charities could reach communities that were by and large beyond their limited reach.

As he began to contemplate the creation of a larger network of Protestant-run charities, Wichern drew heavily on the ideas and experiences of reformers in other countries. He was particularly interested in France because he thought it faced social challenges similar to those in Germany. Most importantly, Wichern was convinced that France was the epicenter of the revolutionary earthquake that shook Europe in 1848. Discussing the origins of social ideologies such as Communism, he writes "such systems and teachings have so far not been at home in Germany, but rather in France, where they have been born out of the first revolution in the last century and have become formed through certain stages to the final revolution."[206] Therefore, because of its experience on the front line of the struggle against radical ideologies, France served as a natural model for Wichern.[207]

As he examined the social problems the revolutions caused in France, Wichern noted the rather aggressive response by the Catholic Church. At the same time, popular

---

[205] Frohman, *Poor Relief and Welfare in Germany from the Reformation to World War I*, 64.
[206] Wichern, "Kommunismus und die Hilfe gegen ihn (1848)," *Sämtliche Werke Bd. 1*, 134.
[207] For a concise account of the Revolutions in France, see Pierre Leveque, "The Revolutionary Crisis of 1848–1851 in France: Origins and Course of Events," in *Europe in 1848: Revolution and Reform*, eds. Dieter Dowe, Heinz-Gerhard Haupt, Dieter Langewiesche, and Jonathan Sperber, 91–119 (New York: Berghan Books, 2001).

piety and support was vital to the Church's successful response. He noted that the Catholic Church in France provided an army of 6000 "charitable sisters to fight poverty and educate children not only in France but also throughout the French colonial empire.[208] Furthermore, Wichern noted that these women had the support of "many thousands from other church congregations."[209] In this respect, the French Catholic Church represented Wichern's ideal response to the problems plaguing Germany. Not only did French Catholics emphasize poor relief and education, but they encouraged popular participation in charity efforts. This especially appealed to Wichern, an awakened Protestant who wanted to generate a similar reaction and response among German Protestants.

In addition to looking to France for guidance, Wichern also sought to incorporate the practices of the missions to Africa. As Martin Gerhardt, the preeminent historian of German Protestantism during the nineteenth century explains, Wichern first made the connection between the overseas missions and Germany's social crises as a young student of Johann Rautenberg in Hamburg. "This thought came to him especially under the influence of Rautenberg… where on the one hand he eagerly concerned himself with the mission to the heathens during the mission hour and on the other hand saw daily the suffering in the neighborhoods of his native city."[210] The emphasis missionaries placed not only on converting non-Christians, but also on improving their material existence intrigued Wichern. Based on his experience living among Hamburg's poor, he was

---

[208] Johann Hinrich Wichern, "Über Dilettantismus in der innern Mission; Orden der römischen Kirche; die feste Beamtung im Dienst der inner Mission. (1847), in *Johann Hinrich Wichern: Sämtliche Werke. Band I: Die Kirche und ihr Soziales Handeln (Grundsätzliches und Allgemeines*, ed. Peter Meinhold (Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1962), 85.
[209] Ibid., 85.
[210] Martin Gerhardt, *JohanHinrich Wichern, Ein Lebensbild. Band I. Jugend und Aufstieg, 1808–1845* (Hamburg: Agentur des Rauhen Hauses, 1927), 261.

convinced that the satisfaction of their daily, practical concerns was an essential precondition to any efforts at spiritual renewal.

Despite the renewed sense of urgency following 1848, Wichern's call for a domestic mission modeled after initiatives in Africa was nothing new. As early as 1816, one theologian had remarked that Germany desperately needed "to erect similar institutions like those in the distant heathen world for our poor neighborhoods nearby, and train Christian teachers for our poor children in the same spirit as those who teach the heathens!"[211] Wichern's interest in the connection between foreign and domestic missions grew through his contact with Johannes Falk, a Protestant theologian and social worker whose work preceded Wichern's. In 1823 he described Falk's work as being "like a mission society, soul saving, heathen conversion… but not in Asia or Africa, but rather in our midst, in Saxony, Prussia, etc..."[212] As one of Wichern's mentors quipped to him "there are enough heathens here for us to convert."[213] Therefore, through the combination of his own youthful experience of poverty and the influence of his early mentors, Wichern devoted himself to organizing a mission within Germany. His dedication to the idea of a domestic mission was so strong that he rejected suggestions to expand the work of his *Rauhe Haus* to include a training center for missionaries who would be sent abroad. Such an expansion would only divert time and financial resources away from what Wichern insisted was the more important concern.

[211] Quoted in Gerhardt, *Johann Hinrich Wichern, Bd. 1*, 262.
[212] Quoted in Gerhardt, *Johann Hinrich Wichern, Bd. 1*, 261–62.
[213] Quoted in Gerhardt, *Johann Hinrich Wichern, Bd. 1*, 262.

In 1836, he made his first public references to an "domestic" mission, later changing it to Inner Mission.[214] Although some Protestants greeted Wichern's idea with skepticism, by 1848 most agreed that some type of coordinated effort would be much more effective to combating poverty than isolated, individual initiatives. In 1848 Wichern's efforts culminated with his address to the Wittenberg *Kirchentag,* a truly momentous and dramatic occasion.[215] Devoted primarily to discussing the creation of a national church, the concept of Inner Mission was not even on the agenda. Consisting primarily of older representatives of church bodies, it almost appeared as if the conference organizers went out of their way to avoid inviting younger, active members of the Protestant community.[216] It was only thanks to the efforts of Moritz Bethmann-Hollweg, the conference chairman and an ardent supporter of the Inner Mission, that Wichern made the agenda at the last minute. When he finally began his remarks, Wichern created "a great moment in Protestant history: the force of [his] remarks compared in dramatic intensity with those of the young Luther before the Diet of Worms. On both occasions, the future of German Protestantism hung in the balance."[217] His address was the "Protestant reply to the *Communist Manifesto*."[218] Wichern's speech would set in motion a social agenda that Protestants would finally realize roughly eighty years later when church leaders held their conference at Bodelschwingh's Bethel community.

---

[214] Ibid., 261. The last time Wichern used the term "*inländische*" mission was in a letter to his wife dated 24. July 1841. Thereafter he referred to his project exclusively as the *Inner Mission*.
[215] Shanahan, *German Protestants Face the Social Question*
[216] Wehr, *Herausforderung der Liebe*, 60–61.
[217] Shanahan, *German Protestants Face the Social Question*, 208.
[218] Ibid., 205.

In his address Wichern called on all German Protestants to unite and assist those adversely affected by industrialization. While the turbulence of the previous years had resulted in "deep moral decay, profound alienation, and widespread falling away from the gospel," he insisted that for Protestants these events symbolized "the birth pangs of a new and better age."[219] While Wichern understood clearly that the social and spiritual problems concerning the church had roots firmly in material poverty, only a small percentage of Protestants had reached the same conclusion. Even though reformers such as Wichern and Fliedner did what they could, their efforts were individual and localized. The work of the Rauhe Haus would not reach beyond the city of Hamburg. Therefore, Wichern insisted that a large, national organization such as the Inner Mission was the only way for German Protestants to respond effectively to the turmoil of revolution.

In his memorandum on the creation of a Central Committee for Inner Mission, Wichern continued to build on the case he argued at the Wittenberg *Kirchentag*. Because people had become significantly more mobile over the previous fifty years, pauperism and poverty created an unprecedented series of social problems across Europe. Therefore, the traditional methods Protestants employed to help individual families and communities would no longer be effective. In order to meet this new challenge, Wichern argued that the Inner Mission would be both an innovative and effective response because it would encourage and co-ordinate a massive, national outpouring of Protestant charity.[220] Ideally the Inner Mission, in the true spirit of the Awakening, would mobilize thousands of additional German Protestants to participate in voluntary welfare and

---

[219] Johann Hinrich Wichern, "The Inner Mission of the German Evangelical Church: A Memorandum to the German Nation on Request of the Central Committee for Inner Mission," in *The Spirituality of the German Awakening*, ed., trans. David Crowner and Gerald Christianson, , 298.
[220] Wehr, *Herausforderung der Liebe*, 64–65.

charity initiatives. In this sense it would help Protestants to move beyond the small, localized relief efforts that had become outmoded by the wake of industrialization. "Everyone must contribute by working and sacrificing in free love," he proclaimed.[221]

To be sure, the foundation of this national movement rested on the localized efforts of individuals communities like congregations and families. It was essential for family members to look out for each other and offer assistance when needed. Yet Wichern highlighted these relationships as cornerstones of the larger Inner Mission and insisted this guiding principle needed to be present everywhere. "The schoolteacher is to be of the same spirit in school to the extent that it is required, as well as the businessman in his occupation… Their activity makes a reality of the general priesthood… in which the church achieves fulfillment in itself…"[222] Thus, the Inner Mission embodied the true spirit of popular piety and the Awakening and its encouragement of popular participation would be one of the primary motivating factors behind the rapid expansion of Bodelschwingh's work in Bethel in the late nineteenth century.

As he began to articulate a future agenda for the Inner Mission, Wichern once again returned to the overseas mission (*Äußere Mission*) for his model. As he explained his vision for the future of Protestant social welfare, he urged church leaders to look upon the Inner Mission as "neither the mother nor daughter of foreign missions, but rather [as] its twin, and, like it, a daughter of the one spirit."[223] While there were many similarities between the two organizations the Inner Mission, unlike the missions abroad, worked exclusively among people who were already baptized Christians. Its primary mission

[221] Ibid., 310.
[222] Ibid., 311.
[223] Ibid., 304.

was to win back people who were either in danger of leaving the church or who had already abandoned it.

Just as the foreign mission traveled into the hearts of non-Christian territories that had minimal contact with European societies, Wichern thought that social workers for the Inner Mission needed to travel into the hearts of urban, poverty stricken areas. "So it could be in any big city, a whole series of small churches ... located in locations that could also used for many other purposes, until everything can be established perfectly."[224] The pastors in these communities could not restrict themselves solely to preaching though. "We hold it to be just as important to connect with a personal visit to the Proletariat, to interact with them in their houses and publicly at their work sites…"[225] If Protestants hoped to have any tangible success reestablishing church communities in urban areas, they needed to maintain a strong presence in the community and take an active interest in people's daily lives.

Having grown up poor, Wichern understood how easily radical ideologies could "gain a foothold" among the lower classes, causing them to stray from Christianity.[226] He acknowledged that one of the many reasons why it held such an appeal was because it contained an element of truth. It decried poor working conditions and highlighted the deplorable living conditions many lower-class people endured.[227] This made it all the more important for Protestant pastors not only to preach to the lower classes but also to move into poorer communities and experience first-hand the conditions faced by the destitute every day. Only this would provide Protestant social workers with the

---

[224] Johann Hinrich Wichern, "Kommunismus und die Hilfe gegen ihm (1848), in ed. Meinhold, Peter. *Sämtliche Werke, Bd. 1*, 149.
[225] Ibid., 149.
[226] Shanahan, *German Protestants Face the Social Question*, 212.
[227] Ibid., 212.

credibility they needed to gain the trust of poor communities and effectively provide relief.

One generation later Protestant reformers like Bodelschwingh would continue to understand the domestic and foreign missions as projects that were both distinct yet inextricably linked. They understood the need not only to encounter marginalized communities but also the importance of trying to genuinely understand the challenges they faced in daily life. In this sense the two organizations were extraordinarily similar and had much that they could learn from one another. In fact, Bodelschwingh thought they were so similar that he eventually consolidated his training courses into a single program for every missionary.

***

Wichern firmly believed that the church needed to play a leading role in any effort to reform poor relief policies. While he acknowledged that the state would also have to be an active partner in this process, he clearly lacked confidence in a solution where the government took a leading role. "While the state and those who carry out its responsibilities are still searching in vain for means to remedy material pauperism and are at a loss to know what to do, the church, in contrast already possesses the help it needs."[228] Any solution to the problem of pauperism needed to emerge from the church, as Wichern argued that it was the only institution capable of simultaneously improving material conditions while also reducing the "massive moral decay in the Christian populace" that was responsible for the poverty.[229]

[228] Johann Hinrich Wichern, "The Inner Mission of the German Evangelical Church: A Memorandum to the German Nation on Request of the Central Committee for Inner Mission," in *The Spirituality of the German Awakening,* ed., trans. David Crowner and Gerald Christianson, 309.
[229] Ibid., 309.

To this end one of the Inner Mission's first major initiatives was to deal with the problem of poverty among migrant workers. After consulting with Wichern and securing financial support from the Prussian Monarchy, Clemens Perthes, a professor at the University of Bonn, opened a hostel for artisans in 1854. Known as the *Herberge zur Heimat*, these institutions not only provided room and board at clean facilities, but also offered travelers spiritual care with regular church services (on which people typically passed).[230] As Scheffler also notes, the hostel in Bonn was subject to an extraordinary level of physical and social regulation. Upon entering the hostel in the evening, guests had to turn in their travel passes to authorities and pick them up upon leaving in the morning. The point of this practice was to enable local authorities to track the movement and activities of individuals suspected of posing a threat to societal order. In the same vein, the hostels also exercised considerable control over an individual's body by regulating personal hygiene and sleeping hours and prohibiting the consumption of alcohol.[231]

Protestant social reformers like Perthes and Wichern were particularly concerned about the devastating impact of industrialization on the lives and careers of artisans. Following the establishment of the first hostels, the local pastors reacted with shock at the growing number of workers who appeared to be totally overwhelmed by the challenges they faced. In 1859 one *Herbergsvater* remarked "Concerning the appearance of the person, most people are quite depraved, body and clothes were covered in an almost

---

[230] Jürgen Scheffler, "Vom Herbergswesen für Handwerksgesellen zur Fürsorge für wandernde Arbeiter: Herbergen zur Heimat im Zeitalter der Industrialisierung, 1854–1914," in *Bürger und Bettler: Materialen zur Geschichte der Nichtsesshaftenhilfe in der Diakonie. Bd. 1, 1854 bis 1954, vom Herbergswesen für wandernde Handwerksgesellen zur Nichtsesshaftenhilfe,* ed. Jürgen Scheffler, 10–19 (Bielefeld: Verlag Soziale Hilfe, 1987), 12.

[231] Ibid., 12–13; "Herbergs-Ordnung," Berlin, 1862, *Archiv des diakonishen Werkes (ADW, CA)*, BIIIg1 aaI.

incredible degree of dirt."[232] As their quality of life decreased dramatically, artisans found their traditional social networks in shambles and were slowly drifting to the margins of society. If they did not receive any assistance, reformers like Perthes and Wichern feared it was only a matter of time before they drifted into socialist circles, and thus further away from the church. Therefore, the *Herberge zur Heimat* was an avenue to provide struggling workers with material assistance while also ensuring that they remained within the church's sphere of influence. In this sense the hostels were also an excellent example of the *Volksmission* aspect of Protest social work during the first half of the nineteenth century.

Through the early 1880s, Protestant reformers largely viewed the *Herberge zur Heimat* as a success. By providing artisans with a place to stay in the evening, the hostels helped to recreate a sense of shared culture and social structures. Even more importantly though, they served as a vital center of social control where both local and religious authorities could keep close tabs on a group that they deeply mistrusted. By 1880 there were approximately one hundred and thirty hostels concentrated primarily in cities across northern and western Germany. At the same time, because both groups were equally concerned about the potential threat posed by marginalized migrant workers, the hostels also continued to foster close collaboration between Protestant reformers and the state.

***

As Wichern and Perthes were building their network of hostels, a young Friedrich von Bodelschwingh was just beginning a career that would follow a very similar path. A product of the German Awakening, he was profoundly influenced by Wichern and the

---

[232] Quoted in Scheffler, "Vom Herbergswesen für Handwerksgesellen zur Fürsorge für wandernde Arbeiter: Herbergen zur Heimat im Zeitalter der Industrialisierung, 1854–1914," 13.

ideas stressed by Pietism. He believed deeply in the importance of missionary work and was also very concerned about the spread of radical ideologies. By the end of the nineteenth century Bodelschwingh had become one of the Inner Mission's most influential leaders by championing many of the same causes as Wichern.

Born in 1831, Friedrich von Bodelschwingh grew up in a conservative household that had strong connections to the Prussian monarchy. Bodelschwingh's father, Ernst von Bodelschwingh, served in the Prussian army during the Napoleonic Wars and from 1815 through 1842 he was a leading figure in the Westphalian provincial government. In 1842 he was appointed the Prussian Finance Minister and in 1844 he became the Minister of the Interior.[233] Initially Friedrich von Bodelschwingh was interested in agriculture, but the social problems and poverty he encountered among rural populations caused him to rethink his career choice. Eventually, following his father's death in 1854, this translated into a serious interest in the Protestant Church and the overseas mission. In his mind, the mission offered an opportunity to combat the problems he observed in rural Germany. As a result, Bodelschwingh studied theology with the intention of joining the mission.

Yet Bodelschwingh's health ultimately proved to be too fragile for him to travel to Africa. As a result he opted to serve closer to home in a mission to the German working-class community in Paris. In 1858 he arrived in Paris as an unknown Wesphalian theological student. Like the other major European cities, Paris was both a modern, world-class metropolis as well as a city that had significant problems dealing with the challenges of industrialization. By the mid-nineteenth century, the city's outer

[233] Martin Gerhardt, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh: Ein Lebensbild aus der deutschen Kirchengeschichte. 1. Band Werden und Reisen* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlag der Anstalt Bethel, 1950), 39–42; Gerhardt's biography contains the most comprehensive account of Bodelschwingh's ancestry. For more detail see especially 1–51.

ring suburbs had become a collection of impoverished neighborhoods and were also growing increasingly more sympathetic to the ideologies that petrified the conservative governments.[234] Bodelschwingh feared that unless someone intervened, it was only a matter of time before the German community brought those ideas back to Germany.[235]

Among those impoverished working-class communities on the outskirts of Paris was a fairly sizeable population of German migrant workers. By the middle of the century, this community numbered between 60-80,000 people out of a total population of 1.7 million people. While the German community came from a variety of backgrounds, most migrants tended to be working-class people who had fallen on hard times in Germany. These were people who desperately wanted a fresh start but lacked the resources to immigrate to the United States. Therefore, they chose Paris instead.[236]

Through his work in Paris, Bodelschwingh clearly demonstrated the profound influence Johann Wichern and German pietism had on his approach to social work. He was deeply concerned about the long-term impact on working-class families of living in poverty. The longer they lived on the margins of society, the more likely they were to drift away from the Church and toward more radical ideologies. Adding to Bodelschwingh's concerns was the constant danger that these pressures would also encourage members of the community to lose touch with their German identity. The longer they remained separated from Germany, the more likely they were to speak

---

[234] Lees and Lees, *Cities and the Making of Modern Europe*, 151. For a more detailed discussion of crime and poverty in Paris during early nineteenth century, see especially Louis Chevalier, *Laboring Classes and Dangerous Classes in Paris During the First Half of the Nineteenth Century* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981; first English edition 1973).

[235] Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, "Die evangelische Mission unter den Deutschen in Paris," in *Ausgewählte Schriften I: Veröffentlichungen aus den Jahren 1858 bis 1871*, ed. Alfred Adam, 7–19 (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1955), 7. For the original see *Evangelisches Monatsblatt fur Westfalen*, December, 1858.

[236] Hans Walter Schmuhl, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh* (Hamburg: Rowalt Taschenbuch Verlag, 2005), 44.

exclusively French and convert to Catholicism. By the time of Bodelschwingh's arrival Catholic organizations like the Society of St. Vincent de Paul maintained a strong presence in Paris as they sought to improve materially the lives of working-class families.[237] Therefore, Bodelschwingh viewed the larger goals of his work in a similar vein to those of Wichern's Inner Mission. In addition to improving the German community's material condition, he also wanted to win them back to German Protestantism.

Upon arriving in Paris, Bodelschwingh followed in Wichern's footsteps by living directly in Montmartre, an outer suburb with a particularly high population of working-class Germans. Initially, he concentrated primarily on holding Church services in German as well as the education of children. Bodelschwingh was particularly concerned with the question of education because he feared that the lack of school was symptomatic of a larger lack of structure and order within working-class families. Instead of attending school, children frequently worked to contribute to the household, or in many cases simply wandered the streets unattended while their parents worked.[238] Compounding Bodelschwingh's fears was the increasingly dire ability of German children to communicate in their mother tongue.[239]

Yet despite these initial challenges, Bodelschwingh persevered and held regularly scheduled classes during the week. In addition to providing children with instruction in German, Bodelschwingh considered these early initiatives as vitally important because of

---

[237] Lees and Lees, *Cities and the Making of Modern Europe*, 109.
[238] Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, "Die evangelische Mission unter den Deutschen in Paris (1861)," in *Ausgewählte Schriften I: Veröffentlichungen aus den Jahren 1858 bis 1871*, ed. Alfred Adam, 70–90 (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1955), 78. For original see *Evangelische Kirchen-Zeitung,* 25/28 December, 1861.
[239] Schmuhl, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh*, 48.

the organization they imposed on their daily lives. Therefore, he did his best to make attendance compulsory. "Each child, who skips school without the knowledge of the parents, will be punished severely with the stick, and in repeated cases with increasing severity."[240] Thus, from his earliest work as a missionary in Paris, one can observe the strong emphasis Bodelschwingh placed on strict order and discipline, themes that would later serve as the foundation of his work at Bethel several years later.

In the tradition of German pietism and Wichern's Raues Haus initiative, Bodelschwingh lived among the families he sought to assist. Indeed, his personal apartment doubled as his initial classroom. While this was initially feasible, his school eventually grew to the point where he needed to find a larger setting. Therefore, in 1859 he moved into an old factory building that had enough space to accommodate the growing number of students who attended his classes. With so much extra space, Bodelschwingh decided to expand his mission even further with the creation of a *Herberge zur Heimat,* modeled after those of the Inner Mission.[241] While he did not call it a hostel, it fulfilled many of the same objectives as those back in Germany, most notably the re-integration of marginalized, unemployed workers. In the context of Bodelschwingh's personal philosophical development this expansion is especially important because it marked his first foray into providing help to migrant workers. While this interest began more or less as a side project in Paris, it would eventually evolve into a core component of his mission at Bethel.

As he spent more time among the poor in Montmartre, Bodelschwingh gradually concluded that a strong sense of community was essential to any relief effort. As

---

[240] Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, "Von der deutschen Mission in Paris (1859)," in *Ausgewaehlte Schriften,* Bd. 1, 20–35, here 28.
[241] Martin Gerhardt, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh* Bd. 1 (Bethel bei Bielefeld, 150), 274.

Gerhardt writes, "Now what he had learned in Gramenz about social effectiveness among his workers, he carried over as the back alley pastor of La Villette in his community: the recognition of the need to care for the whole person, for body and soul, for his outer and his inner requirements"[242] To this end, it was not enough to provide church services and educational opportunities. Rather, Bodelschwingh believed that successful re-integration required near constant supervision to prevent working-class families from all of the supposed dangers and temptations offered by the city.

In 1860, his hostel initiative evolved even further when he moved twelve German families (sixty people) into small wooden houses on a relatively secluded hill in Montmartre. As Bodelschwingh wrote, his goal was to provide "healthy, friendly apartments, close to school and church, at an affordable price," and ultimately "to found a small German colony."[243] On the one hand, as Gerhardt argues "It was Bodelschwigh's first small contribution to the practical solution of the question of apartments for workers in the big city, which he implemented for German natives in the French capital city."[244] On the other hand, however, it was also symbolic of the larger philosophical foundations of Bodelschwingh's poor relief strategy. Like his predecessors in the Inner Mission, he thought that any genuine effort at reform and re-integration began with the recognition that working-class families suffered materially. Therefore, the best way to gain their trust was not only to live among them but also to help relieve their daily concerns about food and housing. Yet, at the same time Protestant reformers like Bodelschwingh viewed material assistance as merely a gateway to effective social integration and spiritual reform. If they no longer had to worry about their material existence, disaffected workers

---

[242] Gerhardt, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh*, 295.
[243] Ibid., 296; Schmuhl, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh*, 50.
[244] Gerhardt, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh*, 296.

would be less amenable to the promises made by radical ideologies. Thus, initiatives like the hostels in Paris were merely the first steps toward exercising greater social control over the migrant worker community and transforming back into German-speaking Protestants.

While it only lasted for a few years, Bodelschwingh's experience as a missionary in Paris was immensely important to his subsequent ideological development. It clearly demonstrated how he appropriated the social ideas of early-nineteenth-century German Protestants and applied them to his own situation in France. At the same time, by living within the German-speaking community and demonstrating that he genuinely understood the material challenges they faced, Bodelschwingh also drew directly from the practices of early nineteenth-century missionaries to Africa. Even more importantly, however, Bodelschwingh's time in Paris would have an immense impact on his subsequent leadership of the Bethel community during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The strategies he developed in Paris to stress concepts like work, family, religion and structure would become the foundation of Bethel's larger mission. Thus, the mission to Paris serves as a vital bridge between the early nineteenth-century efforts of Protestant social reformers like Wichern and Bodelschwingh's own efforts to deal with the challenges created by further industrialization and urbanization at the end of the century.

***

Although European strategies of poor relief have evolved considerably since the Middle Ages, the concept of work has nevertheless been a constant factor in determining both the cause of and solution to poverty. With the onset of the Black Death in the

middle of the fourteenth century Europeans, faced with a massive labor shortage, began to use work as a way to define so-called worthy and unworthy recipients of aid. During the Protestant Reformation, social reformers continued to emphasize work and responsibility with the introduction of the work-house. Based on the assumption that people were poor because they lacked a desire to work, the work-house fostered an environment that emphasized near constant activity. After time in the work-house, social reformers believed that an inmate would emerge with a new found sense of responsibility and work ethic.

With the advent of industrialization and the upheaval caused by the Napoleonic Wars, social reformers faced a notably different set of challenges to their efforts at providing poor relief. The dramatic growth of cities and populations, combined with improvements in transportation, overwhelmed the providers of assistance to the poor. Relatively recent innovations like the Prussian Poor Laws of 1794 quickly proved to be inadequate solutions. By the middle of the nineteenth century it was blatantly obvious that the existing systems of poor relief were totally ineffective.

With federal and provincial authorities struggling to respond to these challenges, German Protestants gradually assumed a greater role in the provision of assistance. Shaped by the ideas of the German Awakening and the growing influence of radical ideologies like Communism, reformers like Johann Hinrich Wichern articulated a new approach to poor relief through initiatives like the Raues Haus and Inner Mission. Worried that the changes caused by industrialization were causing working-class people to become more marginalized, his strategy stressed a combination of material assistance and spiritual care through ideas like work ethic, family structure and Protestantism.

Ultimately he hoped that these ideas would allow Protestants to exercise a greater degree of social control over marginalized workers that would prevent them from drifting further away from the church (and closer to ideologies like Communism).

Wichern's ideas also greatly influenced Bodelschwingh's early work as a missionary in Paris. Viewing Paris as the epicenter of radical ideologies and revolution, Bodelschwingh appropriated many of his methods to combat poverty among German migrant workers in suburban Paris with the ultimate goal of reinforcing their national and religious identities. By stressing German language and Protestantism, Bodelschwingh hoped to prevent the migrant community from drifting further towards the supposed dangers of French Catholicism.

When taken together, the Protestant initiatives of the first half of the nineteenth century are vital to understanding the subsequent development of Bodelschwingh's social welfare philosophy during the second half of the century They would also become the driving engine behind his reorganization of Bethel and the foundation upon which he would build his first worker colony, Wilhelmsdorf. By the turn of the century, they would help to transform Bethel into the leading center for Protestant social welfare in Germany. Concerned that the continuing industrialization of the German economy resulted in only further weakening familial and communal bonds, Protestant reformers like Bodelschwingh insisted expanding and strengthening initiatives that stressed concepts like the work ethic, family, communal bonds, and religion. In this respect, one can understand Bodelschwingh's worker colonies as both an expansion and continuation of early initiatives like the hostels.

Furthermore, the early history of Protestant poor relief programs clearly shows that from their inception at the beginning of the nineteenth century they were part of a larger transnational development. In devising a strategy to combat poverty in Germany, Wichern drew heavily on the activities and initiatives of Protestant missionaries abroad. Just as missionaries sought to win converts among non-Christians, Protestant reformers were trying to win back supposedly lapsed and marginalized communities within Germany. Therefore, in order to achieve effective change, reformers needed to live among their communities and demonstrate that they understood the challenges of everyday life. This was a central component of both the Raues Haus and Bodelschwingh's Paris mission. At the same time Bodelschwingh experimented in Paris for the first time with many of the methods he would later employ in Germany as part of the larger philosophy behind the worker colonies. Therefore, it is impossible to understand fully the development of modern Protestant poor relief policies in Germany without situating them in a larger international context. The next chapter will trace this development further by examining how these early experiences shaped Bodelschwingh's poor relief philosophy while transforming Bethel from a small home for boys with epilepsy to one of the largest Protestant-run centers for social welfare in Germany.

Chapter 3: *Arbeitserziehung* and the Worker Colony: The Development of Bodelschwingh's Philosophy

The Protestant missionary tradition in Africa, along with his experiences in Paris heavily influenced Bodelschwingh's approach to poor relief in Germany. In order to deliver relief effectively, he believed that Protestants needed to demonstrate that they genuinely understood the challenges faced by poor, working-class communities. At the same time, he also though that simply meeting the material needs of impoverished individuals was insufficient. Protestant reformers also needed to effect spiritual reform in order to reintegrate successfully marginalized and disaffected workers back into mainstream society. For Bodelschwingh this meant removing the individual from the sources of temptation that led to what he viewed as deviant behavior, by which he meant the consumption of alcohol, idleness, vagrancy and religious apathy.[245]

When Bodelschwingh arrived at Bethel in 1871, he used the opportunity to realize fully and perfect his philosophy. Ideas like *Arbeitserziehung*, family and responsibility to the larger community became the foundation of the institute's mission, and in the process helped to transform it into Germany's leading center for Protestant social welfare. His efforts to reintegrate marginalized workers culminated in 1881 when he opened his first worker colony outside of Bielefeld. A closed environment, the worker colony isolated

---

[245] For more on nineteenth century concepts of deviancy see especially Robert Jütte, *Poverty and Deviance in Early Modern Europe* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Andreas Gestrich, Steven King, Lutz Raphael, eds., *Being Poor in Modern Europe: Historical Perspectives: 1800–1940* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2006); Beate Althammer, Inga Brandes, and Katrin Marx-Jaskulski, "Religiously motivated charitable work in modern times. Catholic congregations in the Rhineland and Ireland," in *Strangers and Poor People: Changing Patterns of Inclusion and Exclusion in Europe and the Mediterranean World from Classical Antiquity to the Present Day,* ed. Andreas Gestrich and Lutz Raphael, 371–414 (Bern: Peter Lang, 2009).

marginalized workers from the temptations of urban life while exposing them constantly to Bodelschwingh's philosophy. With its promises of transforming clients into loyal supporters of the conservative monarchy, the colony generated considerable interest within conservative circles and eventually became the center of a nationwide network of colonies. As a result, the worker colony was extremely important to shaping Bethel's development over the course of the next half century. Among those groups who were interested in expanding the worker colony initiative were colonial officials in East Africa who were desperate to transform Africans into a reliable source of labor. At the same time, Bethel's rapid growth would eventually lead to an influx of professionally trained physicians who did not agree with Bodelschwingh's vision for the institute. Therefore, Bodelschwingh's early work at Bethel would have dramatic implications for the future development of his philosophy within the community.

***

While in Paris, Bodelschwingh had become increasingly concerned about the impact of industrialization on working-class Germans as he witnessed the impact of long workdays and extreme poverty on the community. If ignored, Bodelschwingh feared that these tensions would gradually make working-class individuals more sympathetic to radical ideologies like Communism, thus threatening both the church and the state. He agreed with Johann Wichern and other leaders of the Inner Mission that Protestants needed to play a much greater role in the administration of poor relief because the problem had become too large for the state to handle alone. He also believed that the providers of relief, in the tradition of early-nineteenth-century missionaries to Africa, needed to reside among those they sought to help in order to convey a sense of genuine

empathy. Furthermore, he thought, like Wichern, that material assistance should only be a means to achieving inner reform, which was the key both to escaping poverty and successfully rejoining society. In Paris this meant not only providing practical relief and rebuilding lost connections with the church, but also rekindling a sense of German national identity among individuals who had been in France so long that they spoke French better than German. If anything, Bodelschwingh's experience in Paris made the larger question of poor relief in Germany all the more urgent. In his mind, France was the root of all revolutionary activity, and effective poor relief was essential to preventing the types of problems that afflicted the German community in Paris from spilling over into Germany.

He did not forget these concerns when he left Paris in the mid-1860s to become a parish pastor in the small Westphalian town of Dellwig. To be sure, the sleepy little village of Dellwig was a far cry from the rough and tumble chaos of Paris. Instead of trying to rescue wayward workers from the dual threat of radical political ideologies and French Catholicism, he now lived in a village that regularly celebrated its German heritage with a seemingly endless stream of *Volksfeste*. To his great dismay, Bodelschwingh quickly discovered that church bureaucracy was his biggest concern in Dellwig, a problem for which he had little patience.[246]

Given Dellwig's remoteness and lack of major social challenges, historians bypass this period of Bodelschwingh's life when analyzing the development of his

---

[246] Martin Gerhardt, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh: Ein Lebensbild aus der deutschen Kirchengeschichte. 1. Band, Werden und Reisen* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlag der Anstalt Bethel, 1950), 353.

approach to social welfare.[247] Yet, a brief analysis of this period clearly shows that it was a crucial transitional step in which Bodelschwingh refined his approach in Paris before making it the foundation for all his work at Bethel. Even though the residents proudly celebrated their nationalism, he feared they were still in danger of drifting away from the church, and thus they were not immune to the social problems that affected the rest of the country. For example, Bodelschwingh noted that the general attitude of the village to church life was "cool, if not lukewarm" because its festivals found a way to exclude the church.[248] In order to stimulate a renewed interest in religion, he consciously connected church life in Dellwig to the larger activity of the overseas missions.[249] Bodelschwingh attempted "to educate the residents of Dellwig to self-sacrifice" by encouraging them to support the mission financially.[250] Thus he used the larger idea of the mission to encourage spiritual reform among his parishioners while simultaneously discouraging them from displaying any interest in new and potentially dangerous ideas.

Of course village festivals were also renowned for the copious amounts of alcohol that people consumed. In this respect, Dellwig was no different from any other town; its residents could always find something to celebrate with a drink. Bodelschwingh noted that even baptismal celebrations became little more than an excuse to drink excessively.[251] Having concluded from his time in Paris that alcohol consumption went

---

[247] For example, there is no mention of Dellwig Matthias Benad and Hans-Walter Schmuhl, ed., *Bethel-Eckardtsheim: Von der Gründung der ersten deutschen Arbeiterkolonie bis zur Auflösung als Teilanstalt (1882–2001)* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2006).
[248] Hans-Walter Schmuhl, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh* (Reinbeck bei Hamburg: Rohwolt Taschenbuch Verlag, 2005), 55; see also Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, "Erinnerungen," *Beth-El* 11 (1919): 31.
[249] Gerhardt, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, Band 1,* 357.
[250] Ibid., 358.
[251] Ibid., 359.

hand in hand with poverty, he believed it was essential to eliminate alcohol as part of his larger agenda of promoting spiritual reform.[252]

To this end, Bodelschwingh utilized a small weekly newspaper called the *Westfälischer Hausfreund,* of which he became the editor shortly after arriving in Dellwig. Described as "Old Prussian-conservative and Christian" the newspaper's general reputation fit perfectly with Bodelschwingh's larger agenda of social reform. Martin Gerhardt described the paper's outlook as "reinforcement of the monarchical political tradition and of the Prussian kingdom of the Hohenzollerns, as well as opposition to Liberalism in all areas of public life."[253] Bodelschwingh remained true to the spirit of the paper by using it to denounce supposedly dangerous ideologies like Liberalism as well as the activities of socialist leaders like Ferdinand Lassalle and Hermann Schulze-Delitzsch.[254] He also used it as a platform to highlight social questions and prompt discussions that he hoped would lead to spiritual reform among the audience. In 1865 he even invited the famous conservative social reformer Victor Aimé Huber to respond to ideas advocated by Lassalle.

On one level, Huber strongly agreed with reformers like Bodelschwingh and Wichern that poor living conditions were a primary cause of pauperism. In order to

---

[252] Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, "Die Kirche und die Volksfeste," *Westfälischer Hausfreund,* 17 December 1865; reprinted in Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, *Ausgewählte Schriften, 1. Band: Veröffentlichungen aus den Jahren 1858 bis 1871*, ed. Alfred Adam, (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1955), 192–94; Gilbert, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, 1. Band*, 369.
[253] Gilbert, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, 1. Band*, 365–66.
[254] For more on Lassalle, Schulze-Delitzsch and the development of socialism in Germany from 1850–1870 see David E. Barclay and Eric D. Weitz, eds., *Between Reform and Revolution: German Socialism and Communism from 1840 to 1990* (New York: Berghan Books, 1998), especially Hermann Beck, "Working-Class Politics at the Crossroads of Conservatism, Liberalism, and Socialism," 63–86; Toni Offermann, "The Lassallean Labor Movement in Germany: Organization, Social Structure, and Associational Life in the 1860s," 87–112; Ralf Roth, "Bürger and Workers: Liberalism and the Labor Movement in Germany, 1848 to 1914," 113–40. See also Thomas Welskopp, *Das Banner der Brüderlichkeit: Die deutsche Sozialdemokratie vom Vormärz bis zum Socialistengesetz* (Bonn: Verlag J.H.W.Dietz Nachfolger, 2000), 60–228; Ralf Hoffrogge, *Sozialismus und Arbeiterbewegung in Deutschland: Von den Anfängen bis 1914* (Stuttgart: Schmetterling Verlag, 2011), 59–66.

prevent socialism from making inroads among the poor, reformers needed to focus on improving their overall quality of life. Yet, for Huber this meant much more than simply providing material assistance. He also stressed the importance of air quality and decent, affordable housing as ways to relieve the mental effects of poverty. He was highly critical of the Inner Mission for not taking these concerns seriously and generally focused more on the economic causes of poverty rather than social issues.[255]

While Bodelschwingh mostly agreed with Huber's understanding of poverty, he ultimately fell in line with reformers like Wichern. Based on his experiences in Paris and Dellwig, he came to view poverty primarily as a social problem. While material assistance and quality of life improvements were important, they were pointless without accompanying social reforms. For Bodelschwingh the point of poor relief was not necessarily the improvement of the worker's material existence. In an 1869 article he insisted that liberal social theorists were horribly misguided by focusing their reform efforts on the material aid. "Spirit and eternity is foolishness; meat, material pleasures, temporal luck, which is the jewel after which one runs. So preach the liberal, enlightened social politicians of the nineteenth century."[256] While he acknowledged that material assistance was necessary, it was far more important for him to combat socialism, which, if it found a receptive audience among poor workers, could threaten the conservative social order.

---

[255] Michael A. Kanther and Dietmar Petzina, *Victor Aimé Huber (1800–1869): Sozialreformer und Wegbereiter der sozialen Wohnungswirtschaft*, ed. GdW Bundesverband deutscher Wohnungsunternehmen e.V. (Berlin: Duncker & Humbolt, 2000), 147–53; see also Ingwer Paulsen, *Viktor Aimé Huber als Sozialpolitiker* (Berlin: Verlag Herbert Renner, 1956).

[256] Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, "Die Arbeiterfrage," *Westfälischer Hausfreund*, 12 September 1869; reprinted in Bodelschwingh, *Ausgewählte Schriften, 1. Band*, 549–51.

During his time in Dellwig, Bodelschwingh's hatred of socialism and the Social Democratic party grew considerably, as he made very clear in the pages of the *Westfälischer Hausfreund*.[257] He completely rejected its calls for a separation of church and state, and was horrified by the party's demand for secular schools. As a result he tried to appeal to both workers and factory owners, demonstrating that both groups had a common interest in working together. "The improvement in the situation of our workers can only happen when employers and workers are guided by the Gospel to Christian virtue. Any kind of violence makes this situation worse."[258] It was for this reason that Protestants of different economic backgrounds needed to work together and take an active interest in poor relief.

Given his experience in Paris, Bodelschwingh was convinced that any effort at reform had to begin with the family. To this end, while in Dellwig, he urged the state to pass laws prohibiting work on Sundays, outlawing child labor, and limiting the number of hours one could work each day.[259] At the same time, viewing alcohol as another threat to the maintenance of strong family units, Bodelschwingh also encouraged local governments to restrict the ability of people to purchase "spiritual drinks," noting the possible impact of a recent Norwegian law that attempted to restrict schnapps consumption after seven in the evening.[260]

---

[257] In this respect he was no different than other German conservatives. For more on the conservative attitudes to the SPD and the practice of *Sammlungspolitik*, see especially Geoff Eley, "The Wilhelmine Right: How it Changed," in *Society and Politics in Wilhelmine Germany*, ed. Richard Evans, 112–35 (New York: Barnes and Noble Books, 1978); see also Thomas Nipperdey, *Deutsche Geschichte, 1866–1918: Erster Band, Arbeitswelt und Bürgergeist* (Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1990), 335–73. For a good, general discussion of conflict between the German political parties see Thomas Nipperdey, *Deutsche Geschichte, 1866-–1918: Zweiter Band, Machtstaat vor der Demokratie* (Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1992), 514–75.
[258] Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, quoted in Gerhardt, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, 1. Band*, 385.
[259] Ibid., 550.
[260] Ibid., 550.

Furthermore, Bodelschwingh also called for extensive education reform. Schools could provide children with the highly regulated environment and patriarchal structure that they lacked at home. He used the pages of the *Westfälischer Hausfreund to* advocate forcefully for greater church involvement in schools because for him any larger effort of social change began with education. If the Social Democrats succeeded in secularizing schools, then in his mind the larger battle was already lost. An active Protestant presence in the schools would ensure that people did not stray from the church and become tempted by secular ideologies. Therefore, he called for an increase in the number of "*christliche*" teachers, and insisted that they maintain an active presence in working-class communities. By living in poorer urban districts, Bodelschwingh hoped that teachers and social workers would not only inoculate the working classes from political ideologies like socialism, but that they could also teach working-class people the importance of strong familial bonds and regular participation in Protestant church life.

Although Dellwig was far removed from the back alleys of Paris, it was nevertheless extremely important to the development of Bodelschwingh's larger philosophy. While there, he used his access to a small local paper to articulate further ideas and practices from his experiences in Paris. Even though the people of Dellwig did not appear to be threatened by any of these dangers, they still needed to remain vigilant to prevent the same social problems from developing there. Thus, Bodelschwingh's relatively brief stay in Dellwig was crucial to the development of the larger philosophy he would implement in Bielefeld.

***

Despite his location in a small, remote village, Bodelschwingh attracted considerable attention as a result of his publishing and activism. Leaders of both the Inner Mission and mission societies in Africa were very interested in his developing philosophy and sought to woo him with more influential positions. The Berlin Mission, for example, offered to appoint him as a general mission inspector who would be based in India.[261] While he desperately wanted to leave Dellwig, he also did not want to leave Westphalia.

Instead, Bodelschwingh agreed to become the head pastor at a small institution for young boys with epilepsy located just outside the city of Bielefeld in East Westphalia. Opened on 6 November 1867, the Bethel institution was part of a larger effort by the Inner Mission to serve people with epilepsy in the Rhineland and Westphalia.[262] Before he arrived in 1871, Bodelschwingh's only interaction with Bethel came through the *Westfälischer Hausfreund*, where he published articles describing the work of the community along with calls for donations.[263] In 1871, the institution housed twenty-five boys as well as a small but growing *Diakonissenmutterhaus*.[264] Using his philosophy, Bodelschwingh would transform Bethel into the largest center for Protestant social welfare in Germany by the time of his death in 1910. Not only did he expand dramatically the scope of the institution, but in the process he firmly established himself as one of the Inner Mission's most influential leaders.

With a much larger platform now at his disposal, Bodelschwingh created a variety of journals, periodicals and pamphlets in which he further publicized the main aspects of

---

[261] Schmuhl, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh*, 62–63.
[262] For more on the early years of the Bethel community see Gerhardt, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, Band 1*, 498–524.
[263] Schmuhl, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh*, 67
[264] Gerhardt, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, Band 1*, 524.

his approach to social welfare.[265] To generate a renewed sense of urgency among his audience, he wrote that he only first began to realize the seriousness of poor relief shortly after he arrived in Bielefeld. Unlike Dellwig, which was small and remote, Bielefeld was located on the heavily traversed East-West route connecting Berlin with Cologne and the industrialized Ruhr Valley.[266] Therefore, one was more likely to experience the social impact of poverty there than in Dellwig. Bodelschwingh told readers how desperate migrant workers would arrive at Bethel in search of help, and that in a moment of sympathy he gave them food and the occasional piece of clothing.[267] To his dismay, he claimed that his acts of generosity only encouraged more people to ask for help. "And this poor pilgrim has many, many brothers on the highways, jogging along behind. How do we deal with the same? Do we not educate them through our heartlessness and thoughtlessness to become idlers and vagabonds?"[268] Not only did Bodelschwingh continue to stress his belief that material aid was pointless when it was not attached to a larger pedagogical lesson, but he also used very clear language to describe the marginalized poor. This type of language would be a mainstay of all his discussions of poor relief at Bethel.

For Bodelschwingh, it was particularly important to link this threat with his arrival in Bielefeld, and to use much stronger language to paint the poor as deviant and threatening. On the one hand, he thought that it explained why the head of an institution

[265] For examples of such literature, see especially the newspaper *Der Wanderer* (*Die Arbeiterkolonie*), which focused on poor relief, as well as the more general *Bote von Bethel* (a monthly pamphlet about the institution), and *Beth-El*, a journal that offered material intended for more educated audiences.
[266] Martin Gerhardt, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, 2. Band: Das Werk, 1. Hälfte* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1952), 122.
[267] Ibid., 122.
[268] Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, "Meinen lieben Bruedern von der Landstrasse," (1905) in Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, *Ausgewählte Schriften, 2. Band: Veröffentlichungen aus den Jahren 1821 bis 1910*, ed. Alfred Adam, (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1964), 129.

for people with epilepsy was suddenly interested in migrant workers and devoting himself to combating poverty. Bodelschwingh feared that people could become suspicious if they knew he had arrived in Bielefeld with an agenda. At the same time, it also allowed him to repackage his larger concerns about the working classes and poverty in a way that his audiences could understand more easily. While most people in East Westphalia would not be able to imagine life in Paris, they could all relate to the image of a potentially dangerous individual showing up on their doorstep demanding alms. Thus, the story also served to generate new levels of support and interest in Bodelschwingh's larger social agenda. Audiences understood that because they refused to work, migrant workers posed a stark danger to societal order.

For Bodelschwingh, it was extremely important to use his greater visibility at Bethel to push for a major overhaul of poor relief provision in Germany. Specifically he though the *Herberge zur Heimat,* one of the Inner Mission's first major undertakings, had lost their focus. They had become little more than hostels where men could find a cheap place to spend the night. As a sign of how far they had fallen, the hostels came under heavy criticism by some social reformers as places that actually reinforced tendencies toward alcoholism and begging.[269] Bodelschwingh argued that the hostels only served to create an "organic relationship" between the hostel's guests and the surrounding bars.[270] In the first issue of the journal *Arbeiterkolonie* he denounced the *Herberge zur Heimat* as nothing more than "schools for the education of indolence and turpitude."[271]

---

[269] Warren Rosenblum, *Beyond the Prison Gates: Punishment and Welfare in Germany, 1850–1933* (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 48.
[270] Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, "Referat," *Hauptarchiv der von Bodelschwingh'schen Anstalten Bethel* (HAB) 8/3–32a.
[271] Central-Vorstande deutscher Arbeiter-Kolonien, ed., "Die Arbeiter-Kolonie. Korrespondenzblatt für die Intressen der deutschen Arbeiter-Kolonien und Naturalverpflegungs-Stationen," *Die Arbeiter-Kolonie* 1, no. 1 (April 1884): 1–7, at 3.

Bodelschwingh, along with many other social reformers, were convinced that the hostels needed to be replaced with something that once again made spiritual reform the primary focus of poor relief.

Ultimately, Bodelschwingh's early efforts to publicize the need for poor relief reform were essential to the later establishment of his first worker colony. The combination of enthusiasm for reform and fear of the poor translated into vital financial support for his efforts. To this end the annual conference for the "*Verein fuer Innere Mission in Minden-Ravensberg, Schaumburg-Lippe, Osnabrueck und Tecklenburg*" in 1879 was marked by an extensive discussion of poor relief reform. Gustav Schlosser, the leader of the *Innere Mission* in Frankfurt am Main, was invited to speak on "the current vagabond threat," and provided a commentary on the problem that would touch upon many of the same themes Bodelschwingh emphasized. In the process, by generating so much fear among Protestant reformers, it created the support Bodelschwingh needed to translate his vision of a worker colony into reality.[272]

Schlosser used his address to paint an extremely pessimistic picture of unruly bands of bums who wandered from town to town, demanding alms. 'Therefore these hordes of vagabonds – stock that devours, just like the Pharaoah's "lean cows" – are threatening to gobble up all that society has gained in prosperity."[273] Using the story from the book of Genesis, he depicted the wandering unemployed as a group of malignant moochers who threatened to destroy society. In his estimation, their demands for alms were the equivalent of taking the town hostage and leveling a "compulsory tax"

---

[272] Gerhardt, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, 2. Band*, 124–25.
[273] Gustav Schlosser, *Die Vagabunden-Noth* (Bielefeld: Schriften Niederlage der Anstalt "Bethel" bei Bielefeld, 1879), 4.

before moving on and doing the same thing to the next community.[274] Therefore, he urged Protestants to support Bodelschwingh and adopt a new approach to combating the "plague" of "begging vagabonds" that would eliminate the threat they posed to society.[275]

Like Bodelschwingh, Schlosser was motivated to help the poor primarily by his belief that they posed a significant security threat to mainstream society. Outwardly, vagabonds were men with a "bearded, dark, weather beaten face" who appeared at the doors of hostels first thing in the morning in search of alms. As a sign of their marginalization, he noted that they were "without a homeland, without a steady job, and men of a wandering residence."[276] At the same time Schlosser also insisted that they threatened the general order of society because of their refusal to work.

> If you ask the vagabond why he was not working, so he has his excuse; his business, so the story goes, just is not going in high summer, it is snow shoveling... If you offer him a job, no matter how easy it is, he has disappeared into thin air before you even understand, leaving only his scent behind. Workshy, deadening, volatile, and swampy is the spirit of the Vagabond.[277]

As a result of their constant migration and lack of regular employment, Schlosser argued that so-called vagabonds experienced a fundamental "estrangement" from God and country.[278] Therefore, Protestants needed to reform poor relief in such a way that would stress the importance of religion and communal bonds in order to counteract this threat and reintegrate the marginalized poor.

Like the other leading figures of the Inner Mission, Schlosser called for active collaboration between Protestant organizations and the state. To this end, government

---

[274] Ibid., 4.
[275] Ibid., 4.
[276] Ibid., 6.
[277] Ibid., 9.
[278] Ibid., 12.

should pass legislation designed to ensure that working-class families had access to safe, affordable housing. In Berlin, for example, he claimed that poorer families were relegated to the dirtier, rear apartments rather than the "friendlier" front ones. At the very least, Schlosser asked "shouldn't they feel well in their own home?"[279] By making safe, clean housing available, Schlosser maintained that the government could encourage working families to establish roots in their neighborhood, which would in turn foster a larger sense of community among working-class people and eliminate any temptation they had to move. Ultimately, Schlosser's call to action would be taken to heart by Bodelschwingh's son Gustav. Using a house building technique he learned in Africa, Gustav would make quality housing the core aspect of his effort to carry Bodelschwingh's philosophy into the twentieth century.

The solution Schlosser proposed was something that would eventually take the form of Bodelschwingh's worker colony. In his conference presentation, Schlosser echoed the views of many Protestants that alms did nothing to discourage individuals from begging. Without fundamental, inner-reform, he argued that beggars would squander any money they received on alcohol and fall deeper into despair. Therefore, the practice of giving alms needed to be strictly curtailed. Instead, Schlosser urged Protestants to consider seriously the prospect of reviving the idea of the work-house and adapting it to meet the needs of an industrialized society. Specifically, he insisted that any aid, monetary or otherwise, should be tied directly to the performance of work. "More than anything else, work must be done, which is not easy, but still possible."[280] For those people who entered the institution without the intention of working, Schlosser

[279] Ibid., 15.
[280] Ibid., 24.

insisted that the administrators should punish them by limiting the amount of food they received. "Those who do not want to work will not be released soon, so that they will not advised on worse ways; but in the institution they get in the hospital only a tough pallet for afterward ... until they understand work and are then cared for better."[281] Schlosser was particularly keen on forcing people to perform agricultural labor. Practically, it was something almost anyone could easily learn how to do. Theoretically, agricultural work would also lead to the creation of stable families once individuals left the colony. Unlike factory work, farms were located far from the urban temptations that tore apart so many working-class families. Furthermore many Protestant reformers believed that the act of working with the land would create a natural bond between the laborer and the nation. Thus, farm work would also counteract the political threat posed by disaffected workers in the city by producing loyal supporters of the monarchy. In support of his proposal, Schlosser highlighted the success of a Belgian initiative, the *maisons de medicité*, as proof that his proposals were not just "castles in the sky" and could be adapted for German use.[282] The emphasis Schlosser placed on agricultural work and familial bonds would later come to be defining characteristics of Bodelschwingh's worker colonies.

***

When analyzing the origins of Bodelschwingh's first worker colony, historians tend not to discuss the impact of his early years at Bethel. Instead, they situate the worker colony into the larger context of nineteenth-century poor relief policies and the early history of the Inner Mission. While these factors undoubtedly exercised a profound influence on Bodelschwingh's approach to social welfare, they do not explain how

[281] Ibid., 26.
[282] Ibid., 26.

Bodelschwingh was able to convince social conservatives to provide him with the initial financial support to make his dream possible.

Schlosser's presentation provided Bodelschwingh with the momentum he needed to turn talk into action. Both Protestant reformers and conservative officials left the conference with the understanding they had to act before it was too late. Bodelschwingh was quick to capitalize on their fears by pressuring local, conservative dignitaries to lend their political and financial support to his plan for a worker colony.[283] Although Bodelschwingh believed that the colony should be supported by voluntary offerings of charity, he also knew that he would never realize his goal unless he received strong local support. Therefore, Schlosser's speech was a godsend because it clearly demonstrated to local authorities why it was in their best interests to help Bodelschwingh.

With their help he purchased a large piece of land to the south of Bielefeld known as the Senne. Largely infertile marshland, the parcel of land appealed to Bodelschwingh for multiple reasons. Most importantly it was extremely cheap, with the German military as the only other competitor for the land.[284] Theoretically, however, the site was also appealing because it was relatively remote, meaning that clients would be far removed from the temptations of the city. Furthermore Bodelschwingh also believed that the practice of reclaiming otherwise useless land would help to foster a greater connection between clients of the colony and the nation.

---

[283] Jürgen Scheffler, "Frommigkeit und Fürsorge: Die Gründung der Arbeiterkolonie Wilhelmsdorf und die Wohlfahrtspflege in Westfalen und Lippe um 1880," in *Diakonie: Geschichte von unten: Christliche Nächstenliebe und kirchliche Sozialarbeit in Westfalen*, ed. Hans Bachman and Reinhard van Spankeren, 117-42 (Bielefeld: Luther-Verlag, 1995), 123.

[284] Wolfgang Motzkau-Valeton, "Zur Geographie," in *Bethel-Eckardtsheim: Von der Gründung der ersten deutschen Arbeiterkolonie bis zur Auflösung als Teilanstalt (1882–2001)*, eds. Matthias Benad and Hans-Walter Schmuhl (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 2006), 96. In a testament to the land's uselessness, the military wanted to use it as an artillery range.

After securing the necessary funds to establish the colony, which was officially known as Wilhelmsdorf, Bodelschwingh began the practical work of preparing the site for an influx of workers on 22 March 1882, the emperor's birthday. While the colony's name broke with the Bethel tradition of naming initiatives after names from the Old Testament, Bodelschwingh believed it was key to garnering additional assistance from conservative leaders. Always eager to demonstrate his loyalty to the monarchy, Bodelschwingh believed that the name Wilhelmsdorf would clearly convey the nationalist aspect of his project while generating valuable publicity for Bethel across Germany.[285] .

By mid-summer the initial work was complete, and on 13 August, 1882, to great fanfare, Bodelschwingh officially opened the colony. From the outset, he willingly played on the fears of potential conservative supporters by differentiating between the deserving and undeserving poor. Building off of the promotional literature he distributed about the need to reform poor relief in Germany, he described two types of poor migrant workers; those who genuinely wanted help and those who did not. With very limited resources, Bodelschiwngh insisted the worker colony had to target those individuals who wanted to reintegrate themselves into society. "Regardless of the price, it cannot be established on the principle of an obligation to give work to each unemployed individual. Then the immediate bankruptcy of the project is assured, and one has at most a colony of malicious and ungrateful idlers."[286] Only those individuals who voluntarily sought out

---

[285] For more on the naming of *Wilhelmsdorf* see Gerhardt, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, 2. Band*, 125–26.
[286] Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, *Die Ackerbau-Colonie "Wilhelmsdorf" nach ihren bisherigen Erfahrungen*, (Bielefeld: Verlag der Schriften-Niederlage der Anstalt "Bethel", 1882), 3.

the colony would earnestly work to reform themselves while also appreciating the opportunity they received.[287]

By contrast, the deviant poor, those who rejected work, not only had little interest in changing their ways, but they would also undermine the larger purpose of the colony by distracting and tempting those who did want to change.[288] If these individuals were allowed into the colony, not only would they disrupt Bodelschwingh's larger pedagogical project, but upon their release from the colony they would inevitably run afoul of the police and end up in prison. In 1881 alone, Bodelschwingh claimed that Prussian prisons contained nearly 24,000 unemployed men. Thus, the deviant poor were both a security threat as well as a threat to the finances of the state. Instead of distributing alms to individual beggars, he urged supporters to donate to his colony.[289] Such offerings would not only allow Bodelschwingh to claim that the colony maintained high levels of popular support, but it would also permit him to control the disbursement of aid. If an individual needed help, he would have to go through the worker colony.

While the nominal goal of the colony was to provide long-term assistance to the deserving poor migrant worker, in reality its true purpose had more to do with eliminating the deviant poor and the theoretical threat they posed to the existence of a society dominated by the Protestantism and the conservative monarchy "These must be

[287] Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, "Wer hilft mir?," in *Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger* 22, no. 359 (1904); Jürgen Scheffler, "Der Anstalt Bethel und die 'Brüder von der Landstraße:' Anstaltsdiakonie und Wohlfahrtspflege am Beispiel der Wandererfürsorge," in *Bethels Mission (2): Bethel im Spannungsfeld von Erweckungsfrömmigkeit und öffentlicher Fürsorge. Beiträge zur Geschichte der v. Bodelschwinghschen Anstalten Bethel*, ed. Matthias Benad and Kerstin Winkler, (Bielefeld: Luther Verlag, 2001), 202.
[288] Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, *Die Wanderarmen und Arbeitslosen* (Bielefeld: Verlag des deutschen Vereins "Arbeiterheim," 1895), 3.
[289] Bodelschwingh, *Die Ackerbau-Kolonie "Wilhelmsdorf,"* 9.

abundant, so that every excuse of the traveler to still have to beg is cut off."[290] By Bodelschwingh's calculation, if the worker colony became the only institution to provide assistance to poor migrant workers, the "*lazy*" and "work shy" would have no choice "to work or to die."[291]

These concerns also influenced the physical location of the worker colony with respect to its distance from an urban area. Ostensibly, the distance was to ensure that only truly motivated individuals arrived at the colony. Wilhelmsdorf was located a "several hour march by foot" outside the city of Bielefeld, and *Hoffnungstaler*, a worker colony north of Berlin associated with Bethel, was located one day's walking distance outside the city.[292] Yet the distance was also key to isolating clients from anything that may distract them from internalizing Bodelschiwngh's philosophy. Based on his experience in Paris, Bodelschwingh concluded that cities were nothing more than dark dens of temptation and immoral behavior. It was all too easy for impoverished workers to end up in the pub at the end of the day and quickly negate any progress they made at reforming their behavior.

One can also observe the legacy of Bodelschwingh's first schools on the way in which the colony operated internally. Set apart from the city, he theoretically designed it to be a heavily-regulated sanctuary that stressed the importance of regular work, familial bonds, religion and the nation. After being submersed by this philosophy for an extended period of time, Bodelschwingh believed the client would be successfully reintegrated. In

---

[290] Der Vorstand der Arbeiter-Kolonie Wilhelmsdorf, *Die Arbeiter-Kolonie "Wilhelmsdorf," 1883*, *Archiv des Diakonischen Werkes* (ADW), 3.
[291] Bodelschwingh, *Die Ackerbau-Kolonie "Wilhelmsdorf,"* 9.
[292] Scheffler, "Die Arbeiterkolonie Wilhelmsdorf, (1882 bis 1970)" in *Bethel-Eckardtsheim: Von der Gründung der ersten deutschen Arbeiterkolonie bis zur Auflösung als Teilanstalt (1882–2001)*, eds. Matthias Benad, Hans-Walter Schmuhl, 115–40 (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2006), at 122.

the process, not only would he no longer be a financial burden on society, but in theory he would also become a loyal supporter of the church and state.

Once they arrived at the colony, clients were required to sign a contract in which they acknowledged that they were voluntarily entering it. Since most individuals arrived completely destitute, the house-father (the *Diakonen* who oversaw the colony) also provided them with a clean change of clothing. Of course nothing was free at Wilhelmsdorf and clients were required to reimburse the colony for everything they received through the provision of labor. Not only did this stipulation help to reinforce the importance of regular work, but it also meant that clients would not be able to check out immediately after entering the colony. Typically an individual needed to work at the colony for a minimum of two weeks to pay the colony for the food, shelter and initial aid he received before entering.[293] Therefore the provision of clothing and other initial forms of aid, by keeping clients in the colony to work off their debt, were essential to the larger pedagogical success of the colony.

If the client worked off his initial debt and decided to remain in the colony beyond the initial two weeks, he received a small wage of 25 *Pfennig* per day for the next four weeks. If he remained in the colony longer than six weeks, his wage would then increase to 40 *Pfennig* per day. While the wages within the colony were better than what one could get while begging, they were also substantially lower than what one could earn through a regular job.

> The merit is standardized that a diligent worker who can find work elsewhere, will have no desire to enter the colony, but on the other hand, high enough that a diligent man earn in 3-4 months proper work clothes and the requisite tools.[294]

---

[293] Ibid., 122; For an example of a *Haus Ordnung*, see Scheffler, ed., *Burger und Bettler*, 69.
[294] "Die Grüdung der Arbeiter-Kolonie Wilhelmsdorf in der Senne," *ADW, M I a 989*.

By keeping the wages low, Bodelschwingh hoped that they would make the colony more appealing than begging, but also pressure clients to find steady work. To this end, clients did not receive their wages until after they officially left the colony.[295] Thus the colony also used the payment of wages as another way to coerce clients into conforming to Bodelschwingh's philosophy.

Inside the colony, Bodelschwingh created a heavily regulated environment in which everything brought out some aspect of his philosophy. Typically, the day began between 5:00-6:30 in the morning, depending on the time of year.[296] After washing and making their beds, colonists ate a small breakfast of bread and coffee and attended a brief church service.[297] For most clients, a twelve-hour workday began promptly at 7:00 AM. Those men who were responsible for making breakfast began their day as early as 3:30 AM with milking the cows.[298] Work was punctuated by three breaks; a fifteen-minute break at mid-morning, an hour for lunch, and a late-afternoon coffee break for thirty minutes. The day concluded at 7:00 PM with dinner followed by cleaning and preparation for the following day's dinner. While Saturday largely followed the same schedule as a weekday, work ended one hour earlier to allow clients time to clean their clothing in preparation for church services the next morning. For Bodelschwingh, ending the day early for personal hygiene was a way to stress the importance of organization and

[295] Ibid.
[296] The work day started later than during the winter.
[297] Schlunk, A. F., *Die Berliner Arbeiter-Kolonie, ihre Entwicklung und Arbeit: Zum 20. Jarestage ihrer Begründung dem 1. Mai 1903* (Berlin: Verlag der Berliner Arbeiter-Kolonie, 1903), 20. See also *ADW BIII g3/CA 342 Vol. 1*.
[298] O. Clarenbach, "Ein Arbeitstag in der Arbeiterkolonie," in *Im Dienst der Liebe: Erlebnisse aus der Arbeit der inneren Mission*, ed. Carl Göbel (Bielefeld: Bethel Verlag, 1907), 135.

personal responsibility. The fact that this was done in preparation for church services also conveyed the importance of religion. [299]

In order to combat idleness and perceived laziness among the colony's clients, Bodelschwingh believed they had to be constantly active. To this end, the colony's *Diakonen* forced the men to remain active after dinner through a variety of activities that also encouraged spiritual reform.[300] In addition to reading and playing outside, the colony's leaders organized choral groups in which the men would sing religious songs. Naturally, because of its overtly religious nature, they pressured clients to choose the latter option for their evening activity. Finally, after another brief church service at 9:00 PM, the day officially ended at 9:30.

In the spirit of emphasizing religion and the importance of community, Sunday was different than the rest of the week. The high point of the day was the morning church service, which the clients attended with the general public. Therefore, clients worked on their personal hygiene the day before so that they would look presentable at church the following morning.[301] Fostering interaction with the public was important not only because it illustrated the importance of community, but also because the colony was largely dependent on public support. By presenting a group of clean, seemingly reformed men, Bodelschwingh believed that Sunday church services were the perfect form of advertisement to solicit additional donations.

For both practical and pedagogical reasons, work in the colony was notorious for being physically demanding outdoor work. Because of the high turnover rate, Bodelschwingh did not want to invest significant time and money training men to

---

[299] Scheffler, "Die Arbeiterkolonie Wilhelmsdorf," in *Bethel-Eckardtsheim*, 122.
[300] Schlunk, *Die Berliener Arbeiter-Kolonie, ihre Entwicklung und Arbeit*, 20.
[301] Ibid., 20.

perform highly specialized tasks. Outdoor labor was attractive in this respect because it could be performed nearly year-round and because a client could learn how to do it quickly and easily.[302] Pedagogically, however, outdoor work stressed the importance of being responsible to a larger community because it would theoretically benefit everyone at Bethel. The other residents at Bethel, for example, consumed the agricultural goods produced at Wilhelmsdorf. Stone breaking, another common task performed by colonists, was a vital component of road construction in the Bethel community. "The bad debris was carted off, the good stone laid out, and to turn the evil ravine into a good driving road."[303] Thus, by benefitting greater Bethel, outdoor labor helped the workers to understand the obligations one had as part of a larger community. The question of obligation and responsibility, however, also applied to the greater public, whom Bodelschwingh condemned with equal ferocity. Even if a marginalized migrant worker wanted to settle down and rejoin society, he argued that society did little to help him make that transition. Without help, a marginalized worker could end up in prison or "state poor houses, which despite every effort, can only be schools of vice."[304] In essence, he accused society of kicking vulnerable individuals while they were down. How would they ever learn to become part of a community if the members of that community refused to help them? The general population needed to demonstrate to the marginalized workers that it was willing to help them make that transition. To this end, Bodelschwingh believed popular support for the worker colony was vital because it

[302] Bodelschwingh, *Die Ackerbau-Kolonie "Wilhelmsdorf,"* 4; "Die Gründung der Arbeiter-Kolonie Wilhelmdorf in der Senne," *ADW M I a 989.* When It was too cold to work outside, clients worked indoors weaving baskets that could be used by the other residents of Bethel.
[303] Bodelschwingh, "Meinen lieben Brüdern von der Landstrasse," in *Ausgewählte Schriften Bd. 2*, 131.
[304] *Die Arbeiter-Kolonie "Wilhelmsdorf*, 1883, 1.

symbolized an attempt by society to restore the broken bond.[305] In practical terms, however, it also meant even more financial support for the worker colony.

Despite his rhetoric about communal obligations, the primary underlying concern that undoubtedly drove Bodelschwingh was his fear that impoverished workers could be easily swayed by radical ideologies. Unemployed and on the fringes of society, ideologies like socialism were attractive because they spoke directly to the immediate concerns of struggling individuals. With this concern in mind, Bodelschwingh also directed his rhetoric of communal responsibility at rich factory owners, who were the main beneficiaries of industrialism. He accused them of being more interested in maximizing their profits than in providing steady jobs that would in turn help build stable communities. For example, he claimed it was not uncommon to hear stories of older people (men over the age of forty) and individuals of "weak character" being denied work at large factories.[306] Furthermore, he claimed that factory owners failed to teach their employees specialized, transferrable skills, which left them particularly vulnerable when the labor market fluctuated during times of economic distress. Therefore, because they did nothing to help their workers integrate into society Bodelschwingh believed that large industrialists were partly responsible for the social problems posed by poor, unemployed individuals. At the same time, his willingness to criticize the industrialists demonstrated that he did not hesitate to assert himself against potentially powerful and influential people. If he appeared beholden to a specific group, he feared it would undermine support for his larger agenda. Given their marginalization, Bodelschwingh could understand it if the poor resented society. As a whole, it had largely failed in its

---

[305] Bodelschwingh, *Die Wanderarmen und Arbeitslosen*, 4.
[306] Bodelschwingh, *Die Wanderarmen und Arbeitslosen*, 5.

obligation to help them. In order to convey a sense of acceptance and empathy, Bodelschwingh again returned to the tradition of nineteenth-century missionaries in Africa as well as his own experiences in Paris. The colony's house fathers not only lived in the colony but also worked in the fields alongside their clients. Thus, everyone needed to work hard, regardless of their socio-economic background. To this end Bodelschwingh frequently liked to paint pictures in Bethel's promotional literature of rich businessmen working alongside impoverished workers in the fields.

> This is a general principle that the house rules must be worked on in every house and class... so we work, whether count or baron, whether merchant or craftsman, whether pastor or doctor whether officer or pharmacist, and if we have never used a pick or have driven truck, we do it as best as we can, and the heart learns to shout about it.[307]

Regardless of one's socio-economic status, everyone had to work equally hard, and if one worked, one could rejoin society. "Therefore, it is absolutely the only way to get out of this crisis, the requirement of a performance of work for any support of any individual capable of working, so the agony of chosing between worthy and unworthy is brought to an end."[308] Through work, Bodelschwingh believed that Protestants were offering individuals a way in from the margins that would also reduce any lingering bitterness that the individual felt toward society. Just as work resulted in so many social problems, it solved these problems when it was used as a force of social leveling.

It was in Wilhelmsdorf, therefore, that Bodelschwingh clearly established the idea of work as the foundation of his larger philosophy. Not only would a strong work

---

[307] "Eckardtsheim," in *Bote von Bethel* 47, 7.

[308] Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, *Vorschläge zur Vereinigung aller deutschen Arbeiter-Kolonien nach allgemeinen Grundsätzen zur einheitlichen inneren Ordnung und zu gemeinsamem Handeln nach außen, namentlich in Betreff der Organization der NAturalverpflegungstationen. Referat gehalten in der Versammlung der vereinigten Vorstände deutscher Arbeiter-Kolonien zu Hannover am 16. Oktober 1883 von Pastor von Bodelschwingh* (Bielefeld: Verlag der Schriften-Niederlage der Anstalt "Bethel," 1883), 22–23.

ethic enable chronically unemployed men to hold down a steady job, but in the process it would also allow them to realize the other components of the philosophy. For example, labor projects like street repair and farm work also taught workers about responsibility and the importance of community because they could see how their work benefitted society in general. Protestant reformers like Bodelschwingh believed the key to successful spiritual reform was making an individual want to reform himself. The work ethic was key to the success of the larger philosophy because it was the means through which an individual would come to understand the importance of things like religion, family and community. As E. Rabenau writes, it was no accident that the proverb "Not external compulsion, but internal coercion, compulsion leads to anger, but voluntary action makes for happy people." acted as the guiding principle behind both Bodelschwingh's philosophy and the worker colony.[309] While compulsion could force an individual to change his behavior while he was in the colony, he would likely resort back to his old lifestyle after leaving. Teaching individuals the importance of working hard, Bodelschwingh believed, would successfully bring about the spiritual reform that needed to occur before they could return to society permanently.

This emphasis on voluntary, spiritual reform was especially important because it was the main factor that brought the worker colonies to the attention of colonial officials in East Africa. As chapter four will demonstrate, colonial officials, having failed to use a variety of compulsory measures, were desperate to transform Africans into a labor pool for colonial projects. Therefore, they encouraged Bodelschwingh to become active in

---

[309] E. F. Rabenau, *Bodelschwingh als Erzieher: Welche Grundsätze über Schulbildung und Erziehung sind aus Bodelschwinghs Persönlichkeit und aus seiner Wirksamkeit zu entnehmen?* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1924), 42–43.

missionary work with the belief that he would try to instill a similar attitude toward work in colonial subjects.

When he looked back on his time in Paris, Bodelschwingh concluded that the key to fostering a strong work ethic in working-class communities was the creation of a clear and strong family structure. At the same time, as he reflected on his own development, Bodelschwingh credited his personal successes to a series of strong male role models. In addition to his father he also recalled several charismatic teachers who encouraged him to work hard. While the structure provided by the classroom was important, it was the "fatherly and motherly position of the teacher to their students" that ultimately made Bodelschwingh want to work.[310] To this end he believed it was essential to replicate a similar structure at Bethel. As Ingo Stücke indicates, one of the defining characteristics of Bethel during Bodelschwingh's tenure was the patriarchal social structure that dominated life in the community. Bodelschwingh depicted the Bethel community as one large family, with Bodelschwingh himself as the charismatic "father." Wilhelmsdorf was organized in a similar manner on a smaller scale, with the house-fathers (or "brothers as they were also called) treating clients like parents would treat their children.[311] Just as Bodelschwingh worked hard to please his parents and teachers, he hoped that the clients of Wilhelmsdorf would want to work hard to please him and the colony's house-fathers.[312] Furthermore, if Bodelschwingh's philosophy was successful, the men would

---

[310] Rabenau, *Bodelschwingh als Erzieher* 14–15, 19.
[311] Ingo Stücke, "Bethel-Gemeinde und Bethel-Mission: Rückwirkungen und Einflüsse der Äußeren Mission auf die diakonische "corporate identity" Bethels 1906–1946," in *Bethels Mission (3): Mutterhaus, Mission und Pflege, Beiträge zur Geschichte der v. Bodelschwinghschen Anstalten Bethel*, eds. Matthias Benad and Vicco von Bülow, 171–251 (Bielefeld: Luther-Verlag, 2003), 176–77. See also Matthias Benad, "Frömmigkeit und Familie in Bethel, Sarepta und Nazareth," in *Inter Legem et Evangelium. Theion-Jahrbuch für Religionskultur*, Vol. 3, ed. Hans Stoodt-Christoph and Edmund Weber, 9–28 (Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1994).
[312] Rabenau, *Bodelschwingh als Erzieher*, 41.

leave the colony looking to settle down and start their own families. Drawing on their experience in the colony, they would understand their responsibilities as the patriarch of their own family. Thus, the father's responsibility to his family would help the individual to maintain a strong work ethic long after he had left the worker colony.[313]

In addition to reintegration Matthias Benad, the leader of the *Bethel Forschungstelle*, argues there was also a deeper theological significance behind the emphasis German Protestants placed on maintaining a strong work ethic that one must also consider when assessing Bodelschwingh's interest in work. He contends that the idea of "*Sterbefrömmigkeit*" was the driving philosophical force behind Bodelschwingh's advocacy of the work ethic at Bethel. According to this theory, failing to work was essentially wasting a gift from God. To this end, the chronically unemployed were in danger of eternal damnation. Therefore, industriousness was something Bodelschwingh expected not only of the unemployed men who entered the worker colonies, but of everyone in Bethel.[314]

While Benad's argument may explain the theological underpinnings of Bodelschwingh's philosopy, it was likely not the primary motivation behind it. Indeed, Bodelschwingh was heavily influenced by the ideas of the early-nineteenth-century Awakening movement. However he never discussed *Sterbefrömmigkeit* to nearly the

---

[313] H. Stölting, "Eine Arbeiterkolonie für Vagabunden," *Daheim: ein deutsches Familienblatt und Illustrationen* (1882), 393.
[314] Matthias Benad, "'Komme ich um, so komme ich um […]' Sterbelust und Arbeitslast in der Betheler Diakonissenfrömmigkeit," *Jahrbuch für Westfälische Kirchengeschichte* 97 (2002): 195–213, at 198–203; see also Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, "Erziehung der Schwestern zur Wahrhaftigkeit und zur Zucht in der Gemeinschaft und durch die Gemeinschaft," in Bodelschwingh, *Ausgewählte Schriften, Vol. 2*, 28–41.

same degree as topics like the family, community and reintegration. He was clearly much more concerned with the social and political threat posed by disaffected workers.[315]

***

During the colony's first years of existence, Bodelschwingh made a point of returning its clients to society as quickly as possible. For example, in 1884, he proudly announced to the General Assembly of Wilhelmsdorf that between the opening of the colony on 17 August 1882 and the end of 1883, 1224 of the 1584 men (77%) who passed through the colony successfully found steady work.[316] In 1887, official statistics claimed that colonists in Wilhelmsdorf spent on average ninety-six days in the colony, indicating that the colony's administration placed a strong emphasis on moving colonists through as quickly as possible.[317]

Bodelschwingh was keen to promote these statistics for two reasons. First, it translated into positive publicity, which he hoped would generate momentum to create a network of colonies. For example, a piece in the small, regional newspaper *Daheim*, lauded the colony for its efforts in this respect. It noted that once the colonist had earned enough money to purchase a set of clean clothing and his own work uniform, "so the house father has the obligation to create the opportunity for him to work a paying job outside. When such a position is found, the colonist has the obligation to leave the colony."[318] The longer clients hung around the colony, the more difficult it would be for Bodelschwingh to sell the virtues of his philosophy to prospective financial supporters of

---

[315] See also, *Die Arbeiterkolonie Wilhelmsdorf und die westfälischen Natural-Verpflegungsstationen. Bericht über die General-Versammlung der Arbeiterkolonie Wilhelmsdorf in Hamm am 7. August 1886* (Bielefeld: Verlag der Schriften Niederlage der Anstalt Bethel, 1886), 5.; Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, "Natural-Verpflegungsstationen," *Die Arbeiter-Kolonie* 4 (1887), 238–42.

[316] *General-Versammlung in Wilhelmsdorf*, 1884, *ADW*, Bibliothek des Central-Ausschusses für Innere Mission.

[317] *Die Arbeiterkolonie Wilhelmsdorf*, 1887, *ADW*, Bibliothek des Central-Ausschusses für Innere Mission.

[318] Stölting, "Eine Arbeiterkolonie für Vagabunden," *Daheim* (1882), 395.

the colony. Therefore, once the authorities determined that an individual was capable of regular work he was dismissed from the colony and sent back to the labor market.

Second, Bodelschwingh also knew that a high reintegration rate would be well received by conservatives; most notably the Hohenzollern monarchy. Given that conservatives were also deeply troubled by the growth of socialism and the threat of revolutionary activity within the working classes, they were natural allies with Protestant leaders like Bodelschwingh. Both groups were eager to restructure poor relief so that it encouraged the impoverished to embrace Christianity and the monarchy. At the same time, they were also both staunchly opposed to the alternatives proposed by the Social Democratic Party.[319] Bodelschwingh also knew that without their support it would be impossible to expand his initiative beyond East Westphalia. "It is simply not true a lazy excuse, that a coalition of church and state, because of a lack of resources, had to let innocent and work-willing individuals sink."[320] Therefore, by highlighting the high number of clients who were discharged from the colony, Bodelschwngh sought to show conservatives why it was in their best interests to back him financially.

Furthermore, Bodelschwingh also looked for other ways to connect his work more explicitly to the Hohenzollern family. In his address at the colony's official opening, Clamor Huchzermeyer, the superintendent of the *Kirchenkreis* Bielefeld, noted that the colony was a symbol of the "Christian-conservative political understanding" regarding privately administered social welfare.[321] "The man, who is named Wilhelm, has a heart

---

[319] For a discussion of SPD social welfare policies see E. P. Hennock, *The Origin of the Welfare State in England and Germany, 1850–1914* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 120–40; Sachsse and Tennstedt, *Geschichte der Armenfürsorge*, 257–66.
[320] Bodelschwingh, *Die Ackerbau-Kolonie "Whelmsdorf,"* 6.
[321] Scheffler, "Frömmigkeit und Fürsorge: Die Gründung der Arbeiterkolonie Wilhelmsdorf und die Wohlfahrtspflege in Westfalen und Lippe um 1880," in *Diakonie: Geschichte von unten*, 126.

for all of the poor among his people and thinks of them first, while others make laws that do little."[322] At the first general assembly of the colony on 9 January 1883, Bodelschwingh further emphasized this connection by publicly acknowledging the public and religious leaders who financially supported him.[323]

In terms of generating support among conservatives, Bodeslchwingh's decision to name the Crown Prince of the Hohenzollern monarchy, Friedrich-Wilhelm, as the official protector of the colony paid particularly high dividends. In so doing, Bodelschiwngh created a very public link between Bethel and the royal family. When the Crown Prince officially visited Bielefeld in July 1883, the entire city responded with a momentous celebration. As the local newspaper reported, "yesterday was for our area a day of celebration and rejoicing in the fullest sense, but it was our most celebrated and widely beloved Crown Prince who offered up the homage of the Ravensberger region."[324] Since the point of the visit was to acknowledge his status as the colony's protector, Friedrich Wilhelm made multiple, well publicized tours of Bethel's initiatives, including a special visit to Wilhelmsdorf. In order to mark the sanctity of the tour, only a select group of local dignitaries accompanied him. "The entire point of the journey was lost if thousands of spectators created a distraction."[325]

Inside, the Crown Prince observed the colony's clients working diligently in the fields, exactly as Bodelschwingh described in the promotional literature. Although they were not on the tour, the local press described how Friedrich Wilhelm "displayed a deep

---

[322] Clamor Huchzermeyer, "Rede bei der Eröffnung von Wilhelmsdorf," *Evangelisches Monatsblatt für Westfalen* 38 (1882), 308.
[323] *Zeitung für Innere Mission* 10 (1883): 305–09, at 98.
[324] "Besuch des Kronprinzen," *Bielefelder Tageblatt: Zeitung für Ravensberg und Minden* 164, 17 July, 1883.
[325] *Bielefelder Tageblatt* 162, 14 July 1883.

interest in everything" including the pig stalls."[326] As Scheffler notes, the visit was a major success for Bodelschwingh because the press reported it as "symbol of public recognition for the value of the worker colony."[327] Bodelschwingh could point to the numerous accounts in the press as an indication of conservative support for not only the worker colony but also his philosophy. It was an opportunity "to demonstrate for the public the closeness of Bodelschwingh, and by extension Bethel, to the monarchy and especially the political loyalty of the institute."[328]

Bodelschwingh was rewarded further in 1897 when the Emperor himself made an official visit to Bethel. Like the visit of the Crown Prince fourteen years earlier, Bodelschwingh planned a tour of Wilhelmsdorf to be the highlight of the visit. The account of the visit in *Bote von Bethel* noted that Wilhelm took a particular interest in observing the men work. In order to highlight work's role as a bridge over class divisions, the article noted that the Emperor was visibly pleased at the sight of the clients and housefathers working alongside each other. At the same time he also made a point of inquiring about the backgrounds of the clients to demonstrate that he cared for all Germans, regardless of their economic circumstances. Thus, in addition to connecting Bethel to the royal family, the Wilhelm's tour of the colony also helped to reinforce Bodelschwingh's rhetoric about the responsibility of the greater community to those individuals who resided on the margins.

Ultimately the Emperor's visit was nothing short of a publicity coup for Bodelschwingh. Upon hearing that the men in the colonies worked on physically

---

[326] "Besuch des Kronprinzen," *Bielefelder Tageblatt,* 17 July 1883.
[327] Scheffler, "Frömmigkeit und Fürsorge: Die Gründung der Arbeiterkolonie Wilhelmsdorf und die Wohlfahrtspflege in Westfalen und Lippe um 1880," in *Diakonie: Geschichte von unten*, 118.
[328] Scheffler, "Die Arbeiterkolonie Wilhelmsdorf," in *Bethel-Eckhardtsheim*, ed. Benad and Schmuhl, 128.

demanding land reclamation projects Wilhelm "expressed his thorough agreement that work in fresh air, 'without work, no bread" were excellent medicine for any affliction."[329] Later in the tour he visited the colony's sleeping quarters. "In the living room the Emperor was especially happy about the large saying painted on the wall: "He who does not want to work, should also not eat! He repeated this saying again for his entourage."[330] According to Bodelschwingh's account of the visit, the Emperor had personally endorsed every aspect of his philosophy. It was not possible for him to have a greater expression of support for the worker colony.

Given the success of this strategy at Bethel, Bodelschwingh made a point of also tying the subsequent institutions he founded to the royal family. In 1906, he held a public celebration at the colony Hoffnungstal, outside of Berlin, to acknowledge a new barracks, which were funded by the royal family. In his inaugural address, he once again drew attention to the presence at the ceremony of the Empress and *Prinz Eitel* Friedrich. The colony was supported, he proclaimed, by "Men of particular nobility, free men of all classes who are ashamed to beg, but not ashamed, by the sweat of their brow to coax with honest labor an honest piece of bread from Mother Earth."[331] In the subsequent promotional literature he produced, Bodelschwingh included two photos of himself prominently featured with the Empress and *Prinz Eitel* at the worker colony as a way to demonstrate that his philosophy enjoyed the full support of the monarchy.[332]

---

[329] "Das Kaiserpaar in Bethel," *Bote von Bethel* 11 (1897), 14.
[330] Ibid., 20.
[331] "Ansprache Pastor von Bodelschwinghs an die Festversammlung von Huffnunstal bei Gelegenheit der Einweihung des vom Kaiser geschenkten Betsaals in Gegenwart der Kaiserin und des Prinzen Eitel Friedrich am 23. Mai 1906," *ADW, Central Ausschuß Bibliothek*, 2.
[332] To reinforce further his conservative, nationalist credentials, Bodelschwingh was also the foremost proponent of Sedan Day, a holiday in celebration of Germany's victory over France in the Franco-Prussian War. See Hartmut Lehmann, "Friedrich von Bodelschwingh und das Sedanfest. Ein Beitrag zum

If conservatives still had any doubts about Bodelschwingh, the complaints and protests of the Social Democrats easily erased them. They clearly saw the worker colony for what it was; a thinly veiled attempt to undercut their support among working-class communities by mobilizing them on behalf of conservatives.[333] They also accused Bodelschwingh and his supporters of being disingenuous when they talked about how their goal was to restore dignity and honor to the wandering poor and the working classes. Rather, in the colony one was more likely to hear shouts of "Here, kneel lower and acknowledge that you are a boy, a boy who is obligated to unconditional obedience. Pray and work, but forget that you have a free will to ask for anything!"[334] The idea that Bodelschwingh wanted to provide workers with a degree of independence was nothing more than a joke[335]

Ironically, the attacks from the Left may have actually benefitted Bodelschwingh. In the minds of his supporters, the hostility from Social Democrats only further confirmed that the worker colony initiative was worthy of their support. With their help Bodelschwingh quickly built a network of colonies across Germany. By 1883 there were thirteen worker colonies, and by 1890 that number had increased to twenty-two. 1883 also saw the first meeting of the organization that would ultimately come to be known as the *Centralvorstand Deutscher Arbeiterkolonien*, an organization that coordinated the administration and co-operation of Germany's worker colonies. This organization would later be accompanied by the *Deutsche Herbergsverein*, founded by Bodelschwingh in

---

nationalen Denken der politisch aktiven Richtung im deutschen Pietismus des 19. Jahrhunderts," in *Historische Zeitschrift* 202 (1966): 542–73.

[333] *Vorwärts*, 13, 22 March, 1883.

[334] *Der Sozialdemokrat. Zentral-Organ der deutschen Sozialdemokratie* 13 (22 March 1883).

[335] Bodelschwingh also responded to these accusations. See Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, *Zu Schutz und Trutz gegen gute und böse Gerüchte* (Bielefeld: Siedhoff, 1897), 5.

1886, along with the journal *Die Arbeiter-Kolonie* (later *Der Wanderer*), which provided a forum for advocates of Bodelschwingh's system to push for further expansion and financial support.[336]

Ultimately, Bodelschwingh's goal was to use all of his positive publicity to create a nationwide network of various initiatives based on his philosophy. Despite its popularity, Bodelschwingh believed that the worker colony's effectiveness was limited without the creation of a network of initiatives that would further restrict the mobility of migrant workers. While colonies were feasible outside cities, they were impractical in rural areas. Furthermore, a concentration of colonies in Western Germany was of limited use when trying to combat a problem that was nationwide.[337] If other provinces did not follow Bodelschwingh's lead in Westphalia, there would be too many cracks in the system through which migrant workers could continue to slip. In order to reintegrate them successfully and eliminate the security threat they posed, Bodelschwingh contended that a comprehensive system of *Wanderarbeitstätte* needed to be constructed across Germany. Workers would have no choice but to adhere to Bodelschwingh's philosophy if they wanted to receive aid.

Therefore, as he publicized Wilhelmsdorf through a series of high profile visits from the royal family, he also worked to translate that into a practical plan for expansion through a series of articles and speeches. His main concern was that there were still too many possibilities for so-called vagabonds to avoid working except in times of great distress. In this context they would only enter the colony when they had no other choice,

---

[336] Scheffler, "Die Anstalt Bethel und die 'Brüder' von der Landstraße," in *Bethels Mission (2)*, eds. Matthias Benad and Kerstin Winkler, 207.
[337] Ewald Frie, *Wohlfahrtstaat und Provinz: Fürsorgepolitik des Provinzialverbandes Westfalen und des Landes Sachsen 1880–1930* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1993), 45–46.

and leave immediately after conditions improved. In order to prevent this, Bodelschwingh believed Protestants needed to police the highways so that migrant workers had no alternatives to working. To this end he proposed complementing the colonies with two smaller initiatives; *Naturalverpflegungstationen* (in-kind relief stations) and a revitalized version of the *Herberge zur Heimat*.[338]

In many respects the smaller initiatives were even more important than the worker colony. Since they were smaller, they were easier for smaller communities to support financially. Furthermore they were also key to policing the highways because they would prevent migrant workers from reverting to old habits after they left the worker colony. One had to pay for any assistance through labor, just like in the larger colonies. Finally, the smaller stations would also give Bodelschwingh the opportunity to extend his philosophy into smaller communities throughout Germany.[339] Taken together, the network was known collectively as the "Bielefeld System" as its organizational center was located at Bodelschwingh's Bethel community in Bielefeld.[340]
Bodelschwingh's tireless efforts at promoting the community paid off as his conservative allies overwhelmingly approved of the proposed network, and with their support it grew to 2,000 stations in operation by 1890.[341] They were familiar with his attitudes toward the SPD and knew that any workers who had passed through his network would be "far

---

[338] Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, "23 Thesen über Ziel und Zweck der Arbeiterkolonien und Verpflegungstationen." *Die Arbeiter-Kolonie* 1, no. 9 (1884): 257–66, at 257.
[339] Frohman, *Poor Relief and Welfare in Germany*, 165; Ewald Frie, "Fürsorgepolitik zwischen Kirche und Staat. Wanderarmenhilfe in Preussen," in *Soziale Reform in Kaiserreich. Protestantismus, Katholizismus und Sozialpolitik*, ed. Wilfried Loth and Jochen-Christoph Kaiser, 114–27 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1997), 115; Karl Heinrich Pohl, *Zwischen protetantischer Ethik, Unternehmerinteresse und organisierter Arbeiterbewegung: Zur Geschichte der Arbeitsvermittlung in Bielefeld von 1887 bis 1914* (Bielefeld: 1991), 63.
[340] Frie, *Wohlfahrtstaat und Provinz*, 44, 48–49.
[341] Frohman, *Poor Relief and Welfare in Germany*, 165.

removed" from "social democratic agitation."[342] As a result, the system also flourished in cities like Bielefeld as a "labor exchange" where businessmen could find reliable workers for local projects. As Karl Heinrich Pohl explains, this exchange had its benefits for both the Protestant reformers as well as the industrialists. Protestants approved of the exchange because they believed it provided another opportunity to stress proper discipline and the work ethic in an environment located outside the colony. As Pohl writes: "Hated were the employers, who did not drive the workers hard enough, thereby leading them back to 'loafing.'"[343] Meanwhile industrialists liked it because they were confident they would get a loyal, relatively docile work force that was "especially willing to work" at a very reasonable rate.[344]

***

When assessing the worker colony's legacy as a tool for poor relief, most historical studies focus their analyses on the Bielefeld System and the passionate responses from social reformers on both sides of the political spectrum. Taken together, they clearly demonstrate that Bodelschwingh's philosophy had a nationwide impact. Yet at the same time such a limited analysis fails to understand the extent to which Bodelschwingh's influence extended beyond Germany. His success attracted the attention of reformers from across Europe who believed that his ideas could also succeed outside Germany.[345] In 1891, the British Earl of Meach reported on *Wilhelmsdorf* in the English journal *The Nineteenth Century*, noting specifically how the colony could work in Britain. "The success which has attended the establishment of these labour colonies is

[342] Pohl, *Zwischen Protestantischer Ethik*, 63.
[343] Ibid., 67.
[344] Ibid., 67.
[345] See for example Letter from England, 25 January 1901, *Hauptarchiv der von Bodelschwingh'schen Anstalten Bethel* (*HAB*), B VI 13.

remarkable, and the directors can point to numerous cases where men who had not worked for years have been restored in a sense of the dignity of labour, and have become honest and useful citizens."[346] Like Bodelschwingh, Meach was clearly interested in the colony's potential for reintegration.

Another English reformer proudly wrote to Bodelschwingh to tell him that he cited Bodelschwingh's success in Gemany during a presentation in support of creating worker colonies. "There is no one living whose judgment I so greatly value and whose example I would so much like to follow in working out these difficult social problems."[347] One Dutch reformer informed Bodelschwingh that he was part of a royal commission for the "punishment of begging and vagrancy as well as their remedy" and wanted to set up an official visit to Wilhelmsdorf to observe first-hand how the worker colony functioned.[348] The use of similar language by reformers outside Germany suggests that, like Bodelschwingh, they were more interested in eliminating a potential security threat posed by unemployed beggars than in providing assistance.[349]

Taken together, these inquiries from other European reformers demonstrate the extent to which Bodelschwingh's philosophy was a transnational phenomenon. Not only did he draw on experiences and traditions from outside Germany when he formulated his philosophy, but the numerous inquiries to Bethel demonstrate that he also shaped poor relief practices throughout Europe. Impressed by his rhetoric and the larger goals of his philosophy, they clearly believed that Bodelschwingh's philosophy could be transferred across national boundaries. Furthermore, as the next chapter will illustrate, German

---

[346] Earl of Meach, "Labour Colonies in Germany," *The Nineteenth Century* (January 1891): 73–88, at 74.
[347] Palin to Bodelschwingh, Nottingham, 1 December, 1905, *HAB*, B VI 13.
[348] J.L.C. van Essen to Bodelschwingh, Arnheim, Holland, 28 March, 1904, *HAB*, B VI 13.
[349] See also *Report of the Scottish Christian Social Union Commission to Germany re Elberfeld System and Labour Colonies* (June–July 1905), 20.

colonial authorities in East Africa were also examining the feasibility of applying Bodelschiwngh's philosophy to their situation in Africa. Therefore, limiting one's analysis of Bodelschwingh's impact to Europe greatly misjudges the extent of his influence.

***

In theory, the Bielefeld System was the pinnacle of Bodelschwingh's efforts to reform poor relief in Germany. Using a network of stations throughout the country, it sought to provide an increasingly mobile labor force with easier access to aid while preventing them from drifting to the margins of society and potentially causing problems for the state. It was a system that was just as much about policing the working classes as it was about helping them. In practice, however, the initiative was extraordinarily regressive. Instead of responding to the challenges posed by an increasingly industrialized world, it sought to turn back the clock to a pre-industrial labor regime by greatly restricting one's ability to travel in search of work. Bodelschwingh and his Protestant reformers failed to understand that many men were forced to travel in search of work as a result of economic fluctuation. In the same vein they also thought that the only reason an unemployed man asked for alms was because he was too lazy to search for work, preferring instead to drink at the pub. It never occurred to them that begging for small donations was something that many men did to facilitate their travel in search of work. Some older guilds even considered it a traditionally acceptable practice.[350] Instead, reformers were more concerned with eradicating the practice of begging while forcing

---

[350] Jürgen Scheffler, "Vom Herbergswesen für Handwerksgesellen zur Fürsorge für wandernde Arbeiter: Herbergen zur Heimat im Zeitalter der Industrialisierung, 1854–1914," in *Burger und Bettler: Materialien und Dokumente zur Geschichte der Nichtseßhaftenhilfe in der Diakonie, Bd. 1 – 1854 bis 1954*, ed. Jürgen Scheffler (Bielefeld: VSH – Verlag Soziale Hilfe GmbH, 1987), 17.

men to settle, start a family, and become active members in the local Protestant Church. Then they could closely monitor an individual's behavior and inoculate him from Social Democracy

In 1895 Bodelschwingh and his supporters took their quest to make the Bielefeld System a nationwide network when they lobbied the Prussian *Landtag* to institute it throughout Prussia. This effort failed though, in part because of the resistance of East Prussian agrarian landowners. They not only believed that such a network of aid stations would facilitate urban migration, thus exacerbating an already growing shortage of agricultural laborers, but also suspected that contrary to what Bodelschwingh claimed, his system actually facilitated begging and vagrancy.[351] Bodelschwingh was persistent, however, and continued to pressure the legislature to pass a law facilitating the system's expansion.[352] To this end in 1903 he ran for, and won, a seat in the *Landtag* as a compromise candidate from Westphalia. Naturally, the issue on which he ran was poor relief reform.

While he worked tirelessly in support of his legislation, his success was minimal at best. In 1907 he convinced the legislature to pass a law that permitted provincial governments to establish their own network of relief stations. However, as Frohman indicates the law's passage was "problematic" because it did not force provinces to create such networks, and only two provinces actually established networks like those imagined by the law's advocates.[353] Furthermore, poverty reform advocates were divided over the

---

[351] Frohman, *Poor Relief and Welfare*, 168.
[352] Martin Gerhardt, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, Ein Lebensbild aus der deutschen Kirchengeschichte: 2. Band, Das Werk/Zweite Hälfte* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1958), 544.
[353] Frohman, *Poor Relief and Welfare in Germany*, 168–69.

law's emphasis, which only further hampered its passage.[354] While some reformers sought to emphasize jobs and integration into the job market, Bodelschwingh and his supporters, wanted the law to promote *Arbeitserziehung* as a way to achieve social reintegration while also eliminating begging.[355] Therefore, the law did relatively little to reform poor relief provision.

While Bodelschwingh dedicated the later years of his life to achieving a comprehensive migrant relief law, he died in 1910 without having seen his vision completed. His efforts were not in vain though, as the national government drafted a law in 1913 to regulate poor relief to migrant workers that embodied the spirit of Bodelshwingh's philosophy. Although it privileged labor market reform over *Arbeitserziehung* it differentiated between the deserving and undeserving poor based on one's capacity to work. [356] In line with the attitude of Protestant reformers like Bodelschwingh, the law offered to assist "those persons who were deemed to be legitimately in search of work" and punish those people the reformers deemed lazy.[357] This distinction would become an even more important characteristic of Protestant social welfare policies in the wake of World War I as welfare providers tried to maximize the impact of their limited resources.

***

Upon returning to Germany in 1864, Friedrich von Bodelschwingh used his time in Dellwig and at Bethel to articulate further a philosophy he had already started to form

---

[354] Ibid., 169.
[355] Ewald Frie, "Fürsorgepolitik zwischen Kirche und Staat. Wanderarmenhilfe in Preussen," in *Soziale Reform im Kaiserreich: Protestantismus, Katholizismus und Sozialpolitik*, edited by Jochen-Christoph Kaiser and Wilfried Loth, 114–27 (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1997), 120–21; Karl Mörchen, "Westfalen am Scheidewege. Eine Schlußbetrachtung des Herausgebers," *Wanderer* 26 (1909): 199–210, at 199 and 205.
[356] Frohman, *Poor Relief and Welfare in Germany*, 169.
[357] Ibid., 169.

as a missionary in the slums of Paris. In Dellwig, he expanded on his philosophy through the pages of the *Westfälischer Hausfreund*, a small local paper. In particular, he recalled his experiences in Paris to reassert the importance of communal bonds. Even though the residents of sleepy little Dellwig were far removed from the big city, they nevertheless still had an obligation to support the reform efforts of the larger Protestant community, both in Germany and abroad.

It was not until he arrived in Bethel, however, that Bodelschwingh perfected his philosophy. He quickly organized life in the institute so that everything operated according to his philosophy, with a particular emphasis on the importance of work. He also expanded the scope of the institute's mission beyond the care of people with epilepsy to include poor relief. The center piece of this effort was a worker colony, a closed environment that provided disaffected, unemployed migrant workers with an especially intense exposure to Bodelschwingh's philosophy. Although the colony provided its clients with desperately needed material assistance, it required that they performed hard, physical labor in exchange for the help. After a minimal two week stay in the colony, Bodelschwingh claimed the previously marginalized individuals would have experienced a significant spiritual change that would allow them to return to productive society. More importantly, they would also exit as loyal supporters of the conservative monarchy.

In order to generate support for his initiative, Bodelschwingh worked tirelessly during this period to promote his philosophy in a variety of ways. He took advantage of Bethel's greater resources and location to advertise his work in numerous pamphlets, speeches and articles. He also took advantage of his close relationship with the Hohenzollern family to arrange for high profile visits that yielded valuable photo

opportunities. There was no better way for Bodelschwingh to publicize his work and burnish his conservative credentials than through a picture of himself with a member of the royal family.

Ultimately, it was through his early efforts at Bethel that Bodelschwingh launched his philosophy onto the national stage. Eagar to provide him with financial support, his conservative allies helped him expand Wilhelmsdorf into a nationwide network of poor relief initiatives that all operated according to his philosophy. At the same time, impressed by his claims of success and his support among German conservatives, social reformers outside of Germany, including German colonial officials in East Africa, inquired about the feasibility of transferring his idea to meet their own concerns. As a result of this interest abroad, Bodelschwingh's early work at Bethel is essential to understanding the transnational development of his philosophy. To this end, the next chapter will examine the interest of German colonial officials in Bodelschwingh's ideas and its impact on their subsequent development.

Chapter 4: *Arbeitserziehung* in the Bethel Mission in East Africa

By the end of the 1880s, Friedrich von Bodelschwingh had established Bethel as one of the leading Protestant centers for social welfare in Germany. While it had a strong reputation for the care it provided to people with epilepsy, it had gained a national reputation as a result of Bodelschwingh's efforts to reform poor relief. When he founded his first worker clony, Wilhelmsdorf, in 1882 Bodelschwingh thrust Bethel into national debates over how best to care for a growing number of unemployed migrant workers. He argued that rather than providing individuals with charity, effective poor relief should focus on reintegrating them into society by stressing spiritual reform. To this end the worker colony stressed the importance of a strong work ethic, communal and familial bonds, notions of responsibility and religion.

Given Bodelschwingh's hostility to the Social Democratic party, conservative authorities were eager to support his new initiative. With their help, Wilhelmsdorf became the model for a network of institutions that stretched across Germany. Ultimately they hoped unemployed workers would be forced to enter the colony to receive assistance and emerge as loyal supporters of the monarchy who were eager to settle down and rejoin society. In this sense Bodelschwingh's philosophy was more about transforming working-class men into conservative Protestants than it was about providing material assistance.

As Bodelschwingh was lobbying to expand his network of worker colonies in Germany, the German Colonial Authority in East Africa was struggling to recruit Africans to work on colonial labor projects. In 1890 the leadership of the Evangelische

Mission nach Deutsch Ostafrika (EMDOA) approached Bodelschwingh about taking control of the fledgling mission and reorganizing it. Eager to expand the scope of Bethel's mission overseas, he quickly agreed. Colonial authorities, for their part, were excited at the prospect of Bethel's entry in to colonial East Africa. If compulsion failed to motivate people to work, perhaps Bodelschwingh's strategy of spiritual reform could succeed.

Following a brief discussion of the EMDOA's history before 1890, the following chapter will examine the mission's activity under Bodelschwingh's leadership. It argues that the EMDOA became a twin to the Bethel institutions in Bielefeld, as Bodelschwingh's philosophy also served as the foundation for his work in Africa. Modeled after the Bethel community in Bielefeld, missionaries were trained in the same manner as the social workers who served in Bielefeld. In this sense they incorporated *Arbeitserziehung* into nearly every initiative at the mission.

Furthermore, just as Bethel's social workers sought to transform disaffected migrant workers into loyal supporters of the monarchy, the missionaries took a very similar attitude to the Africans whom they encountered. Using the Bethel philosophy they sought to transform Africans into productive members of colonial society. In this case the ability to work, coupled with Protestantism and a strong appreciation for the monarchy, were essential to molding Africans into loyal subjects of the greater German Empire. Thus Bodelschwingh's philosophy also emphasized the principles of spiritual reform and reintegration in Africa.

While Colonial authorities were initially thrilled by the possibility of using the Bethel mission to solve their labor problems, Bodelschwingh's philosophy had only

minimal success. By the time the Bethel missionaries arrived in Africa, the reputation of German planters was already damaged beyond repair. Therefore, no amount of reform could convince someone to work voluntarily on a German plantation. Furthermore, while the Bethel missionaries were willing to collaborate with the colonial administration when their interests were mutual, they also worried about being viewed as pawns of the state. Even though their ultimate goal was to convert Africans to Protestantism and integrate them into the larger German empire, they refused to serve as recruiters for colonial labor projects.

Ultimately, the experience of the missionaries in the EMDOA is important because it illustrates further the transnational development of Bodelschwingh's philosophy. They actively applied their training at Bethel to integrate Africans into the larger German colonial empire. In the process, they made observations about the capacity of Africans to perform work that would later inform their attitudes toward social work in Germany after 1918. As a result of their experiences abroad, the missionaries returned to Germany deeply skeptical of the claims made by pro-eugenics reformers.

***

The origins of Germany's involvement in East Africa have already been well established by historians.[358] As Conrad recently noted, however, despite the immense influence of Wehler's study on German colonial policy, the premise of his argument remained highly limited.[359] For Wehler, colonial policy was an exclusively European affair. Bismarck pursued imperial policies as a form of social imperialism to win support

---

[358] One of the earliest studies in this respect was Hans-Ulrich Wehler, *Bismarck und der Imperialismus* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1984); For a recent assessment of German imperialism see Sebastian Conrad, *Deutsche Kolonialgeschichte* (Munich: C. H. Beck Verlag, 2008).
[359] Conrad, *German Colonialism*, 9.

for his domestic agenda. He was uninterested in the activities of groups, like missionaries, that were on the ground in Africa and how they influenced Germany's greater colonial project.

Missionaries, however, were key players in the colonial project since the early nineteenth century. Both the Moravians (also called the Herrnhuters) and the Basel Mission society had an active presence in West Africa and generated a notable amount of interest in overseas exploration among Protestant communities in Germany.[360] The Basel Mission was especially important in this respect because of its reputation as a training center for Protestant missionaries. Although they drew attention to the idea of colonies, their usefulness to more overtly nationalist advocates of colonization was limited at best. The early German missions established a precedent of working in conjunction with mission societies from other countries, in the process refusing to "become the tools of imperial nationalism."[361]

This all began to change in 1884 when Carl Peters travelled to East Africa and began negotiating with local groups of people for the rights to their land.[362] By early 1885 he had successfully pressured the state into formally colonizing the territories he claimed. At the same time, Peters' activity also dramatically changed the role of the missions in the colonial project. Friedrich Fabri, a social conservative, nationalist, and staunch advocate of colonization, adamantly insisted on developing missions as tools of

---

[360] Marcia Wright, *German Missions in Tanganyika, 1891–1941: Lutherans and Moravians in the Southern Highlands* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 2–3.
[361] Ibid., 7.
[362] Arne Perras, "Colonial Agitation and the Bismarckian State: The Case of Carl Peters," in *Wilhelminism and Its Legacies: German Modernities, Imperialism, and the Meanings of Reform, 1890–1930. Essays for Hartmut Pogge von Strandman*, ed. Geoff Eley and James Retallack, 154–70 (New York: Berghan Books, 2004), 154; for more on Carl Peters see Arne Perras, *Carl Peters and German Imperialism, 1856–1918: A Political Biography* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004).

formal colonization.[363] In his *Bedarf Deutschland der Colonien?* Fabri argued that, because they were active primarily in regions far removed from administrative centers, missions could work with the state to open new territories to formal control and eventual exploitation.[364] Fabri believed that a mission that was overtly nationalistic could greatly assist the expansion of German colonial interests. Open to the idea, the leaders of the German East Africa Company joined with Fabri to found the Evangelische Mission nach Deutsch Ostafrika (Evangelical Mission for German East Africa, or EMDOA). Thus from its origins the EMDOA was a staunchly nationalist endeavor that believed German Protestants had an obligation to advance German colonial interests in East Africa.[365]

While there were many things the mission could do to help the administration, Fabri believed one of the most valuable would be to recruit and train workers for colonial labor projects. As part of his social conservatism, Fabri had taken a strong interest in *Arbeitserziehung* and its applicability to East Africa.[366] Before assuming a leading role in the EMDOA, Fabri had come into contact with Bodelschwingh as a result of their mutual concern over the "so called Vagabond crisis." Like Bodelschwingh, he feared that marginalized workers would destabilize the monarchy and cause revolutionary chaos across Germany if they remained unattended.

Initially, Fabri took a strong interest in Bodelshwingh's worker colonies as a way to eliminate the threat posed by disaffected workers while simultaneously supporting the

---

[363] For Fabri's attitudes on colonies see Friedrich Fabri, *Bedarf Deutschland der Colonien? Eine politisch-ökonomische Betrachtung* (Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1884); Friedrich Fabri, *Fünf Jahre Deutscher Kolonialpolitik. Rück- und Ausblicke* (Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1889).
[364] Fabri, *Bedarf Deutschland der Colonien?*, 102.
[365] Wright, *German Missions in Tanganyika*, 7; see also Thorsten Altena, "Missionare und Einheimische Gesellschaft: Zur Kulturbegegnung der Bethel-Mission in Deutsch-Ostafrika 1890–1916," in *Bethels Mission (1): Zwischen Epileptischenpflege und Heidenbekehrung. Beiträge zur Geschichte der v. Bodelschwinghschen Anstalten Bethel*, ed. Matthias Benad, 1–74 (Bielefeld: Luther Verlag, 2001), at 2–8.
[366] Fabri, *Bedarf Deutschland der Colonien?*, 98.

colony in East Africa. "The socially degraded should be placed out of sight, rehabilitated in work houses, then shipped overseas to create there a new life in working-class colonies and create a secure market for the export industry."[367] Ideally, Fabri wanted to establish worker colonies like Wilhelmsdorf in Africa and use Bodelschwingh's philosophy to exploit unemployed migrant workers for the benefit of the colonial administration. Fabri was even more impressed upon meeting Bodelschwingh and witnessing the operation at Wilhelmsdorf firsthand. He proposed creating a partnership between the DOAG, the Inner Mission and colonial advocacy groups that would ultimately establish a network of worker colonies in East Africa for German workers.[368] While nothing ultimately came of the discussions, Fabri's interest in *Arbeitserziehung* and its applicability to the colonies nevertheless demonstrated that there was clear interest among colonial leaders in Bodelschwingh's philosophy. Furthermore it also clearly shows that they paid close attention to domestic social welfare initiatives like the worker colony and sought to apply them as solutions to similar problems in the colonies.

Frabri was unable to realize his goal of creating a worker colony network in Africa because his mission faced a slew of crippling problems. Although it maintained strong support from the DOAG, the EMDOA came under heavy criticism from the other Protestant missions because of its overt nationalism. Among the most vocal critics was Gustav Warneck, a theologian who adamantly insisted on the separation of politics and religious affairs.[369] "The Christian mission has nothing to do with politics, and politics

---

[367] Klaus J. Bade, *Friedrich Fabri und der Imperialismus in der Bismarckzeit: Revolution-Depression-Expansion* (Freiburg: Atlantis, 1975), 163.
[368] Ibid., 163-4.
[369] See Gustav Warneck, *Modern Missions and Culture: Their Mutual Relations*, trans. Thomas Smith, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: James Gemmell, 1888).

should not mix itself into the Christian mission."[370] Rather than benefit from a close collaboration with the state, Warneck believed it would harm the mission because it would elevate the interests of the state over those of the church.[371] In the same vein, they also feared that such a relationship would discourage cooperation between missions from different countries.[372]

Even more debilitating than the criticism about its political allegiances were the accusations of mismanagement and incompetent leadership, which consistently plagued the EMDOA during the first five years of existence. For example, in an 1889 piece on the state of mission work in East Africa, Gustav Warneck discussed the mistreatment of Africans in the colony and its impact on the effectiveness of the Protestant missions. As he assessed the validity of English accusations that the Germans were mistreating people, Warneck wrote that "even" the EMDOA had arrived at the same conclusion.[373] The implicit criticism was that if a poorly run organization, notorious for its open collaboration with the colonial authorities, made these accusations, then there had to be truth behind them. Although the EMDOA tried to reform itself, it nevertheless remained the subject of regular criticism and ridicule during its early existence.[374]

In order to help revive the mission, the EMDOA's leadership once again approached Bodelschwingh about assuming a leadership role. In many respects, he was the ideal person to step in and repair the mission's reputation. As a leading figure within the Inner Mission he was well known and respected among German Protestants. At the

---

[370] Gustav Warneck, *Allgemeine Missionszeitschrift* (1886), 228.
[371] Gustav Menzel, *Die Bethel Mission: Aus 100 Jahren Missionsgeschichte* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins GmbH, 1986), 27–28.
[372] Wright, *German Missions in Tanganyika*, 7.
[373] Gustav Warneck, "Zur Lage in Ostafrika," *Allgemeine Missionszeitschrift* 16 (1889): 3–20, n.4-5.
[374] Wright, *German Missions in Tanganyika,* 7.

same time, because he was also a staunch nationalist, he appealed to the mission's conservative leadership. Therefore, the EMDOA's leaders hoped that by virtue of his reputation he could ease tensions with the other missions, while not entirely abandoning the mission's nationalist agenda. After three years of discussions, Bodelschwingh finally agreed in March 1890 to supply the EMDOA with social workers trained in his philosophy.[375]

Although the agreement stipulated that Bodelschwingh was responsible only for missionaries, he quickly assumed a leading role in the organization. Using his charismatic personality, he "fundamentally changed" the outlook of the struggling mission. While he was well aware of the criticisms other Protestants had about the EMDOA's way of operating, they largely "fell on deaf ears" as Bodelschwingh was focused on extending his philosophy into Africa.[376] Bodelschwingh not only took responsibility for shaping the mission's agenda in East Africa, but he also effectively moved its headquarters from Berlin to Bielefeld. Although the EMDOA did not officially rebrand itself as the Bethel Mission until after World War I, it was for all intents and purposes an overseas extension of Bethel after 1890.

As Thorsten Altena notes, this approach was key to dealing with the strong sense of disunity within the mission that plagued its internal operations. By drawing people from different backgrounds it was difficult for the mission's leadership to get everyone on the same page. Not only did Bodelschwingh use his social welfare philosophy to ensure that each missionary went to Africa with the same educational background, but he

---

[375] Menzel, *Die Bethel Mission*, 44; Menzel suspects that the leadership of the EMDOA contacted Bodelschwingh verbally in 1887, but that a working relationship did not form until three years later.
[376] Martin Gerhardt and Alfred Adam, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh: Ein Lebensbild aus der deutschen Kirchengeschichte. 2. Band: Das Werk, Zweite Hälfte* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1958), 418–19.

also utilized a "projected family idea" to foster a strong sense of loyalty and devotion to him personally.[377] The effect, according to Altena, was that the mission quickly developed the feeling of a close-knit community where everyone worked together. "Strikingly one could also say that in other mission societies the address of the committee member as "father" by the missionaries strongly expressed their subordinate position within a strict regiment, while for Bodelschwingh the practical salutation as 'father' by the EMDOA missionaries possessed a connotation with which they simultaneously expressed their respect as well as their trust for him, which he, for his part, was also prepared to fulfill."[378] Thus, Bodelschwingh used a core aspect of his philosophy to deal effectively with one of the major problems that plagued the EMDOA before his arrival. Not only did the missionaries willingly work with each other, but their devotion to Bodelschwingh also made them especially loyal to his philosophy. This factor would be particularly important to shaping the missionaries' attitudes to the changes at Bethel after 1918.

In a smiliar vein, Bodelschwingh's reputation also helped the EMDOA to attract a significantly higher quality pool of recruits to join the mission. For example, Ernst Johanssen, "one of the most formative colleagues of the EMDOA in the East African mission region before 1916" was initially skeptical about the Berlin mission because of its overt nationalism and open collaboration with the colonial authority.[379] However, a visit to Bethel in 1890 and a personal meeting with Bodelschwingh completely changed his opinion. "This first encounter would be of decided importance for my life… the more

---

[377] Thorsten Altena, "Grenzüberschreitungen: Zum Beziehungsgeflecht von Innerer und Äußerer Mission in den Anfangsjahren der Bethel-Mission," in *Bethels Mission (3), Mutterhaus, Mission und Pflege: Beiträge zur Geschichte der v. Bodelschwinghschen Anstalten Bethel*, ed. Matthia Benad and Vicco von Bülow, 147–70 (Bielefeld: Luther-Verlag, 2003),at 157.
[378] Ibid., 158.
[379] Ibid., 159.

I got to know him, the more this synthesis of nature and virtue, of spirit and humility, of a worldview of love and groundedness in work, of passion and perserverence won me over."[380] Johanssen was so struck by Bodelschwingh's personality that he abandoned plans to join the rival Basel Mission and instead came to Bethel.

Johanssen was by no means unique, as several other highly qualified missionaries also described being captivated by Bodelschwingh's personality after meeting him.[381] Compared to other missions, the EMDOA under Bodelschwingh attracted candidates from higher social classes. For example, of the thirty-six missionaries who went to East Africa between 1885 and 1914, only 2.7 percent came from a "petty-bourgeois" background.[382] A report for the *Reichskolonialamt* on the missions in East Africa from 1907 noted that the EMDOA stood out from the other societies with a significantly greater number of academically trained missionaries.[383] Before 1890 most of these individuals would not have seriously considered working with the EMDOA.

According to Altena, the academic backgrounds of the new missionaries were an essential precursor to reshaping the EMDOA.[384] Before they departed for Africa, Bodelschwingh required the missionaries to undergo additional training in Bethel's theology and approach to social welfare. They were immersed in the Bodelschwingh

---

[380] Ernst Johanssen, *Führung und Erfahrung in 40 jährigem Missionsdienst, Band I: Anfangsarbeit in Usambara von 1891–1907* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1934), 38–39.
[381] See for example, Trittelvitz, *Nicht so langsam!*, 45–50; Curt Ronicke, "Kleine Erinnerungen an einen großen Mann," in *Kleine Erinnerungen an einen großen Mann. Zum Gedenken an Walther Trittelvitz*, ed. Curt Ronicke, 14–16 (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung er Anstalt Bethel, 1959), 14-16; Friedrich Lang-Heinrich, "Lebenserinnerungen (Wie ich Missionar wurde)," Bethel, 1921, *Archiv der Vereinten Evangelischen Mission (AVEM), M 217, Bd. 3)*, 2–4.
[382] Thorsten Altena, *"Ein Häuflein Christen mitten in der Heidenwelt des dunklen Erdteils" : zum Selbst- und Fremdverständnis protestantischer Missionare im kolonialen Afrika 1884–1918* (Münster: Waxmann, 2003).
[383] Report for the Reichskolonialamt on the statistics of missions involved in German East Africa, 6. Juli 1907, compiled by pastor Carl Paul, *BA Berlin, R 1001/842*, 9–12.
[384] Altena has conducted the most thorough investigation of the social backgrounds of each German mission society in Africa. For more see Altena, *"Ein Häuflein Christen mitten in der Heidenwelt des dunklen Erdteils,"* 191–314.

philosophy and spent just as much time working at one of Bethel's local initiatives as they did in the classroom. The academic background theoretically enabled missionaries to adapt to life at Bethel more quickly and understand the different ways the Bethel method could be applied to their work in Africa. While they trained for their work abroad, Bodelschwingh tried to integrate the missionaries into the Bethel community as much as possible. As a result, the EMDOA virtually mirrored the Bethel community in Bielefeld.[385]

In the same vein the EMDOA also reflected the staunch nationalism that informed Bodelschwingh's philosophy at Bethel. Although he attempted to carve out a degree of autonomy vis a vis the state as a way to relieve the concerns of other Protestants about the EMDOA's cozy relationship with the colonial administration, Bodelschwingh nevertheless believed that there was nothing wrong with using the mission to expand German colonial holdings in Africa. For example, when the German government was trying to extend the northwest boundary of the colony into what is now Rwanda, Bodelschwingh eagerly dispatched his missionaries as an expeditionary force to hold the territory until German colonial forces could secure it. At the same time, Bodelschwingh also kept the EMDOA closely allied with the German East Africa Company, colonial associations in Germany, and some settler organizations in the colony.[386] In his mind, the EMDOA and the colonial authorities needed to work together because both groups had similar goals.[387] In this sense, the EMDOA was yet another initiative through which

---

[385] Altena, "Grenzüberschreitungen," 164–65.
[386] Horst Gründer, *Christliche Mission und deutscher Imperialismus: Eine politische Geschichte ihrer Beziehungen während der deutschen Kolonialzeit (1884–1914) under besonderer Berücksichtigung Afrikas und Chinas* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1982), 215–16.
[387] Friedrich von Bodelschwingh to Reichskanzler, 12 September 1890, *Bundesarchiv Berlin (BA Berlin), R 1001/837*, 8.

Bodelschwingh could assist the state while publicly demonstrating his support for the monarchy. Just as he signaled his support for Wilhelmsdorf by providing financial assistance and publicity through an official visit, Wilhelm offered similar gestures of support for the mission following Bodelschwingh's transition.[388]

As Steven Feierman notes, the Bethel missionaries' collaboration often had a dramatic impact on the social structures of African communities. Since missionaries were frequently the first German settlers to arrive at interior communities, the colonial authorities used their presence to project their own authority over rural populations. Through their complicity in the murder of African chiefs, Feierman argues that the Bethel missionaries played a vital role in the total destruction of traditional Chiefship in rural Tanzania.[389] Not only did they help to cement German authority as unquestionable, but Feierman also demonstrates that Africans frequently explained hardship as a consequence of their failure to obey the Germans. For example, one person explained the famine and cattle plagues of the late nineteenth century as divine punishment for his community's refusal to work on German plantations.[390]

While both Protestant and conservative leaders were generally excited by Bodelschwingh's involvement in missionary work, not everyone believed his approach would prove to be successful. Before he joined Bethel as a mission inspector, Trittelvitz asked Grundemann for his advice about a career with the mission.

---

[388] Gerhardt and Adam, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh*, 421. As a personal gesture of support, the royal family also made a personal gift of 3000 Marks for the establishment of a mission seminar.

[389] Steven Feierman, *Peasant Intellectuals: Anthropology and History in Tanzania* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1990), 124–25. For more on the mission's influence on local political structures see Gabriel K. Nzalayaimisi, "The Berlin Mission and the Destabilization of Power and Local Politics in Eastern and Southern Tanzania, 1887–1918," in *Mission und Macht im Wandel politischer Orientierung: Europäische Missionsgesellschaften in politischen Spannungsfeldern in Afrika und Asien zwischen 1800 und 1945*, ed. Ulrich van der Heyden and Holger Stoecker, 211–27 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2005).

[390] Ibid., 127.

> The whole enterprise Berlin III is very unfortunate ... It would all be very different if the matter immediately came into the hands of an old, experienced mission leadership. But already the interference of v. Bodelschwingh is a misfortune! This highly honorable man of God, who has done so much good in the field of diakonie, was weak enough… to consider himself capable, also for work on a completely different field. I would like to say, it is as if a faithful pastor, who has done excellently in pastoral care, in his old age begins to serve as a poet of hymns of the church, and does not consider that for him the prerequisites are missing. Above all, I must say the connection of the mission to the heathens with the so-called Inner Mision is completely absent. Both are very different areas.[391]

Although he supported the idea of mission work abroad, he believed that Bodelschwingh, by applying domestic social welfare practices to his initiative in Africa, was setting the EMDOA up for continued failure. Just because Bodelschwingh was extremely successful at Bethel did not mean the same ideas would transfer to Africa.

***

On one level, Grundemann was right to point out that Bodelschwingh intended to usher extensive change into the EMDOA. Yet it is also possible that Gundemann, like his friend Gustav Warneck, leveled his criticisms under the belief that Bodelschiwngh and the EMDOA were nothing more than upstart novices who represented potential competition to the established missions.[392] By using domestic social welfare practices to guide the activities of the mission in Africa, Bodelschwingh proposed a fairly significant departure from the way missions traditionally operated abroad. Therefore, the initial criticism Bodelschwingh received was partially motivated by a sense of competition and disapproval of his intention to do things differently.

---

[391] Walter Trittelvitz, *Nicht so langsam! Missionserinnerungen an Vater Bodelschwingh* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1929), 33.

[392] Menzel, *Bethel Mission*, 46; Thorsten Altena, "Grenzüberschreitungen: Zum Beziehungsgeflecht von Innerer und Äußerer Mission in den Anfangsjahren der Bethel-Mission," in *Bethels Mission (3), Mutterhaus, Mission und Pflege: Beiträge zur Geschichte der v. Bodelschwinghschen Anstalten Bethel*, ed. Matthias Benad and Vicco von Bülow, 147–70 (Bielefeld: Luther-Verlag, 2003), 150–51.

Whatever his motivations were, Grundemann's assertion that the EMDOA would fail spectacularly under Bodelschwingh was dead wrong. Both colonial officials in East Africa as well as colonial advocates in Berlin were eager to support the revitalized mission because of the strong emphasis it placed on *Arbeitserziehung*. For years, their failure to recruit African workers for colonial labor projects had been the bane of their existence. At the German colonial congress of 1902 in Berlin, one participant declared the "worker question is the most important in our colonies, the tropical colonies always stand and fall with it. However, with the colonies, it is also my suspicion, the mother land also stands and falls."[393] The failure to produce raw material for German factories not only threatened the profitability of the colony, but also the significant investments made by both the German state and private industry. If Bodelschwingh could successfully apply his philosophy (especially the work component) to the mission's work in Africa, he could potentially solve the one problem that stood between colonial investors and profitability.

Economically, German East Africa was "Germany's most valuable" colony. Following the American Civil War (1861-65), cotton imports from the United States dropped dramatically, a major problem for German inustrialists who developed a voracious appetitie for cotton during the late nineteenth century as Germany's economy industrialized. Cotton "was at the heart of many industrial debates because it was the most important raw material to be imported into Germany," something that industrialists never failed to highlight.[394] To this end, they planned to create a number of cotton

---

[393] Major Morgen, *Verhandlungen des Deutschen Kolonialkongresses 1902, zu Berlin am 10. und 11. Oktober 1902* (Berlin: Verlag von Dietrich Reimer, 1903), 538.
[394] Thaddeus Sunseri, *Vilimani: Labor Migration and Rural Change in Early Colonial Tanzania* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2002), 3.

plantations in German East Africa that would feed the growing factories back in Germany.

In order to generate support for creating cotton plantations in East Africa, both industrialists and government officials who supported the plan made a conscious effort to link colonial cotton with the fears of conservative social reformers about the social tensions created by industrialization. They noted that the textile industry was unique because it relied primarily on female labor in the factories, which was also a source of great anxiety to the reformers. They feared that the increased employment of women would destabilize family structures, which would in turn make them more succeptible to radical ideologies.[395] Sunseri highlights the resulting rural to urban migration as further evidence of the concern social reformers had over female employment in textile factories. In addition to releasing women from the social controls exercised by the home, migration was also damaging because it pulled women away from agricultural work, which social conservatives believed help foster a deeper connection with the nation.[396]

Further exacerbating the fears of conservative reformers was the unstable nature of the textile industry, which by the end of the nineteenth century was in a state of crisis. In addition to the problems with labor migration, fluctuation in the supplies of cotton resulted in periodic factory closures. To the dismay of conservatives, Social Democrats were quick to step in and advocate on behalf of the "disgruntled" workers in the industry.[397] Naturally, Social Democratic involvement only increased the concerns of

---

[395] Ibid., 9.
[396] For more on gender and labor migration see Elizabeth Bright Jones, *Gender and Rural Modernity: Farm Women and the Politics of Labor in Germany, 1871–1933* (Farnham/Burlington: Ashgate, 2009).
[397] Sunseri, *Vilimani*, 1.

conservative social reformers that instability in the textile industry could lead to potentially disastrous upheaval among the working classes.

As Sunseri notes, colonial cotton advocates sought to take advantage of these problems by portraying cotton as the solution to restoring stability to the textile industry. They argued that the textile industries constant fluctuations resulted from an unreliable supply of cotton. When supplies of cotton ran low, factories needed to shut down, which resulted in temporary unemployment for the workers. If the textile industry could be assured of a constant supply of cotton, not only would workers not have to fear the possibility of unemployment, but the industry would also be able to pay female workers a higher, more livable wage. Therefore, they argued that Germany should use its colonies to create plantations for large-scale cotton production as a way to remove the uncertainties of working-class life.[398]

In order to maximize the return on their investments, both the industrialists and plantation owners insisted on creating large-scale plantations, even on land that was not particularly well suited to cotton farming.[399] At the same time, they had no intention of recruiting the significant amount of labor these projects would require. Just as the state provided them with large subsidies, they assumed it would also provide them with workers. This was problematic though as most of the colony was relatively sparsely populated. In fact, Sunseri questions if its population was large enough to support widespread plantation agriculture. He estimates that in a territory larger than imperial

---

[398] Ibid., 7–10.

[399] For more on the environmental damage caused by German colonial policies see Thaddeus Sunseri, *Wielding the Ax: State Forestry and Social Conflict in Tanzania, 1820–2000* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2009). This was also not a practice unique to German colonial policies. For a discussion of Portuguese cotton production in Mozambique see Allen Isaacman, *Cotton is the Mother of Poverty: Peasants, Work and Rural Struggle in Colonial Mozambique, 1938–1965* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1995).

Germany there were barely seven million inhabitants.[400] Furthermore, as Juhani Koponen points out, plantation work was also physically demanding and paid extremely poorly. Laborers were required to work ten hours a day in a highly regulated environment with physical punishment for those who failed to keep pace.[401] With practically no tangible benefit for themselves, Africans were generally disinclined to work on German plantations. It was exploitative work that took them away from their own private farms.[402] To avoid the plantations Africans either violently resisted, or in many cases simply moved away from the Germans. Only by doubling wages were the Germans able to entice some Africans to return to work.[403]

Yet, even with increased wages, plantation owners were still not able to recruit an adequate number of workers from the surrounding communities and began to look outside of Africa for other sources of labor. Some of them returned to Fabri's initial proposal and recruited Europeans to work in their fields. Although it may have helped social conservatives to remove supposedly deviant individuals from the continent, it did not prove to be smart business. German convicts were not used to the harsh tropical climate in East Africa and many died after exposure to tropical diseases. Additionally, Europeans commanded significantly higher wages than Africans, which led to the failure of several plantations.[404]

Other plantation owners worked with colonial authorities to recruit workers from East Asia. As Koponen notes, plantation owners liked Chinese laborers in particular

---

[400] Sunseri,*Vilimani*, xxiii.
[401] Juhani Koponen, *Development for Exploitation: German Colonial Policies in Mainland Tanzania, 1884–1914* (Hamburg: Lit Verlag, 1995), 335.
[402] Sunseri, *Vilimani*, 17.
[403] Ibid., 54.
[404] John Iliffe, *A Modern History of Tanganyika* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 145.

because of their reputation for working hard with little supervision.[405] Some colonial officials even hoped that the Asian workers, who also worked independently for long stretches of time, would set a positive example for Africans.[406] The first group of 462 Asian laborers arrived in June 1892, with a second group of 200-300 recruits following in 1894 and 1895. While it is impossible to determine an exact number, Koponen argues that documentary evidence suggests a total of 700-800 individuals were recruited from East Asia.[407]

Despite the benefits of employing Asian laborers this experiment, just like the use of German convicts, ended in an "embarrassing" failure for the colonial administration. Not only did Asian laborers command higher wages, but the state also had to cover the high costs of their travel from Asia to East Africa.[408] Even worse was the damning reputation planation owners developed for their excessive use of violence. As Koponen notes, Asian workers frequently worked on plantations that had difficulty recruiting local African workers because of their excessive use of violence.[409] Unsurprisingly, the violence did not cease when the new workers arrived from Asia. "Their working period was plagued by desertions, a few attempted rebellions, and excessive flogging." In addition, the Asian laborers frequently fought with local people who accused them of theft.[410] When the men returned to Asia after their contract expired, they not only told horror stories of their time on German plantations, but they also had the physical scars to testify to the abuse they suffered. Naturally, other men thought twice before signing up

---

[405] Koponen, *Development for Exploitation*, 336.
[406] Freiherr von Schele, Denkshrift, 1894, *BA Berlin, R 1001/118*, 18–20.
[407] Koponen, *Development for Exploitation*, 336.
[408] For more on costs see Anlage zu Bericht no. 50, 21 April 1894, *BA Berlin, R 1001/111*, 38–48.
[409] Koponen, *Development for Exploitation*, 337.
[410] Ibid., 337.

to work for the Germans.[411] Adding insult to injury for the German government, other colonial states became increasingly protective of their subjects and refused to grant Germans permission to recruit workers in their colonies. Thus the experiment with workers from Asia died almost as quickly as it began.

Having failed to recruit non-African workers twice, colonial authorities accepted that they were dependent on African men to work on the plantations. Therefore, the question of labor dominated colonial discussions for the duration of Germany's presence in Africa. A scan of the colonial press and correspondence pertaining to the question of African laborers reveals no shortage of references to "inborn laziness."[412] Hans Zache, a career colonial civil servant who published frequently in the colonial press is representative of this attitude.[413] "The negro, especially the East African *bantu*, is lazy. That is, despite charitable assertions to the contrary that one hears from time to time, of this there is no question."[414] The overwhelming consensus among Europeans was that Africans chose not to work on colonial projects because they were lazy.

In the same vein, colonists also passed judgment on the capacity of Africans to perform sustained physical labor. German colonial leaders believed Africans possessed an inherent ability to perform physical labor. Carl Peters proclaimed "the Negro is created by God for hard labor," while the colonial writer Oskar Baumann noted that African labor was vital to the success of American plantations before the civil war.[415] Yet, despite their capacity to work, they believed Africans were unaccustomed to

---

[411] Sunseri, *Vilimani*, 55.
[412] See for example, Magdalene v. Prince, *Eine deutsche Frau im Innern Deutsch-Ostafrikas* (Berlin: Ernst Siegfried Mittler und Sohn, 1908), 58.
[413] Koponen, *Development for Exploitation*, 286.
[414] Hans Zache, *Deutsch-Ostafrika (Tanganjika Territory)* (Berlin: Safari-Verlag, 1926), 39.
[415] Carl Peters, *Gesammelte Schriften, I,* 415; Oskar Baumann, *In Deutsch Ostafrika während des Aufstandes* (Vienna: Olmütz, 1890), 216; Koponen, *Development for Exploitation*, 321–22.

extended periods of work, which made them ineffectual plantation laborers. "However, the Negro is not accustomed to prolonged and regular work, he comes and goes as it suits him. Only with patience and proper handling will he become amenable to coming regularly and performing his work without breaks."[416] Colonial authorities believed their challenge was finding a way to instill a European style work ethic in African men so that they would passively work long periods of time on the cotton plantations.[417]

Since German plantation owners succeeded in damaging their reputation beyond repair, it was nearly impossible for them to attract Africans through the promise of carrots like higher wages. Working conditions were so notoriously awful, that no amount of money could convince African men to volunteer for plantation labor. Therefore, colonial authorities concentrated their efforts on devising ways to force Africans to work on colonial projects.[418] For example, in order to explain why they thought Africans were lazy, colonists often pointed to the supposedly comfortable lives of Africans, which gave them no reason to work. In an article for *Die Finanz-Chronik*, Carl Peters wrote: "The people there by and large have no inner urge to work, and with the favorable living conditions in the tropics, also no explicit need."[419] In the same vein, Governor Schele argued that the key to recruiting African workers was to make their lives considerably more difficult.[420] "Also, one should see to it that the natives are not paid high wages and

---

[416] "Freiherr von Schele und die Arbeiterfrage," *Hamburger Nachrichten* (17 May 1894), *BA Berlin, R 1001/118*, 20; See also Schele, Denkschrift, *BA Berlin R1001/118*, 18–19.
[417] In this regard see especially Frederick Cooper, "Colonizing Time: Work Rhythms and Labor Conflict in Colonial Mombasa," in *Colonialism and Culture*, ed. Nicholas B. Dirks, 209–245 (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992).
[418] Koponen, *Development for Exploitation*, 330-36.
[419] Carl Peters, "Die afrikanische Arbeiterfrage," *Die Finanz-Chronik* (2 November 1901): 1633–34; see also *BA Berlin, R 1001/118*, 127.
[420] For additional examples of this argument see Hans Meyer, *Ostafrikanische Gletscherfahrten* (Leipzig: Dunker & Humblot,1893), 304; Richard Burton, *The Lake Regions of Central Africa, Volume 2: From Zanzibar to Lake Tanganyika* (Santa Barbara, CA: The Narrative Press, 2001), 308.

that the belongings that he must purchase, also earn through previous work ,are not too cheap ... because the natives will work only as long as it as it appears to satisfy their needs."[421] In order to force Africans onto the plantations, colonial officials initiated measures like the hut-tax, which was payable only through currency earned as a wage. The only way to earn money for the tax was by working on a plantation, and the plantation owners purposely kept wages low as a way to force Africans to work for long periods of time in order to meet their tax obligation.[422]

However, as Sunseri demonstrates, taxation was also largely ineffective.[423] In regions where colonial authorities could collect taxes easily, men simply fled to other regions where the colonial administration did not maintain a strong presence.[424] In other regions peasants dealt with their tax burden by selling crops or livestock instead of working on the plantation. In this manner, most peasants were ultimately able to meet their tax burdens relatively easily. Dismayed by their inability to force Africans to work through taxation, the plantation owners accepted they would have to find other ways to force Africans to work.

Having failed both to recruit foreign laborers and force Africans to work through the hut-tax, colonial authorities turned to slavery as the solution to their problem. Ostensibly, the use of slave labor was highly problematic because the Germans justified their occupation of East Africa by promising to abolish slavery. Yet, with the worker

---

[421] "Freiherr von Schele und die Arbeiterfrage," *Hamburger Nachrichten* (17 May 1894), *BA Berlin, R 1001/118*, 20.
[422] For more on wages and taxation, see Koponen, *Development for Exploitation*, 343–48.
[423] In this sense, Sunseri challenges the arguments made by Koponen and Illiffe, among others. For a more thorough discussion on the effects of colonial taxation policy see Koponen, *Development for Exploitation*, 339–415; Illiffe, *Modern History of Tanganyika*, 151–53; Walter Rodney, "The Political Economy of Colonial Tanganyika, 1890–1930," in *Tanzania under Colonial Rule,* ed. M.H.Y. Kaniki, 128–63 (London: Longman, 1980), 133–34; Helmuth Stoecker, ed., *German Imperialism in Africa* (London: 1986), 110–11.
[424] Sunseri, *Vilimani*, 65–67; Sunseri argues that this response also placed immense pressure on rural households, as women were frequently forced to work on behalf of the household.

question and labor shortages dominating colonial political debates, no one was willing to take the initiative and actually abolish the institution. As Jan-Georg Deutsch writes, “the labour question was a hidden agenda in subsequent debates” over the abolition of slavery.[425] Schele “unequivocally” disapproved of abolition because he believed it would devastate the colonial agricultural industry since most plantations were dependent upon slave labor.[426] In 1901, Governor Götzen refused to pursue abolition for similar reasons.[427] Since the plantation owners were both highly dependent on slave labor and staunch political allies of the colonial administration, the last thing the governor wanted to do was antagonize his base of support.[428]

Yet in the end, slavery also failed to solve the labor shortages that plagued the plantation owners. Ideally, they wanted to tap into existing slavery networks and hire enslaved Africans to work for them. Half of the slave’s small wage would go to the slave owner as a fee for using the slave. German labor practices, however, once again created more problems than they solved. Specifically, Europeans did not understand the full complexity of slavery in East Africa.[429] For them, all slave networks operated like chattel slavery in the American South before 1865. In reality, however, East African slavery bore very little resemblance to the American institution.[430] Africans were not used to the long workdays and the intense, physical nature of plantation labor. As a result, they regularly deserted the plantations when hired by Europeans. Once again, the Germans’

[425] Jan Georg Deutsch, *Emancipation without Abolition in German East Africa, c. 1884–1914* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2006), 137.
[426] Ibid., 138.
[427] Koponen, *Development for Exploitation*, 331-32.
[428] Ibid., 332-33.
[429] For a description of domestic slavery see Marcia Wright, *Strategies of Slaves and Women: Life Stories from East/Central Africa* (New York: L. Barber Press, 1993). For a discussion of African resistance to slavery see Jonathan Glassman, *Feasts and Riot: Revelry, Rebellion and Popular Consciousness on the Swahili Coast, 1856–1888* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1995).
[430] Koponen, *Development for Exploitation*, 334.

inability to grasp these differences led them to drive away their workers. Eventually, some plantation owners realized that the brutal working conditions on the plantations directly led to their inability to recruit workers.[431] While they tried to change by reducing their use of violence and softening oversight practices in the fields, these adjustments were largely too late to have any impact. The reputation of plantation work as extremely violent and demanding was well known and did not disappear easily. Therefore, slavery also failed to solve adequarely the labor question in East Africa. It was clear that plantation owners needed a new approach that did not involve forcing Africans to work.

***

Having run out of answers, the German East Africa Company took a different approach in 1885 when it announced an essay contest on the question "*Wie erzieht man am besten den Neger zur Plantagenarbeit*?" Alexander Merensky, a mission inspector who had previously served in South Africa, wrote the winning essay.[432] He argued that on the surface, they key factor to solving the question was climate, which was the variable that distinguished East Africa from other colonies.[433] As a result of the harsh tropical climate, colonial authorities could not import laborers from other parts of the world because they were succeptible to tropical diseases. Therefore, the economic

---

[431] See for example, Thaddeus Sunseri, "Peasants and the Struggle for Labor in Cotton Regimes of the Rufiji Basin, Tanzania (1890–1918)," in *Cotton, Colonialism and Social History in Sub-Saharan Africa*, ed. Allen Isaacman and Richard Rhodes, 180–199 (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1995) at 192.

[432] For a concise discussion of how the Protestant missions approached this question in general, see especially Majda Hamilton, *Mission im kolonialen Umfeld: Deutsche Protestantische Missionsgesellschaften in Deutsch-Ostafrika* (Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen, 2009), 89–102; Sebastian Conrad, *Globalisierung und Nation im Deutschen Kaiserreich* (Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 2006), 79–83.

[433] Alexander Merensky, *Wie erzieht man am besten den Neger zur Plantagenarbeit?* (Berlin: Wilhelm Süssrott, 1912), 3.

success of colonial plantation owners was dependent upon their ability to recruit workers from the local population.[434]

The problem, as Merensky saw it, had to do with the question that colonial authorities posed. Rather than trying to force Africans to work, they needed to ask how they could convince Africans to work for them. To this end, he argued that what they saw as "laziness" did not necessarily imply "no desire to work." Merensky argued that because the colony was sparsely populated and the land was especially rich, East Africans did not need to work long days of physically intense labor in order to meet their needs.

> It will therefore not be feasible summarily to portray laziness as a reason for their reluctance to serve the whites because the same group also has needs and lives where the relationship to their land is ordered and generally not bad… neither is Africa too thinly populated, and therefore the residents of this land neither serve each other, nor the whites, they find their livelihood in an easier way. In this state of affairs one asks: 'How does one educate blacks to do plantation work?' Initially one would have to answer, as if it read: "How to move the black to serve white planters? Can we force him at all? And through which means will this be possible?[435]

By rephrasing the question, Anton Markmiller argues that Merensky also completely reframed the so-called worker question in East Africa. Rather than focus their energy on finding compulsory measures like taxation or slavery, he urged plantation owners to think about spiritual reform.[436] It was not until 1885, the year Merensky wrote his essay, that

---

[434] For a discussion of the British context see Frederick Cooper, *From Slaves to Squatters: Plantaion Labor and Agriculture in Zanzibar and Coastal Kenya, 1890–1925* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), 69-132.
[435] Ibid., 6–7. See also Charles Buchner, "Die Mithilfe der Mission bei der Erziehung der Eingeborenen zur Arbeit," in *Verhandlungen des Deutschen Kolonialkongresses, 1905*, 427–42 (Berlin: Verlag von Dietrich Reimer, 1906), at 429.
[436] Anton Markmiller, *"Die Erziehung des Negers zur Arbeit" Wie die koloniale Pädagogik afrikanische Gesellschaften in die Abhängigkeit führte* (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 1995), 148.

anyone seriously proposed trying to motivate Africans internally to work on European projects.

On a practical level, Merensky argued that institutions like slavery were economically inefficient. As part of his obligation as the master, the plantation owner needed to provide the slave with things like clothing, food and housing. "In brief, from the Negro will… much be taken and at most little or nothing returned for it."[437] Merensky believed that despite working in the fields, the slave would never produce enough to compensate his master for the value of what he received. The value of slave labor only decreased further by the time one factored in the cost of passive acts of resistance.[438] Therefore, from an economic standpoint the process of compelling Africans to work was more trouble than it was worth. If one could motivate Africans to work internally, one would not have to absorb all the additional expenses associated with slavery.

In a similar vein, Charles Buchner, a missionary from the Herrnhut mission, argued that *Arbeitserziehung* was infinitely preferable to importing workers from Asia because the latter would ultimately lead to unrest among Africans. Alienated by the presence of foreign workers, Buchner feared native people would become "an inconsolable and dangerous proletariat" that could threaten the entire continent.[439] Therefore, in order to prevent internal disruption, Buchner argued that missionaries were especially obligated to stress *Erziehung* within their communities. Since both the

---

[437] Merensky, *"Wie erzieht man am besten den Neger zur plantagen Arbeit?"* 8.
[438] See especially Frederick Cooper, *Plantation Slavery on the East Coast of Africa* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977), 200–10
[439] Buchner, "Die Mithilfe der Mission bei der Erziehung der Eingeborenen zur Arbeit," 428.

colonial authorities and the missions had a joint interest in preventing the development of unrest, this was also another opportunity for the two groups to work together.

While he clearly thought that inner reform was the key to convincing Africans to work on colonial projects, Merensky provided little detail on how he believed colonial authorities could actually achieve it. He wrote vaguely about changing "political and social factors" that would in turn "lead to civilization and Christianization, and to work."[440] For example, in a later discussion he proposed introducing the concept of private property, believing that Africans would willingly develop the land if they thought they were working for themselves.[441] He urged the colonial authority to adopt a more long-term approach to the way it governed its subjects, and to avoid policies that set the colony up for long-term failure. For example, the use of excessive violence by plantation owners had the short-term effect of forcing men to work harder, but it was ultimately one of the primary factors responsible for acts of resistance that harmed productivity. Although the planters later arrived at this conclusion themselves, it was too late.[442] In order to change the attitudes of Africans to work, the colonial administration needed to avoid alienating them entirely. Therefore, it had to recognize these problems before they did permanent damage.

The closest Protestant missionaries came to making a specific policy proposal was L. Diestelkamp's suggestion to adapt the worker colonies to East Africa. As a member of the EMDOA, he noted that the mission was particularly well suited to approach the question of inner reform in Africa because of Bodelschwingh's work in Germany. To this end, he proposed replicating the worker colonies abroad as a way simultaneously to

---

[440] Merensky, *Wie erzieht man am besten den Neger zur plantagen Arbeit?,* 11.
[441] Buchner, "Die Mithilfe der Mission bei der Erziehung der Eingeborenen zur Arbeit," 439.
[442] Undated report from Graf Götzen, *BA Berlin R 1001/118*, 109–11.

effect spiritual reform and economic productivity.[443] Even though nobody ever implemented Diestelkamp's suggestion, it nevertheless demonstrates that the members of the EMDOA believed that their relationship with Bethel made them uniquely qualified among the Protestant missions to deal with the question of *Arbeitserziehung* in the colonies.

Although Merensky never provided the German East Africa Company with an explicit blue print they could follow, he highlighted two foundational factors without which he believed inner reform would be impossible. Taken together they are noteworthy because also represent core aspects of Bodelschwingh's philosophy for reforming the character of disaffected migrant workers. First, Merensky argued in favor of a strong colonial government that could convincingly project its authority. "The Negro never recognizes two lords, and if a colonial government wants to educate its subjects to work, it must immediately recognize, that its influence on them cannot be called into question. Its influence will stand and fall with its authority."[444] Once the government had established its authority, Merensky believed it could more easily control and regulate the lives of its subjects. To this end, the colonial authorities could create a space in which individuals were constantly compelled to work.

A large number of Africans, however, did not live in regions that the state could control easily, which limited the extent to which it could project its power. Missionaries on the other hand had much more intimate contact with Africans and represented a significantly greater authority. "Christianity is the only power that has successfully combatted the polygamy of the Africans, which is largely recognized as the actual origin

---

[443] Buchner, "Die Mithilfe der Mission bei der Erziehung der Eingeborenen zur Arbeit," 435.
[444] Merensky, *Wie erzieht man am besten den Neger zur Plantagenarbeit?*, 12.

of the lazy lifestyle of the men. Therefore, the husband of a wife must also in Africa be the man who participates in fieldwork if he does not want to starve and become poor."[445] Missionaries were able to establish contact with people in ways that were impossible for an impersonal bureaucracy. In order to become a good Christian, they stressed the importance of hard work. In this case, in order to establish and provide for a family, men needed to work hard in the fields. In this sense, Merensky's theory was very similar to Bodelschwingh's belief that regular work was a necessary precondition to settling down and supporting a family.

Even though Merensky's proposal strongly resembled aspects of Bodelschwingh's philosophy, Anton Markmiller notes that the two ultimately differed on their end goal. Although Bodelschwingh was quick to point out the ways in which his approach benefitted the state, he also made it clear that it was not his intention to create a reservoir of cheap labor.[446] In theory, Merensky also stated that missionaries were under no obligation to recruit Africans for colonial projects. "Christianity does not have the obligation to make and to educate natives to work for white settlers; it should be a source of mercy for all people and classes."[447] Yet as Markmiller observes, Merensky usually referenced colonial plantations when discussing the importance of work.[448] For example, at a mission conference in Saxony he argued that the idea of the civilizing mission was important because it made colonial subjects better suited to work on colonial projects.

> The question of how to educate the primitive people to work will be covered in our days, with much zeal. The cultured people [Kulturvölker]

[445] Ibid., 27–28.
[446] Critics argued, however, that in practice the worker colonies provided factories with a steady stream of cheap, compliant labor.
[447] Ibid., 26.
[448] Markmiller, *"Die Erziehung des Negers zur Arbeit,"* 150–51; Merensky, *Wie erzieht man am besten den Neger zur Plantagenarbeit?*, 12–25.

> in which the economic requirements of the prestige and value of work is more and more greater, is entered into lively exchange with the native people [Naturvölkern]; there it is understandable that one wonders what means are to be applied to move these people to participate more than ever in the collective work of the human family. It happens less out of love for these peoples and of their participation according to their skill, but rather from the desire to exploit them if at all possible.[449]

As far as he was concerned, labor was second only to the environment when determining the economic success of a project. He argued that after the quality of the land used for farming, the labor supplied by Africans was the most important factor to determining the economic success of the colony.[450] Thus, despite his rhetoric about the spiritual importance of work, Merensky viewed the civilizing mission as nothing more than a tool to create a reservoir of cheap wage laborers for colonial plantations.

Ultimately, Merensky's proposal represents the questions missionaries, including those in the EMDOA under Bodelschwingh, faced as they tried to carry out their civilizing mission under the colonial authority. On one level, missionaries like Merensky insisted that *Arbeitserziehung* did not mean learning to work for European planters. Rather, a strong work ethic was "in their own interest, as well as in the interest of the people themselves."[451] One needed to work regularly because work led to an improved quality of life. Yet, the theoretical goals of the missions also frequently overlapped with those of the planters. Therefore, missionaries faced constant pressure from colonial authorities to send members of their communities to work on the plantations as a way to facilitate the colony's economic success. Despite their rhetoric about remaining autonomous, it was often difficult for missionaries to pass up an opportunity to assist the

---

[449] Alexander Merensky, "Welches Interesse und welchen Anteil hat die Mission an der Erziehung der Naturvölker zur Arbeit?" *Allgemeine Missionszeitschrift* 14 (1887): 147–64, here 147.
[450] Markmiller, *"Die Erziehung des Negers zur Arbeit,"* 155–56.
[451] Merensky, *AMZ*, 151.

colony when possible. Even Gustav Warneck, who was deeply critical of the EMDOA's coziness with the German East Africa Society, acknowledged that missionaries could not ignore the labor questions that threatened the colony's economic success.

> For practical colonial policy, which Germany now also carries out, the question of *Arbeitserziehung* is almost a question of survival, without the work of the natives our colonies are of little value to us. Therefore, this question is with us now as the main issue on the agenda of the colonial policy discussion ... Now that the mission not only has a great independent interest in this question of the day of colonial policy, but one on the side of the colonizers expressly sought their participation to the solution of it, so it is almost imperative that they take to their position publicly… Requests have been made on this up to the imposition: the *Arbeitserziehung* of primitive people should be taken almost to the point of conversion, to bring them "the gospel of work" instead of the Gospel of salvation in Christ.[452]

Despite his fears that the colonial state would co-opt the mission for its own purposes, Warneck was also a nationalist who had a vested interest in the colony's success. Should the German colonial empire succeed and expand, German missionaries would have more territory in which they could work. Therefore, even Warneck saw that missions had a vested interest in working closely with the colonial administration.

A 1905 report to the East African colonial administration on the question of labor in West Usambara showed that the Bethel missionaries were also open to applying Bodelschwingh's philosophy to help planters recruit workers. It noted that both Trittelvitz and Johanssen, two of Bethel's leading missionaries, were not opposed to the possibility of encouraging Africans who were in contact with the EMDOA to take jobs at nearby plantations.

> They were of the view that the Waschambaa could still perform wage labor on the plantations without affecting the food supply of the land, with the compromise that in times of sowing, tending and harvest, they would

[452] Gustav Warneck, "Nachwort des Herausgabers," *Allgemeine Missionszeitung* 14 (1887): 171–84, here 171–74.

> be allowed to take care of their own economy. The missionaries also agreed to emphasize that the mission was not opposed when the natives, without prejudice to their own business, are stopped in their remaining free time under regulatory pressure to perform wage labor on the plantations.[453]

In this case plantation work would have the dual benefit of keeping individuals at the station working during their freetime (thus reinforcing the mission's philosophy) while also helping the colony economically. As staunch nationalists, the missionaries were generally willing to assist the colonial administration when possible.

If there were any missionaries who opposed the practice of knowingly sending members of their community into potentially dangerous situations on the plantations, there is no evidence to reflect this. However, such a blatant contradiction was not necessarily a sign that the missionaries treated Africans in a manner that was notably different than the clients of worker colonies in Germany. In an attempt to keep costs as low as possible, the administration frequently pushed their clients to work at factories outside the colony.[454] As a result, critics accused Bodelschwingh of placing profit before pedagogy. In the same vein, it appears as if the Bethel missionaries were willing to force the members of their communities to gain work experience on plantations in the name of cost efficiency.

***

By 1890, when Bodelschwingh assumed control of the EMDOA, authorities in both Africa and Europe were no closer to implementing Merensky's idea than they were when he wrote his essay in 1885. If anything, the discussion that Merensky generated

---

[453] Haber to the Government in Daressalam, betr. Arbeiterverhältnisse in West-Usambara. Bericht vom 4. Januar 1905, 12 January 1905, *BA Berlin R 1001/118*, 174–77.

[454] See Pohl, *Zwischen Protestantischer Ethik*, 63-8.

among missionaries demonstrated that they were at least willing to work with the settlers. Therefore, Bodelschwingh's arrival in East Africa offered the possibility of turning Merensky's theory into action. Drawing off of his experience with the worker colony initiative, Bodelschwingh planned on transferring the ideas and methods he developed in Germany to accomplish a similar purpose in Africa. The EMDOA under Bodelschwingh now appeared to offer the tonic that would remedy the seemingly endless search for workers.

Bodelschwingh's general approach to missionary work in Africa was exactly the same as his approach to social work in Paris and Westphalia. The only difference this time was that instead of reintegrating disaffected workers, the missionaries of the EMDOA sought to convert Africans to Christianity and integrate them into the larger German colonial empire. To this end, when the missionaries arrived in the Usambara highlands they immediately set out to create stable communities that stressed the importance of regular work, religion and family life. Their hope was that local people would be so impressed by life in a mission community that they would convert to Christianity and relocate to be with the missionaries.

As in Europe, regimented, physical labor formed the foundation of life in the communities. Writing to missionaries in 1893, Bodelschiwngh said "It is very important to me… the education of your dear children to fundamental work. With two hours of work… it is not possible to have a healthy Christianity, nor a true journey to the Savior."[455] He reinforced the point in another letter to missionaries in Usambara one year later when he wrote: "If it is correct… that on average the men do not work more than

---

[455] Bodelschwingh, 18.11.1893, quoted in Gustav Menzel, *Seine grosse Freude: Friedrich von Bodelschwingh und die Mission* (Wuppertal: Verlag der Vereinigten Evangelischen Mission, 1982), 28.

two hours daily, so it is also in fact an obligation, in order to plant a healthy Christianity, to create more work."[456] To be sure, statements like these excited colonial authorities, who wanted to believe that Bodelschwingh would use his philosophy to solve their labor problems.

In reality, however, the missionaries made it very clear that their primary goal was to use work as a means to win religious conversion. Following the pattern established by their colleagues in Europe, the missionaries frequently describe encounters with individuals on the margins of society. Johannsen, for example, describes how his station used work to convert and re-integrate a local man who was a notorious "thief." Later, he notes how another "work shy" man fled the community because of its highly regimented lifestyle only to be struck by disaster upon leaving.[457] Thus, he voluntarily returned to the missionaries after realizing the benefit of a regimented lifestyle.

In order to build successfully a Protestant community in Usambara, the missionaries understood that they needed to win the trust of the people in areas surrounding their mission stations. As Johannsen notes, the Schambala held a common set of prejudices about Europeans based on their encounters with colonial officials and planters.[458] Therefore, to their frustration, the missionaries frequently found themselves working against preexisting stereotypes.[459] As a result, they understood that they also had

[456] Bodelschwingh, 20. 10. 1894, quoted in Menzel, *Seien grosse Freude*, 29.
[457] Ernst Johanssen, *Führung und Erfahrung in 40 jährigem Missionsdienst: Band* I (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1934), 153-4.
[458] For an excellent history on the relationship between the Bethel Mission and the Schambala see Steven Feierman, *Peasant Intellectuals: Anthropology and History in Tanzania* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990).
[459] Johanssen, *Führung und Erfahrung in 40 jährigem Missionsdienst: Band* I, 175.

an obligation to approach Africans with "open eyes" and genuinely learn about local cultural practices if they hoped to see their philosophy take root.[460]

To this end, the missionaries sought to stress commonalities between cultures while also trying to understand the reasons behind specific practices as a way to avoid alienating local people. For example, Johannsen notes that the first thing they noticed upon arriving in Usambara was that the Schambala had their own way of organizing agricultural work. They stressed the "joy of work" by encouraging children to perform field labor and many local proverbs emphasized "industriousness" and the "value" of work.[461] Naturally, the missionaries co-opted these attitudes in their efforts to teach local people about the European work ethic.

In addition to work, the other practice about which missionaries were deeply concerned was marriage. Given the importance of family and religion to Bodelschwingh's philosophy they believed it was essential to eliminate practices like polygamy. Yet they also understood that this could be a very problematic, and at times messy process. Therefore, the Bethel missionaries approached the question of polygamous relationships on a "case by case" basis.[462] They noted that the Schambala endowed marriage with a sense of moral correctness and tried to use it as part of a larger argument against polygamy. At the same time, they also refused to allow people in polygamous relationships to reside in the mission community. In this way they hoped that indirect pressure through exisiting values, combined with the attraction of stability at

---

[460] Ibid., 69; Of all the Bethel missionaries, Ernst Johannsen made the greatest effort to accomplish this. His three volume memoir draws heavily off of his extensive collection of personal papers, located in the VEM (Wuppertal). See especially, M 750, Bd. 1-3.
[461] Ernst Johanssen, *Führung und Erfahrung in 40 jährigem Missionsdienst: Band* I, 67
[462] Ibid., 158-63

the mission would convince those people in polygamous relationships to abandon the practice.

Despite their interest in Schambala culture, there is no doubt that the missionaries were primarily concerned with work. Not only did work provide structure within the community, but through it the EMDOA also highlight aspects of German nationalism. For example, the missionaries used activities that drew explicit connections between Christianity and loyalty to Germany. Loyal subjects not only would be less likely to rebel against colonial authority, but they would also feel a more vested interest in the future success of the colony. In this sense Bodelschwingh again viewed colonial subjects in the exact same way as the marginalized workers in Germany. In both cases he feared that their lack of Christian faith would lead them potentially to cause trouble for the ruiling authorities. In this case, he sought to fuse Protestantism and nationalist devotion as a way to transform African communities into loyal blocs of colonial subjects.

In order to highlight the importance of loyalty, they encouraged people to express their enthusiasm and support for the German presence. For example, in 1910 the *Nachrichten aus der evangelischen Mission*, the EMDOA's official organ, featured a song of praise that a member of the community wrote for the emperor. Opening with the line "Africa, rejoice, be thankful for the Kaiser," the poem stressed themes of loyalty and thankfulness that East Africa was controlled by Wilhelm.

Call to him Hurra, Hurra and ask him for life
Where such a risk arises, which they devalue, he is the Eagle.
His name is total love and total honor.
Remember, how the Kaiser dealt with the evildoers.
Therefore you must fear him and never sin against him.
Honor him dearly and pay him taxes.

Who is it that can take away all your concerns, everywhere? [463]

Bodelschwingh stressed the importance of national devotion even more through the stories he regularly told in the Bethel literature about three African children whom he brought to Bielefeld. As the articles explained, these children would be immersed in his philosophy while at Bethel with the goal of someday returning to Africa to teach it to others. As part of their education, Bodelschwingh noted how the children were encouraged to develop a deep reverence for the German nation.[464] To illustrate this point he described the annual Sedan Day celebrations in the community.[465] The highpoint of the holiday was a parade in which the town turned out to celebrate German unification and the country's victory over France in 1871. One year, one of the African children wanted to participate in the parade, and Bodelschwingh proudly described her as a "good Prussian" as she marched with the other children.[466] Such anecdotes were priceless for Bodelschwingh because they clearly illustrated the importance of nation as an aspect of his philosophy. Practically speaking, these types of stories were also valuable because their popularity frequently translated into financial offerings to the Bethel community.[467]

Although the missionaries of the EMDOA began practically to apply Bodelschwingh's philosophy to their work immediately upon arriving in East Africa, their approach did not gain traction until the late 1890s, when the collective impact of a

---

[463] "Danklied Afrikas an den Kaiser," *Nachrichten aus dem ostafrikanischen Mission* 24, no. 8 (August 1910): 154–55.

[464] See for example "Aus Elisabeth Fatumas Leben und Sterben," *Der Bote von Bethel,* no. 3, 1897, 7–8.

[465] Hartmut Lehmann has written most extensively on the relationship between Protestantism and nationalism. See especially Hartmut Lehmann, "Pietism and Nationalism: The Relationship between Protestant Revivalism and National Renewal in Nineteenth-Century Germany," *Church History* 51 (1982): 39–53; Hartmut Lehmann, "Friedrich von Bodelschwingh und das Sedanfest," *Historische Zeitschrift* 203, no. 3 (1966): 542–73. See also Alon Confino, *The Nation as a Local Metaphor: Württemberg, Imperial Germany, and National Memory, 1871–1918* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 30–34.

[466] "Aus dem Jahre des grossen Krieges," *Der Bote von Bethel* 4 (1897), 1.

[467] For more on work as a symbol of national character see Warren Rosenblum, *Beyond the Prison Gates: Punishment and Welfare in Germany, 1850–1933* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 2008), 49.

series of ecological disasters resulted in a destructive famine. These were triggered by an outbreak of *Rinderpest* (cattle plague) that decimated cattle herds (frequently wiping out between ninety and ninety five percent of the herds).[468] Between 1897-1899, the population of the Tanga district, where the Bethel missionaries were active, decreased from 123,308 to 61,328. One estimate placed the resulting death toll from 1894-1899 at 750,000.[469] For its part, the German government displayed little interest in providing humanitarian relief. As Iliffe contends, Germany did not have a significant amount of capital to invest in the colonies, and "there were many more enticing outlets for it than Tanganyika."[470] Furthermore, James Giblin maintains that although famine was nothing new for the people of East Africa, the disasters of the late 1890s were exacerbated by German colonial policies. Political upheaval caused by the European presence greatly weakened the bonds of traditional farming communities. In the past, these communities would have protected vulnerable individuals from the full impact of famine. Now, however, people frequently left home in search of food. Making matters even worse, many peasant families sold their grain reserves, upon which they would have normally relied when harvests were poor, in order to pay their tax obligations to the colonial state.[471]

Therefore, in a desperate search for help, many individuals turned to the missions. While they were more than eager to help, the missionaries also knew how to take good

---

[468] Iliffe, *A Modern History of Tanganyika*, 124–25.
[469] Ibid., 165.
[470] Ibid., 126; Iliffe argues that the ecological disasters were exacerbated by the effects of European colonial policies. Furthermore, the repeated crises had significant political ramifications that delayed further investment. For more, see 123–67.
[471] James L. Giblin, *The Politics of Environmental Control in Northeastern Tanzania, 1840–1940* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992), 124–27. See also Gregory Maddox, James L. Giblin and Isaria N. Kimambo, eds., *Custodians of the Land: Ecology and Culture in the History of Tanzania* (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1996).

advantage of a crisis. As Koponen notes, both missionaries and colonial authorities had a long tradition of using famine as a way to pressure Africans to perform labor before receiving food.[472] For example, in 1894 the *Deutsches Kolonialblatt* reported that, "When possible, the Governor intends to distribute food not free but at a low price or as payment for work." These jobs included "useful works such as road construction."[473] Indeed, a government report noted that the "labor situation" in Tanga and Usambara had improved in 1895 because of a famine.[474]

In this sense, the Bethel missionaries were no different from the other missionaries in the region. They saw the famine as a crisis they could exploit to their benefit. Not only did it force Africans to work and encounter Bodelschwingh's philosophy, but it also formed the basis of a very effective publicity campaign in Germany. Faced with a steadily increasing number of people in search of help one of the missionaries, mimicking the actions of other missions in East Africa, initiated a program where people would sign a list pledging ten days of labor in exchange for food during the famine.[475] Left with no other options, the Africans had to accept the terms. As Bethel missionaries reported in July, 1899, "Many hundreds of unfortunate blacks will be cared for daily at eight main stations." The missionaries at Hohenfriedburg were overwhelmed to the point they had to expand the station specifically to accommodate everyone. At the same time the Bethel missionaries reported they also created two new stations especially to cope with the famine.[476] At the station in Uzaramo they noted that people who

---

[472] Koponen, *Development for Exploitation*, 346.
[473] Deutsches Kolonialblatt, 1894, 406
[474] Koponen, *Development for Exploitation*, 345–46.
[475] Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, "Brot für Steine!" in *Nachrichten aus der Ostafrikanischen Mission* 3 (March 1899), 42–44.
[476] Circular to Missionsdirektor Schreiber, Barmen, July 1899, *HAB 1/E* 138.

previously would never "have dreamt of touching a saw or doing any kind of labor… would happily act as goat- or swineherdsmen, a work which would previously had been undertaken by freed slave children."[477] Given the initial success of the program, the missionaries asked Bethel about expanding it to include the entire colony.

The expansion of the initiative at Uzaramo into one of the EMDOA's signature initiatives is what differentiated it from other the other organizations in East Africa. Bodelschwingh was energized by the missionaries' plea for support and he built it into a larger campaign called *Brot für Steine* (Bread for Stones). The plan called for those who approached the mission in search of food to perform work before they received assistance. Typically, the missionaries required individuals to bring a stone with them to the station that could later be used in the construction of a church for the community.[478] By requiring an individual to work in exchange for help, *Brot für Steine* adopted the pedagogical principles behind the worker colonies in Germany. In this case it was a literal application of Bodelschwingh's axiom that one who does not work shall not eat.

Brot für Steine was an important initiative not only because it was a practical application of Bodelschwingh's philosophy in East Africa, but also because the clear parallels with Bethel in Bielefeld allowed Bodelschwingh to use it as the centerpiece of a publicity campaign designed to generate support for the mission among his extended

[477] Koponen, *Development for Exploitation*, 346; Sigvard von Sicard, *The Lutheran Church on the Coast of Tanzania, 1887–1914* (Lund: Gleerup, 1970), 124–25.
[478] Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, *"Brot für Steine!"* (Bethel bei Bielefeld, 1899), found in *HAB 1/E 138*; As Giblin notes, the fact that the mission stations had food to distribute indicated that the effects of the famine were not uniform. Furthermore, many missions had food to distribute because they purchased grain from farmers before the famine occurred. At one Mandera Mission station, peasants had to pay more than double what they received for their harvests during the famine. For more see Giblin, *The Politics of Environmental Control*, 126.

network of financial supporters.[479] As Thorsten Altena notes, the idea of using the stones to build a church was a clear reference to an earlier campaign at Bethel that resulted in the construction of the community's main Zion Church in 1883. Since the site for the church was located at the top of a hill, the builders faced a logistical challenge when they had to figure out how to get the building supplies to the construction site. As a solution, Bodelschwingh strongly encouraged visitors to the site to take a stone for the church on their way up the hill, and bring an empty wheelbarrow with them on the way down.[480] Practically, his idea helped to get the stones up the hill, but pedagogically it taught his parishoners the importance of a strong work ethic. Therefore, when supporters read about *Brot für Steine*, they immediately thought of the Zion Church and made the connection between East Westphalia and East Africa.

***

For the Bethel missionaries, *Brot für Steine* was an unqualified success. Not only did it enable them to transfer seamlessly Bodelschwingh's philosophy to Africa, but it also exposed a significant number of people to his approach. Given the willingness of Africans to work in exchange for assistance, the Bethel missionaries were encouraged to expand the scope of their work even further. To help facilitate this process, they used *Brot für Steine* as the basis for an extensive propaganda campaign designed to raise more money. The initiative was so celebrated that it quickly became a mainstay of nearly every extended account of the mission's history published by the Bethel press. In this

[479] For example see, Bodelschwingh, "Brot für Steine," *Nachrichten aus der ostafrikanischen Mission* 3 (March 1899), 42–44; Trittelvitz, *Nicht so langsam!*, 72–74.
[480] Thorsten Altena, "Grenzüberschreitungen: Zum Beziehungsgeflecht von Innerer und äusserer Mission in den Anfangsjahren der Bethel-Mission," in *Bethels Mission, Bd. 3: Mutterhaus, Mission und Pflege*, ed. Matthias Benad and Vicco von Bülow, 147–70 (Bielefeld: Luther Verlag, 2003), 170.

sense it was valuable because the public could easily see how Bodelschwingh was applying his initiatives within the Inner Mission to East Africa.

Ultimately, the culmination of the missionaries' effort to transfer the Bodelschwingh philosophy to Africa was the EMDOA's station at Lutindi, which became the centerpiece of the entire mission. Whereas the other stations attempted to incorporate aspects of Bodelschwingh's social welfare policies, Lutindi was a miniature version of Bethel in Africa. Like Bethel, it was also the focus of a variety of publicity material. For example, Bethel regularly produced a monthly pamphlet entitled *Lutindi Bote* that followed the same model as the popular *Bote von Bethel* series. Each month those people who supported financially the Lutindi station received a brief pamphlet with anecdotes about life at the station. These stories described the lives of both Africans and European missionaries while emphasizing the importance of things like the work ethic and religious instruction. Furthermore, Lutindi also had a place of prominence in nearly every published account of Bethel's activity in East Africa.[481] Although the vast majority of this literature is of limited historical value because of its heavily sanitized, uncritical character, it is nevertheless important because it clearly shows the lengths to which the Bethel missionaries went to hold up Lutindi as Bethel's twin in Africa.

In Lutindi's heavily mythologized origin story, it was first founded in 1896 as a center to care for the children of slaves. However, as the practice of slavery slowly

---

[481] See for example Tittelvitz, *Nicht so langsam!*, 124; Paul Döring, *Morgendämmerung in Deutsch-Ostafrika: Ein Rundgang durch die ostafrikanische Mission* (Berlin: Verlag Martin Warneck, 1901), 76–78; Gustav von Bodelschwingh, *Friedrich v. Bodelschwingh: Ein Lebensbild*, 12th edition (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1949), 261–62; Hildegard Waltenberg, *Lutindi, die Stadt auf dem Berge*, 3rd edition (Bielefeld: self published, 1998).

declined, Lutindi subsequently lost its *raison d'être.*[482] In search of a new mission, Wilhelm Bokermann, Lutindi's lead missionary, wrote Bodelschwingh in 1904 suggesting that the station remake itself as a modern center for mental health care. Bokermann noted the presence of several local people who had mental disabilities and argued that the station could fill a glaring need for mental health care in the colony. According to the Bethel mythology, Bodelschwingh was immediately energized by the suggestion and agreed with Bokermann. Lutindi could display the close connection between Bethel's domestic and foreign missions while also providing another opportunity to export the Bethel philosophy to Africa.[483]

In the event, Lutindi's origins were much more complex and heavily entwined with official colonial policy. According to Alfred Diefenbacher, colonial authorities first approached Bodelschwingh about the possibility of constructing a mental health center as early as 1899, five years before Bokermann's letter.[484] They were concerned that most Africans with mental disabilities found themselves either in hospitals or in prison, which consumed valuable resources while providing no practical benefit to the individuals with disabilities. The authorities ideally wanted to open a center relatively close to Dar es Salaam, the colony's administrative center and largest city.[485] However, they were also concerned about funding and staffing the facility, which ultimately led Götzen to approach Bodelschwingh about forming a partnership with the government. If

---

[482] Although the government officially abolished slavery, Georg Deutsch insists de facto slavery persisted until 1918, when the British assumed control of German colonial possessions. For more see Deutsch, *Emancipation without Abolition*.
[483] See for example Trittelvitz, *Nicht so langsam!,* 123–24; Bodelschwingh, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh,* 259–62.
[484] Albert Diefenbacher, *Psychiatrie und Kolonialismus: Zur "Irrenfürsorge" in der Kolonie Deutsch-Ostafrika* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 1985), 42.
[485] Ibid., 50.

Bodelschwingh could apply his philosophy to this initiative as well, it was possible that he could also transform patients at the station into productive colonial subjects.

For his part, Bodelschwingh was in no position to refuse Götzen's offer. Lutindi was initially founded to care for victims of slavery, a concern that colonial authorities did not take seriously, which meant that it received almost no financial support from the state.[486] By the early 1900s, Lutindi was in dire straits financially and only remained solvent because of Bethel. In fact, at the same time the government was discussing the creation of a center for mental health, the *Evangelische Afrikaverein's* board was discussing ways to rescue its financially troubled station.[487] Therefore, while Bodelschwingh was certainly an important player in the creation of a psychiatric hospital at Lutindi, his desire to transfer his philosophy to Africa was not the driving force behind it. His decision to transform Lutindi was more or less made out of necessity.

The transition to a center for mental health care was also far from seamless. As part of his plan to make Lutindi into Bethel's African twin, Bodelschwingh wanted partially to create the atmosphere of a refuge by building Lutindi far from any population center. In this sense it would isolate clients from the dangers of urban life, much like the worker colonies isolated migrant workers in Germany. Götzen, however, feared that a remote location would limit the center's usefulness and therefore wanted to locate it in the capital. In the end, since Bethel was financing the construction, Bodelschwingh won the argument.[488] While the conflict was relatively minor, it is nevertheless revealing because it illustrates Bodelschwingh's determination to transfer his philosophy to Africa in a way that mirrored exactly his initiative in Germany.

---

[486] *Satzung des Evangelische Afrikavereins*, (Berlin: Vaterländische Verlagsanstalt, 1894), 3.
[487] Diefenbacher, *Psychiatrie und Kolonialismus*, 54.
[488] Ibid., 63.

As Feierman notes, Bodelschwingh's plan to transform Africans into loyal colonial subjects also made Bethel complicit in the larger colonial agenda to destroy traditional conceptions of chiefship. Under normal circumstances, it would have been the chief who took responsibility for helping marginalized individuals. Since the missionaries had helped the colonial authorities to eliminate the chiefs, it was now their obligation to assume a "quasi-chiefly authority" and help marginalized people.[489] Thus, Feierman argues that Lutindi existed, in part, to fill a pressing and pracitical need for aid that the missionaries created when they helped to eliminate the Chiefs.

Ironically, Bodelschwingh's plan to isolate Lutindi worked a little too well, because it he had difficulty drawing attention to the new initiative. Despite his reputation as a master publicist, the only paper to advertise Lutindi's grand reopening was the weekly *Usambara Post,* which only ran a small announcement for two weeks in February 1905.[490] Bokermann's correspondence with Bodelschwingh during this time only further indicated that the station was struggling. "…How our care for the mentally ill will develop, looks to be somewhat dark to us, because currently it has, despite increasing publicity, not won any clients or applications."[491] Bokermann even went on to suggest that the colonial government should transport potential patients to the station. Only at the end of 1906, after the station's population increased significantly, did Bokermann believe Lutindi was on solid ground.[492] Only after the resolution of these inititial problems did Lutindi become an institute that would benefit both Bethel and the colony.

---

[489] Feierman, *Peasant Intellectuals*, 130–31.
[490] *Usambara Post: Zeitung für die Nordbezirke Tanga, Pangani, Wilhelmstal* 4, no. 15 (11 February 1905), 3; *Usambara Post* 4, no. 16 (18 February 1905); Diefenbacher, *Psychiatrie und Kolonialismus,* 87.
[491] Bokermann to Bodelschwingh, 28 May 1905, *HAB B IX, 9.2*.
[492] Diefenbacher, *Psychiatrie und Kolonialismus*, 71.

Even before its transition into a center for people with mental disabilities, Lutindi operated entirely according to the Bethel philosophy. In addition to his desire to replicate Bethel in Africa, Bodelschwingh also knew that supporters in Germany would easily understand the connection, which would encourage them to provide much needed financial support. To this end, daily life in Lutindi was nearly identical to the worker colony Wilhelmsdorf. Through a regiment that stressed constant activity, the missionaries stressed the importance of *Arbietserziehung* and religious faith. The day began promptly at 5:30 AM with breakfast, which was then followed by a brief church service. Residents worked until 5:30 in the evening with brief breaks to eat and sing church hymns. Following a small dinner, the day concluded with an evening church service.[493] The end goal, as always, was to transform successfully clients of the station into productive colonial subjects, which Bodelschwingh hoped would translate into additional support from the state.

In order to emphasize Lutindi's importance, Alexander Merensky wrote a series of articles for the *Evangalische Afrika-Verein's* journal *Afrika* in 1894 and 1895 that expanded on his earlier essay. Merensky urged the colonial authorities to assist Bodelschwingh's attempt to reintegrate the former slaves by providing them each with a small parcel of land. "For the use of the land and for the cost, which… the government of the colony will provide, the people will have to pay a fee. That is the only successful way to educate the people to industriousness."[494] In theory, land ownership would not only teach an individual about responsibility, but it would also force him to work in order to pay for the maintenance of the land. In the same vein, he also argued that married

[493] Wilhelm Bokerman, "Ein Arbeitstag in Lutindi," 21 July 1900, *HAB 1/E 300*.
[494] Alexander Merensky, "Was soll aus unsern befreiten Sklaven werden?," *Afrika* 68–76 (1894): 74.

couples should also pay a "marriage tax" so that the husband understood "that the acquisition of a wife is associated with costs." Therefore, in addition to reintegrating former slaves into society, the responsibility aspect of Bodelschwingh's philosophy would push African men back onto the plantations.[495]

Although Bodelschwingh's philosophy played a dominant role in Lutindi's mission from the beginning, it was not until the transition that it truly became Bethel's reflection in Africa. Unlike the other stations, which were operated by specially trained missionaries, Lutindi was staffed almost exclusively by social workers who received the exact same training as their colleagues in the worker colonies. This background would later be essential to explaining the positions that the returning missionaries took in Bethel's postwar debates over the future of the care provided at the institution. Because they were trained exclusively in the Bethel approach to social welfare, they left for the colonys with a nearly unshakable faith in Bodelschwingh's ideas.

Indeed, an examination of daily life at Lutindi reveals a community deeply devoted to the Bethel philosophy. The social workers at Lutindi purposely eschewed modern medicine in favor of therapies that emphasized movement and activity. Even as late as 1936, one misionary wrote that the social workers at Lutindi preferred to avoid prescribing medicine to their patients. "As our work in Lutindi does not cease, and work is known to make one tired and hungry for sleep, we distribute only a little sleep medicine."[496] According to Diefenbacher, the social workers at Lutindi made a concerted effort to avoid using medicine when treating their patients. Records for Lutindi also indicate that the station did not have significant quantities of medicine on hand at the

---

[495] Alexander Merensky, "Deutschlands Pflicht gegen seine schwarzen Unterthanen," *Afrika* 77–82 (1895): 82.
[496] Waltenberg, *Ärtzliche Mission* (1936), 42.

station. Furthermore, the earliest mention of medicine at Lutindi does not occur until 1920.[497] Demonstrating his profound devotion to Bodelschwingh's ideas Wilhelm Nickel, a leading social worker at Lutindi and Bokermann's eventual successor, argued that the only medicine prescribed at the station was work.

> For these sick people, both in the homeland as well as here in Africa, work is the best medicine, unless the disease has already progressed too far. We have a wide number of mentally ill, who cannot be busy outside. Here, these people are offered a favorable opportunity to work.[498]

Unlike at Bethel, where a small but growing number of professionally trained physicians were launching the first assaults on Bodelschwingh's philosophy, *Arbeitserziehung* continued to reign supreme at Lutindi. By rejecting modern forms of medicine, Lutindi was the total embodiment of Bodelschwingh's philosophy.

Under the leadership of Bokermann and Nickel Lutindi, even the daily schedule more closely resembled that of a worker colony than during the station's days as a slave refuge. "It is not necessary for them to acquire their livelihood through hard work. With very little work everything grows for them by itself. However, here in Lutindi there is the well-known principle: 'pray and work." Because this is also practically implemented, our station residents have become so accustomed to work over the years that they do not feel well without it."[499] In addition to the long work days, Lutindi's social workers also privileged outdoor, physical labor. As Bokermann wrote in 1908,

> We also observe that with those who wandered freely and far, but were also so far to procure food, <u>their isolation in a mental asylum, along with the altered lifestyle, had a debilitating effect on their entire body</u>. We seek

[497] Diefenbacher, *Psychiatrie und Kolonialismus*, 89; "Medikamente," *HAB E 308*.
[498] Wilhelm Nickel, "Was soll aus unseren Kindern werden?" *HAB 2/52–5a.*
[499] Ibid.

> to suspend these effects as much as possible through much work and exercise in fresh air outside the asylum.[500]

If a patient was physically unable to work, the social worker encouraged him to move around as much as possible during the day.[501] In the same spirit as the worker colony, the goal was to keep the clients constantly occupied.

Bokermann stressed activity and work because he truly believed in their therapeutic benefits. Reflecting the philosophy that guided the worker colonies, Bokermann argued that in addition to the physical benefits of movement and activity, outdoor labor also carried significant emotional and spiritual benefits.

> It had been shown that the mentally ill Negroes were accustomed to great freedom and independence. Should we limit that? No, we granted to them both as much as is possible and soon realized that working outdoors was the best medicine for them. Even the most restless and agitated patients were allowed so far as they were not a direct threat to their environment, to work in the healthy mountain air of Usambara.[502]

In order to convey the success of Bodelschwingh's approach, he told his audience back in Germany that the residents of Lutindi had enjoyed working so much that they came to view it as a "privilege," and therefore "gave the greatest effort" to avoid losing it.[503] Naturally, Bokermann's comments translated extraordinarily well into clear, easily digestable publicity material for audiences back in Germany.

At the same time, Bokerman's approach also went over very well with colonial authorities. Given their belief in the spiritual benefits of outdoor, physical labor, it was only natural that Lutindi's leaders looked to create their own plantations and in some

---

[500] Bokermann to Bodelschwingh, 2 October 1908, *HAB B IX 9.2*; See also Bodelschwingh Jr. to Bokermann, 23 September 1912, *HAB 2/52–3*.
[501] Bokermann, "Tagesordnung Lutinis," *Aerztliche Mission* in Diefenbacher, *Psychiatrie und Kolonialismus*, 85.
[502] Wilhelm Bokermann, *Lutindi*, 1916.
[503] Ibid.

cases form a partnership with the local planters. In addition to its philosophical benefits, it was also practically important because it helped the station to become self-sufficient. By working on land that belonged to the mission, the residents could grow much of the food that they would later consume. Yet, just like their colleagues at other stations, Bokermann and Nickel were not opposed to farming out their charges to work at nearby, private plantations. As Nickel noted, "With the surrounding plantation owners, we are finding ready sale."[504] Despite their rhetoric about maintaining a distance from the colonial administration and private plantation owners, the missionaries had no hesitations about altering their stance if it could be mutually beneficial. As long as the planter promised not to mistreat his workers, the Lutindi missionaries willingly sent their clients to work on plantations. Plantation work not only kept them active, but it also theoretically helped to build a strong work ethic, The missionaries appeared to take the guarantees provided by the plantation owners at face value despite the widespread stories of rampant physical abuse.

The willingness of the Bethel missionaries to tolerate and even condone the use of violence in some instances was the one major factor that distinguished Bethel in East Africa from the community's headquoarters in Bielefeld. As Diefenbacher notes, physical restraints and compulsory measures were regularly employed at the station until at least the mid 1930s. In 1909, Bokermann proudly noted that the social workers used "increasingly fewer violent punishments" when dealing patients they considered to be problematic.[505] For his part, Bodelschwingh appeared to be unaware that the social workers used violent measures in Lutindi. When he requested pictures of Lutindi and its

---

[504] Nickel, "Was soll aus unseren Kindern werden?," *HAB 2/52–5a*.
[505] Diefenbacher, *Psychiatrie und Kolonialismus*, 88; Bokermann to Bodelschwingh, 18 March 1909, *HAB B IX, 9.2*.

residents, Bokermann sent him a picture of a mentally-ill man bound to a device called a "slave fork [*Sklavengabel*]." Looking like a long, two pronged fork, an individual was bound between the two prongs in an attempt to restrict his mobility. Bokermann included the picture to show Bodelschwingh how individuals came to Lutindi and to illustrate the "cruelty of the heathen" compared to the staff at Lutindi. Bodelschwingh, however, misunderstood and thought the device was a mainstay of care at Lutindi.

> I am shocked by the picture of the poor, sick individual bound in the fork-shaped stock. I can believe that in specific cases such assistance is charitable to the severely sick in emergency situations. Nevertheless I urge you not to show anyone the picture. Our modern doctors will break the staff about it and say that the treatment of our patients is very backwards. Here one is no longer permitted a soft straitjacket, not even a cell. I think that, with your lack of resources, it goes too far... I would be grateful if I could have the explanation for the pictures in the next letters. I hope that the tense looking mentally ill person does not come from Lutindi, but from some government prison in Tanga.[506]

In addition to his concern that this image would destroy Bethel's public reputation, Bodelschwingh was particularly concerned about its potential repercussions within the institute. As the next chapter will show, at this time in Bethel Bodelschwingh was also locked in a tense struggle with the physicians for control and influence. In an attempt to outmaneuver him, the physicians tried to paint Bodelschwingh as an out of touch religious fanatic. Based on his response it appears that he was particularly concerned that these images would give those accusations traction.

***

Of course, the prevelance of violence at Lutindi also raises the spectre of racism within the EMDOA. As Thorsten Altena notes, subtle forms of passive racism were evident in many of the first hand accounts the missionaries produced. For example, the

---

[506] Bodelschwingh quoted in Diefenbacher, *Psychiatrie und Kolonialismus*, 88.

missionary Paul Wohlrab wrote that before the missionaries arrived, the Schambala was a "fully undeveloped Negro."[507] In the same vein Ernst Johanssen, one of the leading missionaries believed that "his race" belonged to "the master nation [*Herrenvolk*]."[508] Even Trittelvitz revealed his racial chauvinism in an episode he recounted for a children's book. "…we saw, that the high prince did not respect the poor little blacks, but was also friendly to them."[509] Altena, however, contends that these attitudes were by no means representative of the mission as a whole because they were so exceptional.[510] Furthermore Altena argues that if anything the attitudes expressed by the Bethel missionaries reflect a strong sense of racial chauvinism. To this end, comments like those made by Johannsen, Trittelvitz and Wohlrab were motivated "less based on chauvinism due to racist social Darwinism, but rather much more… by the absense of Christianity against the backdrop of the previously discussed cultural understannding…"[511] In the eyes of the missionaries, Africans were inferior to the Germans if they had not yet converted to Christianity. Altena insists that the Bethel missionaries were largely resistant to the biological racism that permeated colonial culture at the time and that they rarely expressed interest in ideas like social Darwinism. In this sense once an African individual converted to Christianity and embraced aspects of Western European culture, he would completely redeem himself in the eyes of the missionary.

Given the evidence about the treatment of Africans at Lutindi, however, Altena's claim regarding the prevalence of racist attitudes among the missionaries needs to be

---

[507] Paul Wohlrab, *Usambara*, 19.
[508] Johanssen, *Führung und Erfahrung* I, 61.
[509] Walter Trittelvitz, *An meine 80.000 Kinder in Deutschland* (Bethel, 1909), 75.
[510] Altena, *"Ein Häuflein Christen mitten in der Heidenwelt des dunklen Erdteils,"* 145.
[511] Altena, *"Ein Häuflein Christen mitten in der Heidenwelt des dunklen Erdteils,"* 145.

qualified. If a religious deficit was the primary factor that influenced missionary attitudes to their African clients that still does not explain their tolerance of physical abuse at Lutindi. The fact that the missionaries willingly sent individuals to work on plantations despite their notoriety for poor working conditions, while also using violence themselves with clients, suggests that conversion did not ncecessarily lead to full redemption.

Yet, there is also notable anecdotal evidence to support Altena's claim that the attitudes of missionaries to their African clients changed dramatically following conversion. In 1929, Bokermann wrote a retrospective of Lutindi's first twenty-five years as a mental health care center. As part of his account, he recalled the stories of several individuals who came to Lutindi during its early days. Describing the first individual to arrive at Lutindi, a man named Kabenga, he wrote: "The sight of this wild man was horrifying: the bushy, unkempt coarse hair stood far off; the tauriform, wild look with the grim signs of his face, betrayed that he had been wandering as homeless for a long time. We suspect therefore that he has been totally insane for seven years, and since then had a limited existence like a crazy animal."[512] In addition to comparing Kabenga to a wild animal upon arriving at Lutindi, Bokermann also makes a point of noting that Kabenga survived in the surrounding forests by living off of wild fruit and stealing from local villagers.

By highlighting his unkempt physical appearance and his reliance on theft for survival, Bokermann paints Kabenga as a deviant individual who also posed a threat to the security of those around him. Unlike later patients at Lutindi, Kabenga never fully redeems himself in Bokermann's narrative, in part because he remains skeptical of

---

[512] Wilhelm Bokermann, "Ein 'EBEN-EZER' der Irrenstalt in Lutindi in West-Usambera (früher Deutsch-Ostafrika," *VEM, MII 2.15 M274*, 4–5.

Lutindi and, by extension, Christianity. "After a few days he returned again, but it remained a fairly long time until he was fully committed to staying at Lutindi. He remained, however, and appeared happy in the organized environment."[513] Bokermann implies that Kabenga only begins to improve himself once he accepts the missionaries and accepts a life of structure and order (elements of Bodelschwingh's philosophy) at Lutindi. While Bokermann's attitude changes slightly following Kabenga's willingness to engage with the missionaries, his skepticism of the mission means that he is never fully accepted.

Shortly after the encounter with Kabenga, Mabruki, a second individual, arrived at the institution. Unlike Kabenga, Bokermann describes Mabruki as having a stronger mental state than Kabenga while also appearing to be physically healthier. "He is not directly deranged, but rather slow." Even more importantly he was "still physically strong and mentally fresh," and had previously traveled with European caravans.[514] Mabruki, however, also lived a deviant life on the margins of society, having made his living "through begging and stealing." He only came to Lutindi after a companion of his grew frustrated with having to care for him because "he either could not or would not work."[515] In many ways Bokermann thought Mabruki was like one of the marginalized migrant workers before entering the worker colony. He believed Mabruki was lazy and that redemption would only come in an environment that emphasized Bodelschwingh's philosophy.

Sure enough, after an extended stay at Lutindi, Mabruki began to show marked signs of improvement in Bokermann's eyes.

[513] Ibid., 5.
[514] Ibid., 6.
[515] Ibid., 6.

> Yes, he was physically weak, but we were of the opinion that he had to earn his room and board, and that he could do this. However, it was very difficult to convince him of this, because he insisted that his spirt forbade him to work and that he suffered a sickness, which could not be expressed through words. Nevertheless, he worked somewhat. However, as the cold, rainy season set in, it was impossible to bring him out of the house…We repeatedly noticed that he was physicially and mentally healthy. He eventually came so far, that he daily went to work voluntarily and even cared for a mentally ill individual who became totally dim-witted through a fit of rage. He brought him his food, washed his feet, and cared for him in a way that was genuine and thoughtful.[516]

Once immersed in Lutindi's highly structured environment, Mabruki improved to the point where he took the initiative both to work and assist other residents. With the change in behavior, Bokermann's tone also changes dramatically when describing Mabruki. Rather than a lazy beggar who refused to work and stole from others, Mabruki came to personify the Bethel philosophy by voluntarily caring for another patient at the institution.

A similar theme also emerges when one examines the language Bodelschwingh used when referencing Africans. For those Africans who remained beyond the reach of the mission, or who did not embrace his philosophy, Bodelschwingh consistently used terms like "native," "heathen," or "the poor blacks."[517] Such terms did not imply that Africans were biologicaly inferior but that any difference was rooted in their failure to convert to Christianity. Once an individual converted and demonstrated a willingness to embrace his philosophy, the language Bodelschwingh used also changed dramatically. For example, during his propaganda campaign in support of *Brot für Steine*, Bodelschwingh avoided negative words and phrases as he urged Germans to support the mission financially. In this context they became Germany's "starving, black imperial

---

[516] Ibid., 6–7.

[517] These terms appear consistently throughout Bodelschwingh's writings on the mission to refer to non-Christian Africans.

comrades [*Reichsgenossen*]."[518] In his eyes, work and Christianity not only helped integrate Africans into colonial society, but also provided them with a degree of acceptance as members of the Empire. As fellow, Christian subjects of the empire, Germans had an obligation to support the less fortunate in East Africa.

In fact, Bodelschwingh and his son increasingly adopted language that closely paralleled and mirrored the language they used when describing the men who populated his worker colonies. In a letter to the *Evangelischer Afrika Verein* in 1913, Fritz von Bodelschwingh expressed concern, "that from the perspective of the government one has sent to them a flock of homeless and physically worn down brothers of the highway [*Brüder von der Landstrasse*]."[519] In Bethel, mission leaders seriously discussed the possibility of creating a worker colony in East Africa modeled after Wilhelmsdorf. While World War I ultimately derailed these plans, Bodelschwingh was prepared to expand greatly the mission to care for the "black brothers of the highway."[520] In his mind, the Africans at Lutindi were much the same as the migrant workers in the colonies; individuals who were alienated from society because of a lack of religion. However, once they embraced Christianity and the Bethel philosophy, Bodelschwingh and the missionaries in Africa more or less accepted their clients as fellow subjects of the empire.

***

When Bodelschwingh assumed control of the *EMDOA* in 1890, he re-organized it to become a direct extension of Bethel in Africa. To this end, Bodelschwingh trained the missionaries in the same manner as the social workers who served in the worker colonies. They were instructed in Bodelschwingh's philosophy of social welfare with the intention

---

518 Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, "Dankbrief II," March, 1899, HAB 1/E 138
519 Bodelschwingh an Steinhausen, 18.11.1913, HAB 2/52–4.
520 Bodelschwingh an Olpp, 29.12.1913, HAB 2/52–4.

of applying it to their communities in Africa. Using ideas like *Arbeitserziehung*, the importance of family structures, Christian faith and national pride, the Bethel missionaries sought to reform the inner character of the Africans at their stations in order to bring them in from the margins of the colonial state and integrate them more thoroughly into the empire.

To this end, the EMDOA under Bodelschwingh became a nearly exact replica of the Bethel community in Bielefeld. Through initiatives like *Brot für Steine*, the Bethel missionaries forced their clients to work for the aid they received at the station. At the Lutindi station, Wilhelm Bokermann created a mental health care center that operated in a manner that strongly resembled the worker colonies back in Germany. Through constant activity and hard, physical labor, the Bethel missionaries sought to transform their clients into good Protestants and productive colonial subjects.

Given the degree to which Bodelschwingh emphasized *Arbeitserziehung,* it was only natural that the German East Africa Company looked upon the EMDOA with great interest. By the time Bodelschwingh arrived, it had already tried, and failed, to use compulsory measures like wages, taxation and slavery to force Africans to work on colonial plantations. In 1885 Alexander Merensky, a fellow missionary, proposed reforming the inner character of Africans as a way to motivate them to work voluntarily on colonial projects. Although the idea appeared promising, by 1890 the colonial authorities still had not figured out how practically to realize it. Therefore, they eagerly anticipated Bodelschwingh's entry into mission work because his social welfare philosophy appeared to be the missing piece to the labor question.

Even though the Bethel missionaries insisted on trying to maintain a degree of autonomy in East Africa, they were also proud nationalists who wanted the colonial state to succeed. Therefore, they did not hesitate to collaborate with the colonial authorities when the interests of the two aligned. By sending their clients to work on the cotton plantations, the missionaries could simultaneously help the colony while reinforcing the Bodelschwingh philosophy. Despite their close relationship, however, the extent to which they helped to reduce the labor shortage was minimal at best. The notorious reputation planters had earned for their excessive use of violence and the poor working conditions on the plantations was too difficult to shed. Not even Bodelschwingh's philosophy could motivate Africans to take that work.

Given the missionaries' willingness to send their clients to the plantations, their occasional use of violence at the stations, and the chauvinistic language they frequently used when describing their clients, it is only natural that one raise the spectre of racism. Such evidence suggests that despite their insistence that the EMDOA was a perfect mirror of the community in Germany, there were some notable differences between the two branches of the Bethel mission. Yet, it would also be wrong to characterize the Bethel missionaries as biological racists. The language they used to describe their clients demonstrates that any sense of inferiority was based primarily on the failure of an individual to convert to Christianity and embrace Bodelschwingh's philosophy. Once an individual made that commitment, the language of the missionaries changed dramatically to resemble the language they used to describe marginalized workers within the worker colonies.

Yet as the Bethel missionaries worked diligently to implement Bodelschwingh's philosophy in East Africa, social welfare practices back in Bethel began to undergo a significant shift. In an attempt to help Bethel attract professional physicians and remain a leading center for social welfare, Bethel's leadership began to incorporate scientific ideas like eugenics into their social work. By the time the Bethel missionaries returned to Bielefeld in 1918, they were shocked to discover the extent to which the community's leaders had embraced scientific ideas. In an attempt to push back against the inroads made by the physicians, the missionaries devoted themselves to reasserting the primacy of Bodelschwingh's philosophy.

Before examining the missionaries' activities after 1918, one must first understand how and why Bethel's leadership began to explore social welfare methods other than Bodelschwingh's philosophy. The next chapter, therefore, will discuss the Bethel institutions during the early twentieth century and the conditions that led its leadership to adopt eugenic ideas as an aspect of the care provided at Bethel.

Chapter 5: Bodelschwingh's Philosophy Challenged: Eugenics at Bethel

By the turn of the century, Friedrich von Bodelschwingh had used his philosophy to establish Bethel as the leading center for Protestant social welfare in Germany. In addition to caring for people with mental disabilities, Bethel also became the headquarters for his worker colony initiative as well as the training center for a mission to East Africa. For each of these initiatives, *Arbeitserziehung* was the core component of a philosophy designed to transform disaffected individuals into productive members of society and loyal supporters of the state. Eager to adapt Bodelschwingh's philosophy in their communities, social reformers from across Europe actively inquired about the possibility of using the worker colony outside Germany.

Yet, as the so-called Bielefeld System grew, it also evolved away from the ideas that made it famous. When he first opened Wilhelmsdorf in 1882, Bodelschwingh insisted that the colony existed to assist disaffected migrant workers who wanted to settle down and re-enter society. To this end, he was adamant that individuals who had no prospect of reintegration did not belong in the worker colony. Not only would they distract the other clients from concentrating on inner-reform, but they would also consume valuable resources. Yet as the network grew, local authorities began to use the colonies as dumping grounds for unwanted categories of people like criminals and people with mental disabilities. As the colonies became repositories for people considered no longer useful to society, the worker colony network also shifted away from Bodelschwingh's original vision.

At the same time, the turn of the century also brought significant changes to the Bethel institutions in Bielefeld. Under Bodelschwingh's leadership, Bethel grew to become one of Germany's largest and most influential centers for social welfare. In order to maintain this position, however, Bethel's leaders began to incorporate modern scientific ideas like eugenics and psychiatry into their provision of social welfare. Although these ideas diluted the influence of Bodelschwingh's philosophy, they were necessary to attract professionally trained physicians to the community. Therefore, Bodelschwingh reluctantly embraced them in an effort to continue expanding Bethel.

Bodelschwingh was aging, however, and by 1905 he had largely withdrawn from the day-to-day management of Bethel. Instead, he ceded control over the community to his son Friedrich (Fritz) von Bodelschwingh. Eager to distinguish his tenure as Bethel's leader from that of his fathers, Fritz further embraced the professionalization of social welfare. Modern science was one of the few fields the elder von Bodelschiwngh left relatively unexplored. At the same time, the younger Bodelschwingh was further encouraged to embrace eugenics as a result of Germany's horrific experience in World War I. The devastating shortage of resources coupled with the extensive loss of human life made eugenics an even more attractive option for Bethel's leaders. Through measures like sterilization, they believed they could direct their limited resources to help those individuals who were most able to contribute to society. Over time, eugenics promised to eliminate the presence of individuals, like those in the worker colonies, who would never be able to return to society. Thus by the 1920s poverty and deviance became biological questions rather than social.

The following chapter traces this development from the early 1900s through the Nazi ascension to power in 1933. It argues that as the Bethel missionaries in Africa continued to devote themselves to the traditional Bethel philosophy, dramatic changes occurred at the institution in Germany that caused Bethel's leaders to move away from the ideals that defined the community. Therefore, this chapter will demonstrate that the impetus to embrace scientific ideas clearly originated within the Bethel community in Bielefeld.

***

By the early twentieth century, Bodelschwingh's worker colony network barely resembled his original vision for Wilhelmsdorf in 1882. As Larry Frohman notes, the colonies "were originally intended to serve able-bodied workers who had lost their jobs through no fault of their own."[521] To this end, the goal was to rehabilitate marginalized workers so that they could become productive members of society. By 1900, however, the worker colonies were populated with people who had little prospect of ever returning to society and living independently. Ironically, Bodelschwingh was partially to blame for the change, as his rhetoric focused increasingly on combatting vagrancy rather than helping disaffected migrant workers to get back on their feet.[522] Taking their clues from him, local authorities began dumping individuals whom they believed to be irredeemable in the worker colonies. As a result, the worker colonies quickly became populated with

---

[521] Larry Frohman, 166.

[522] Ewald Frie, *Wohlfahrtsstaat und Provinz: Fürsorgepolitik des Provinzialverbandes Westfalen und des Landes Sachsen, 1880–1930* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1993), 43.

people who would never have a chance to leave; a process that became even worse following the economic recessions of the early 1900s.[523]

Bodelschwingh noted this change in his 1903-1904 yearly report for Wilhelmsdorf. Although the economy improved, the colony's administration never witnessed a corresponding drop in the number of people seeking refuge at Wilhelmsdorf. Even though the number of clients at Wilhelmsdorf and its affiliated colony Wietingsmoor decreased in 1904 from 1725 to 1716, the number of "care days," the total number of days that visitors remained at the colony, increased from 134,978 to 154, 665.[524] The reason for this discrepancy, Bodelschwingh explained to the colony's supporters, had to do with the types of people who populated the colony.

> The quality of these workers, however, has simultaneously become lower with the deeper levels of the labor market in previous years. Of course now the only class of unemployed who come to the gates of the colony are those who are weakened by age, alcohol and other ailments, rejected everywhere by the Workshops.
> So we have taken on at our province in recent years a greater number of your physically weakest and mentally receding migrant poor who needed more care and contributed less than the workers for the previous year.[525]

The colony's leadership no longer accepted exclusively individuals whom they could rehabilitate. Rather, as Bodelschwingh explained, Wilhelmsdorf accepted individuals who not only were incapable of rejoining the work force, but who likely would never be

---

[523] Helmut Türpitz and Hans-Walter Schmuhl, "Von der Arbeiterkolonie Wilhelmsdorf in der Senne zur Zweiganstalt Eckardtsheim (1882 bis 1914), " in *Bethel-Eckardtsheim: Von der Gründung der ersten deutschen Arbeiterkolonie bis zur Auflösung als Teilanstalt (1882–2001)*, ed. Matthias Benad and Hans-Walter Schmuhl, 428-437 (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2006), 429–30; see also Hans-Walter Schmuhl, *Arbeitsmarktpolitik und Arbeitsverwaltung in Deutschland 1871–2002: Zwischen Fürsorge, Hoheit und Markt* (Nuremberg: Bundesanstalt für Arbeit, 2003), 1–61; David Blackbourn, *The Long Nineteenth Century: A History of Germany, 1780–1918* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 351–70.
[524] Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, "Wilhelmsdorf im Jahre 1903/04," (Bethel bei Bielefeld, 10 September 1904) in *Archiv des Diakonischen Werkes, Central-Ausschuß Bibliothek* (hereafter ADW, CA Bibliothek), 1.
[525] Ibid., 2.

able to live independently. This problem only grew worse as the Bielefeld System expanded across Germany.[526] Bodelschwingh's assistant Karl Mörchen noted that as the system grew, it provided assistance for an increasing number of "not so work capable" individuals. Most of these individuals were either seasonal workers who were unemployed for extended periods of time, or "old and run-down, inferior individuals, who at the time neither here (in Bielefeld) nor elsewhere received work because younger and more capable forces were available."[527] Since they were unable to work, these individuals frequently performed simple tasks such as street cleaning, wood chopping, transporting various materials, and other forms of outdoor, agricultural work.[528] While these tasks kept one active, they were also not as intensive as the work required of more capable clients. Thus, since this labor would not lead to reintegration, it did not contribute to Bodelschwingh's larger pedagogical goals.

Even more significant, however, was the impact of this shift on the financial state of the worker colonies. A key aspect of Bodelschwingh's argument in favor of expanding the Bielefeld System was that it was financially self-sufficient. In this sense, once a community established a worker colony, it would not have to provide any subsequent funding. Clients earned the costs of their room and board through the labor they provided within the colony. Left-leaning workers associations even charged that the colonies focused so intently on self-sufficiency and profitability that they frequently lost track of their larger pedagogical purpose. In his yearly report for 1903-1904,

---

[526] Karl Heinrich Pohl, *Zwischen protestantischer Ethik, Unternehmerinteresse und organisierter Arbeiterbewegung: Zur Geschichte der Arbeitsvermittlung in Bielefeld von 1887 bis 1914, Bielefelder Beiträge zur Stadt- und Regionalgeschichte,* vol. 8, ed. Stadtarchiv und Landesgeschichtliche Bibliothek Bielefeld (Bielefeld: Stadtarchiv und Landesgeschichtliche Bibliothek, 1991), 135.
[527] Karl Mörchen, "Vorbericht für die vierte Verbandsversammlung und Arbeitsnachweiskonferenz, 9.-11.11.1905 in Wiesbaden, Berlin" (Berlin: 1905), 46.
[528] Pohl, *Zwischen protestantischer Ethik*, 136.

Bodelschwingh acknowledged that the different clientele had a negative impact on the colony's bottom line. Despite the decrease in the number of colonists, the colony nevertheless added an additional 144,820 Mk. in debt for the previous year.[529] Bodelschwingh thus found himself under increasing pressure to lower the colony's operating costs in order to maintain the support of his political allies. As Karl Heinrich Pohl notes, for the individuals who fell into this category "the Bielefeld regulations were particularly rigid: accommodation and food were provided only with an intensive job search and, in a negative case, only with the elimination of the claim through an accepted effort."[530] The pressure on potential clients to demonstrate they had made every possible attempt to find outside work increased dramatically.

Ultimately, this pedagogical shift is important because it marks the point where Protestant social reformers first began to question seriously the wisdom of investing resources in a population that would almost certainly never be able to rejoin society and live independently of the worker colony. Even though Bodelschwingh believed the colonies still served an important function through the fight against vagrancy, he also knew that they were heavily dependent on financial subsidies. Always concerned about the public image of his initiatives, he knew that politicians would be unenthusiastic about investing in a system that would become a bottomless pit for financial subsidies. Therefore, given the changing nature of the colony, Bodelschwingh and his colleagues needed to focus much more on eliminating as much unnecessary spending as possible in order to maintain popular support. In this context, the administrators of the worker colonies began questioning the logic of investing resources on the care of individuals

---

[529] Bodelschwingh, "Wilhelmsdorf im Jahre 1903/04," *ADW CA Bibliothek*, 1.
[530] Pohl, *Zwischen protestantischer Ethik*, 136.

who would never reenter society. These concerns only grew greater in the coming years as resources became scarcer.

***.

As Bodelschwingh and his supporters oversaw a shift in the larger mission of the worker colonies, a second and equally important transition occurred at the Bethel community in Bielefeld. This process began with the gradual institutionalization of Bethel during the late nineteenth century. From its founding in 1867 through the early 1890's, Bethel understood itself primarily as a community rather than an institution.[531] Bodelschwingh regularly emphasized this distinction when describing everyday life at Bethel. "In general it is not treated as a hospital life, but rather a community life that must be designed naturally, spontaneously and harmonically not in the church and school, but in every social and communal initiative."[532] To this end, Bodelschwingh and his colleagues focused their efforts on therapeutic treatments that were designed to mitigate the effects of illness while enabling residents to live as normal a life as possible.

Yet, despite Bodelschwingh's best efforts to maintain his image of Bethel as a community and refuge for marginalized individuals, it gradually adopted many of the characteristics and practices of an institution by the late nineteenth century. On some levels, fostering an institutional environment was conducive to implementing Bodelschwingh's larger philosophy. In a speech at the *Armenpfleger-Kongress* in 1883, he noted that caring for people with mental disabilities was fundamentally very similar to

---

[531] Hans-Walter Schmuhl, *Ärzte in der Anstalt Bethel: 1870–1945*, ed. Matthias Benad, Forschungsstelle für Diakonie- und Sozialgeschichte an der Kirchlichen Hochschule Bethel (Bielefeld: Bethel Verlag, 1998), 7.

[532] Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, "Über die öffentliche Fürsorge für Epileptische: Vortrag auf dem Armenpfleger-Kongress, 1883," in *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh: Ausgewählte Schriften, Band II: Veröffentlichungen aus den Jahren 1872 bis 1910*, ed. Alfred Adam, 42–66 (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1964), 61.

helping unemployed migrant workers. By housing people in an institution, one could create a situation that emphasized aspects of the philosophy like the importance of a community. "As soon as the first signs of an episode show themselves, the little classmates jump with determined courage in order to protect their fallen comrade from harm, which is also why the number of injuries with these episodes is so exceptionally rare."[533] Using this anecdote, Bodelschwingh maintained that the institutional atmosphere helped foster a sense of "belonging" and "home" that allowed him to implement aspects of his philosophy in a way that was not possible in greater society.[534]

The same principle also applied to individuals who were unable to live independently, but did not require the constant supervision of an institution. Bodelschwingh favored the creation of supervised households within the larger Bethel community in which social workers could stress aspects of the Bethel philosophy.

> From the outset, the idea was envisaged to form small families 9-10 patients each provided with a communal living room and a dormitory, in which the concerned nurses spend all day and night with the sick and share every piece of joy and life with them, and even when possible take the place of their mother and father.[535]

In this case the communal houses drew on the worker colony model to replicate patriarchal family structures. Trained social workers played the role of the worker colony's "house fathers" to create a family-like atmosphere within the house. Even though the communal structures in these homes would never help to re-integrate the residents into larger society, Bodelschwingh insisted that they would be able to mitigate the effects of the disability.

---

[533] Bodelschwingh, "Über die öffentliche Fürsorge für Epileptische: Vortrag auf dem Armenpfleger-Kongress, 1883," 44.
[534] Ibid., 44.
[535] Ibid., 47.

In addition to family structure, the institutional setting also provided Bodelschwingh with an ideal opportunity to emphasize *Arbeitserziehung*. Within the institution he could concentrate individuals in a single location where daily life could be easily organized around work. "This valuable lost asset, work, is only possible to be recreated in an organized way for severely sick cases in an institutionalized life. If the necessary supervision and guidance is offered, even the weakest will be busy in a variety of ways."[536] Ultimately, Bodelschwingh sought to utilize the institution as a way to adapt his larger philosophy to treat people with mental disabilities. In many respects, the institution replicated the atmosphere within the worker colony with the implicit understanding that institutionalized individuals would likely never reenter society. .

Of course, Bodelschwingh's approach to institutionalization also translated easily into a promotional campaign that stressed the theoretical self-sufficiency of his approach as well as the close connection between the Bethel institutions and the affiliated worker colonies. Numerous pamphlets proudly noted how clients of the worker colonies performed tasks that the individuals with disabilities were unable to do. In this respect the worker colonies served as a constant pool of reliable labor for the larger community. "The healthy members of Wilhelmsdorf give the workshops a solid foundation."[537] Thus, by helping to support the residents of the institution, Bodelschwingh could demonstrate how the clients of the colonies had both integrated themselves and contributed productively to the community.

Despite his initial concerns, therefore, that the process of institutionalization would undermine the community-like atmosphere he wanted to construct at Bethel,

[536] Ibid., 45.
[537] Ibid., 65.

Bodelschwingh clearly saw it as something that would only help him pursue his larger agenda. For him, treating people with mental disabilities incorporated the same elements as his philosophy for assisting marginalized workers. At their core, he insisted that mental illness and chronic poverty were two sides of the same coin. Both the mentally disabled and unemployed migrant workers lived in an environment that prevented them from finding steady work, which in turn led to a strong feeling of alienation from the rest of society. "The close relationship between both types of colonists is clear. The main emergency facing both can be summed up in the words: homeless, unemployed."[538] To this end, it made sense to couple worker colonies with mental-health institutions. By operating according to the same philosophy, when taken together the institution and worker colony gave both groups of people an opportunity to work and find acceptance within a larger community. "The epileptics have silently taken the poor pilgrims of Wilhelmsdorf in their flock for years, and the latter have thanked them for that love, in that they have taken over all the work that is too difficult and dangerous for the epileptics."[539] For the clients of the worker colony, they could contribute productively to Bethel within a semi-secluded environment as they prepared to work and live independently of Bethel. Meanwhile, using the same principles, residents of the institution could work and live within a community that was accepting of people with disabilities.

Since the two adopted the same pedagogical principles, Bodelschwingh advocated, whenever possible, to couple worker colonies with communities for people with mental disabilities. Not only would social reformers be able to implement the same

---

[538] Ibid., 65.
[539] Ibid., 65.

philosophy and methodology in both initiatives, but both groups of residents would also be able to help each other. In addition to creating a sense of larger community, Bodelschwingh also believed that coupling the two initiatives would position them to be self-sufficient. Not only was self-sufficiency a valuable promotional tool, but it was also something that distinguished Bodelschwingh's approach from other Protestant initiatives. Therefore, the close association between the institution and worker colony played a very important role in generating important publicity and support for Bodelschwingh's efforts at poor relief.

***

As Bethel expanded, the pressure on its leadership grew to recruit more professionally trained physicians to work in its institutions. On one level the professionalization of care appeared to integrate seamlessly with the larger Bethel philosophy. Mainly, both processes ultimately sought to rehabilitate and reintegrate marginalized individuals. Yet, this process was not without tension at Bethel, as Bodelschwingh remained skeptical of the physicians as outsiders and questioned their devotion to his philosophy. Only reluctantly did he invite professionally trained doctors to Bethel.

As a social welfare center that specialized in the care of people with epilepsy and mental illnesses, Bodelschwingh faced particularly strong pressure to recruit doctors who had professional backgrounds in modern psychiatry. Even before the advent of psychiatry, care for people with mental disabilities had always paralleled the assistance offered to the poor and unemployed.[540] Religious groups were the primary care

---

[540] See also Dirk Blasius, *Der verwaltete Wahnsinn: eine Sozialgeschichte des Irrenhauses* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1980).

providers, which largely consisted of seclusion and separation from the surrounding communities.[541] In the seventeenth century, social reformers believed the workhouse was just as suitable for people with mental illnesses as it was for the poor and unemployed. "The former penitentiaries were also orphanages and poor houses; they harbored the problem population of early modern society beggars, vagrants and other evil rabble."[542] In both cases, they believed that *Arbeitserziehung* was the key to dealing with the undesired traits displayed by the afflicted individual. However, unlike the way nineteenth-century reformers like Bodelschwingh used work as a therapy to reintegrate marginalized individuals, the workhouse was characterized by its use of work as a tool of repression. Seventeenth-century reformers were convinced that both the poor and people with mental disabilities posed significant security threats to society. Therefore, the purpose of the institution was to protect the greater public from these supposedly deviant groups. It was not until later that reformers realized that the public, in fact, posed the much greater threat and that these groups needed to be protected.[543]

Only in the early nineteenth century did social reformers begin to create institutions that provided more humane treatment, and that focused on eventual reintegration as opposed to segregation. Using his position as the Director of the Prussian Health Services, Johann Gottfried Langerman founded an experimental "mental institution" in Bayreuth called *Siegburg*. The institution combined the innovative practice of institutionalization, which formed the foundation of modern psychiatric care,

---

[541] Dirk Blasius, *"Einfache Seelenstörung" Geschichte der deutschen Psychiatrie, 1800–1945* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1994), 16.
[542] Ulrich Trenckmann, "Die institutionell-administrative Entwicklung der Unterbringung und Behandlung Geisteskranker in Sachsen von Absolutismus bis zur bürgerlichen Revolution," *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Hygiene und ihre Grenzgebiete* 25 (1979): 536–9
[543] Blasius, "*Einfache Seelenstörung*," 17.

with the more established use of work therapy.[544] Eventually, reformers also began to experiment with the idea of reintegration by differentiating between individuals who could be cured of their affliction and those who would require regular care for the duration of their lives.[545]

During the 1860's two universities (Berlin and Göttingen), encouraged further changes to the nature of mental health care when they added chairs in psychiatry, helping to make it an accepted field of medicine. By the end of the century, sixteen universities had added chairs in psychiatry with an additional thirty-nine employing adjunct instructors in psychiatry.[546] As a result, mental asylums began to recruit professionally trained physicians to work with their populations.[547] Directors hired professionally educated psychiatrists, who in turn taught the institution's staff how to provide proper care for patients.[548] Eventually, this transition had a significant impact on religiously affiliated institutions like Bethel, as it forced them to follow the lead of the secular, state-run institutions and hire a professional medical staff. Even though Bodelschwingh reluctantly acknowledged the importance of professionalized medical care, he continued to insist that it was of secondary importance to spiritual and therapeutic treatments. As a result, by the end of the nineteenth century, the directors of church-run institutions came into increasing conflict with their staff of professional physicians. Not only did the physicians want the final word on decisions relating to patient care, but they also insisted on having greater influence and status within the institution's administration.

[544] Ibid., 22–31.
[545] Ibid., 44.
[546] Ibid., 47.
[547] Before the professionalization of care, physicians arrived at an institution with no formal, professional training in psychiatry. They gained experience working with individuals with disabilities through on the job training.
[548] Ibid., 57.

***

Despite Bodelschwingh's best efforts to control the pace and nature of change at Bethel, he could not resist the dramatic changes that social welfare provision experienced during the late nineteenth century. Not only did these changes influence the pedagogical mission of the community, but they altered the physical structure of Bethel as well. As Bethel expanded, it moved away from the smaller, community oriented environment that Bodelschwingh claimed was a vital characteristic of the greater Bethel ethos. By the early 1900s Bethel was a collection of institutions that tried to cure patients through modern medicine as opposed to relieving the symptoms of their affliction through social therapeutic measures.[549]

While many factors combined to influence this transition, an 1893 Prussian law that reorganized and expanded poverty relief undoubtedly had the greatest impact on Bethel. Specifically, the law required the provinces to provide care for poor individuals who also had mental disabilities or epilepsy. As a result, they struck agreements with local, private social welfare centers, including Bethel, to comply with the law.[550] On one level, the law was a boon for Bodelschwingh because it ensured a steady stream of new patients in need of care. By 1907 the number of patients at Bethel had increased by 150 per cent over twenty years from one thousand to twenty five hundred individuals, the vast majority of whom arrived.as a result of the 1893 law.[551] At the same time, between 1890 and 1939, the number of professional physicians at Bethel increased from four to

---

[549] Schmuhl, *Ärzte in der Anstalt Bethel*, 7–8.
[550] Blasius, "Einfache Seelenstörung," 65–7; Uwe Kaminsky, *Zwangssterlisation und Euthanasie im Rheinland: evangelische Erziehungsanstalten, sowie Heil- und Pflegeanstalten, 1933–1945* (Köln: Rheinland Verlag, 1995), 39–40.
[551] Gerhard Schorsch, "Der ärztliche Arbeitsbereich der Anstalt Bethel," Vortrag vor dem Arbeitskreis leitender Mitarbeiter im Frühjahr 1947, 7, *HAB B I 12, 9.*

nineteen.[552] As part of its terms for making contracts with religious-affiliated centers like Bethel, the state insisted on exercising increased oversight and regulation of the care they provided. Specifically, the state wanted to ensure that these institutes hired university educated physicians and psychiatrists. While the state permitted religious institutions like Bethel to pursue a religiously motivated agenda, it insisted that they also embrace minimal professional standards, like a professional staff.

Therefore, by increasing the number of professional physicians at Bethel, the 1893 law had the effect of creating an atmosphere that was ripe for conflict over the direction of the institute's mission. It did not take long for the doctors to accuse Bodelschwingh and his colleagues of disrespect, which they argued was reflected in both their salaries and their status within the institute. In order to try and gain the upper hand in the dispute, a number of physicians did not hesitate to use the state's role as regulator in order to pressure Bethel's leadership into giving in to their demands.[553] For example, in a framework describing the relationship between the institution and its doctors, the regional government in Minden stated that the physicians were obligated to visit regularly the patients under their charge. "These physicians, who are trusted physicians of the Provincial Association as well as of the institution, shall be obliged to visit sick patients at least once daily (repeatedly when needed)… and to watch over the execution of treatment for them."[554] On its face the regulation seemed rather innocuous, but the physicians used it as a way to expand their influence and authority within Bethel.

---

[552] Ibid., 8.
[553] "Bestimmungen für die bei den Privatanstalten anzustellenden Ärzte, bezüglich der diesen Anstalten seitens des Landeshauptmanns der Provinz Westfalen überwiesenen Kranken," *HAB 1/C 1,* 2–3; "Verfügung der Königlichen Regierung zu Minden vom 29 August 1896," *HAB 1/C 1*, 14–16.
[554] "Bestimmungen für die bei den Privatanstalten anzustellenden Ärzte, bezüglich der diesen Anstalten seitens des Landeshauptmanns der Provinz Westfalen überwiesenen Kranken," *HAB 1/C 1,* 2–3.

> He has to control the boarding, and in particular patient cases arrange for a special diet. He has to control clothes, storage, cleaning of the sick, and he has a say as to which patients can be used for work... and finally to organize and execute other measures related to the care of the sick.[555]

By insisting that they be allowed to make their daily rounds, the physicians were able to control numerous specific aspects of an individual's care at Bethel. In 1896, the district authority in Minden went even further and exercised "massive pressure" on Bethel to provide doctors with pensions that matched those provided by provincial institutions in order "to win capable doctors."[556] Thus, by asserting its right to regulate the care that Bethel provided, the state also exercised considerable influence on reshaping the institute's internal dynamic and greater mission. It effectively undercut Bodelschwingh and his philosophy in favor of the modern, scientific methods favored by the physicians.

Of course Bodelschwingh did not acquiesce without a fight, and insisted on trying to reassert the supremacy of his philosophy over that of the physicians. At its base, he maintained that mental illness resulted from acts of sin. As a result, any medical care prescribed by the physicians needed to take a back seat to the spiritual care provided by the social workers.

> A Christian knows that all disease is a result of sin, and therefore he then bows in dear repentance and prays: "Lord, teach me genuinely to recognize my sin and for it forgive me for the sake of Your name... I want to recognize you as the doctor of my body and praise you forever."[557]

---

[555] Ibid.

[556] Schmuhl, *Ärzte in der Anstalt Bethel*, 13; Regierungs-Präsident Minden to Bodelschwingh, 26 November 1896, *HAB 1/C 1,* 33–36.

[557] Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, "Christlicher Ratgeber für Epileptische," in *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh: Ausgewählte Schriften, Band II: Veröffentlichungen aus den Jahren 1872 bis 1910*, ed. Alfred Adam, 67–82 (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1964), 74–75.

In this context spiritual care had to take a leading role because it promised to combat the affliction at its root. Medical treatment would only be effective if one sought it in conjunction with spiritual care.[558] "However, the salvation of the body is dependent on the salvation of the soul, and therefore the latter is by far and away of primary concern."[559] In the same vein, Bodelschwingh also insisted that spiritual care was simply more effective than the methods of the professional physicians. "As often as the doctors try to use other treatments, or temporarily suspend this drug for a majority of patients, an exceptional case immediately appears and the house fathers and mothers ask again to return to the old treatments."[560] Since the social workers spent more time around the patients than the physicians, they were able to compensate effectively for their lack of professional training. Indeed, when the physicians needed to know a patient's history, they frequently looked to them for details. For these reasons, Bodelschwingh insisted that the *Diakonen,* and by extension his philosophy, were indispensable components of care at Bethel.[561]

Although Bodelschwingh complied with the stipulations that required him to hire professional physicians, he did little to hide his disdain for them and his belief that they were woefully unprepared to perform the work required of them at Bethel.

> The directors and physicians of asylums must be clear about it, that they cannot properly care for their patients if they do not let their staff provide a very attentive care not only in a biological but also in a spiritual sense... The doctors alone, from their scientific perspective, cannot provide the necessary training for their nursing staff… It is therefore necessary that the pastors at the institution also provide the spiritual armaments to the nursing staff in addition to the practical and popular scientific ideas from

---

[558] Ibid., 75.
[559] Ibid., 80.
[560] Ibid., 78.
[561] Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, *Die Mitarbeit der Kirche an der pflege der Geisteskranken* (Bielefeld: Schriftenniederlage der Anstalt Bethel, 1896), 30.

> the doctors. The physician must therefore view the pastors as indispensable colleagues from whom they can learn and vice versa.[562]

On one level, therefore, the physicians needed to collaborate closely with the social workers in order to ensure that the patients at Bethel received an appropriate level of spiritual care. At the same time, however, by requiring such a relationship Bodelschwingh could exercise an additional degree of control over the doctors. It would be considerably more difficult for a physician to prescribe a course of treatment not in line with Bodelschwingh's philosophy if he were constantly accompanied by a social worker trained by Bodelschwingh.

Naturally, Bodelschwingh's insistence on maintaining a tight grip on the day-to-day activity at Bethel led to numerous conflicts with the medical staff. While most of these conflicts centered on issues such as wages, pensions, and housing arrangements, many concerned the larger philosophical orientation of the institution. Specifically, the physicians were well aware of Bodelschwingh's attitude toward modern medicine. In 1896 this growing conflict came to a head when Paul Steffan, the chief physician at the psychiatric house Gideon, demanded that Bodelschwingh terminate the hospital's head nurse because she "had refused to turn over a corpse for autopsy without the permission of the next-of-kin."[563] In Steffan's eyes, this was a clear case of insubordination and was symbolic of the larger tension between the physicians and the social workers.

Unsurprisingly, Bodelschwingh supported the accused nurse, noting that she was a "friendly advocate for the sick" and did not owe the physicians any "slavish

---

[562] Ibid., 30–2.
[563] Hans-Walter Schmuhl, *Ärzte in der Westfälischen Diakonissenanstalt Sarepta: 1890–1970*, ed. Matthias Benad, Forschungsstelle für Diakonie- und Sozialgeschichte an der Kirchlichen Hochschule Bethel (Bielefeld: Bethel Verlag, 2001), 10.

obedience." Furthermore he used the conflict as an opportunity to chide Steffan for his behavior and strongly insinuated that the doctor would be better off if he simply left Bethel.[564] Indeed, Steffan's personnel file in the Bethel archive depicts the physician as a pig-headed, stubborn man who went out of his way to pick fights with his colleagues.[565] In this case, the embattled Steffan had stirred up so much outrage that he had to fend off charges that he was trying "to provoke a war between the doctors and the institute."[566] Although Steffan ultimately remained at Bethel, the conflict caused him to open his own private practice and maintain a loose affiliation with the institute.[567] Bodelschwingh had successfully demonstrated in this instance that he would not hesitate to fight with the medical staff if it meant that he would be able to assert the supremacy of his philosophy over the methodology of the physicians.

While Bodelschwingh may have asserted himself in the conflict with Steffan, it was far from a decisive victory. The 1890's and early 1900's were characterized by nearly constant tension at Bethel as the physicians did not hesitate to challenge Bodelschwingh for greater control within the institute.[568] The conflict became especially heated following a lecture Bodelschwingh gave at an 1893 conference on psychiatry and mental illness in which Bodelschwingh defended his philosophy. The Association of German Psychiatrists responded with a blistering attack on Bodelschwingh in which they lambasted him as an anti-science religious fanatic. His theories stood "at odds with experience through science and indisputable facts, and stood in sharp contrast to the

---

[564] Bodelschwingh to Steffan, 13 October 1896, *HAB 1/C 9*.
[565] "Auszug aus dem Protokoll der Sitzung des Arbeitsausschusses," 23 June 1908, *HAB 1/C9*.
[566] Steffan to Bodelschwingh, 16 October 1896, *HAB 1/C9*.
[567] Schmuhl, *Ärzte in der Westfälischen Diakonissenanstalt Sarepta*, 10.
[568] See Adolf Dannemann, *Geisteskrankheit und Irrenseelsorge. Ein Wort der Aufklärung und Warnung* (Bremen: Carl Schünemann,1895); Bodelschwingh, *Die Mitarbeit der Kirche an der Pflege der Geisteskranken*.

administration of justice, legislation and public opinion of all civilized countries of the world."[569] Rather than help people who suffered from mental disabilities, the physicians insisted that Bodelschwingh's attitude was symbolic of a philosophy that had not evolved since the seventeenth century. Furthermore, they insisted that, rather than open communities, the institutes run by religious authorities resembled "prisons, led to the punishment of the mentally ill, to exorcism, and finally to the witch trials of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries."[570] If anything, it was nothing short of embarrassing and depressing that "at the end of the century one still had to contend with people, who insist that a criminal is a fanatic, the ill demonically sick, etc."[571] Based on their experiences at Bethel and other religious institutions the professional psychiatrists believed that the care provided at these types of institutes was nothing short of judgmental and archaic.

If he was given the choice, given the internal conflict and public bickering, Bodelschwingh wanted nothing more than to rid Bethel permanently of the professional physicians. Yet, he knew that he was hamstrung because such an extreme step would make it nearly impossible for him to achieve his larger goal of building Bethel into a major center for social welfare in Germany. Not only would it violate the terms of the contract he signed with the Prussian state, but it also would put Bethel at a severe disadvantage as it competed with secular institutions. Even though he believed they were terribly disruptive within the institute, Bodelschwingh knew he needed the physicians.

Therefore, in order to try to have it both ways, Bodelschwingh ultimately decided to screen, insofar as it was possible, the backgrounds of his physicians before he hired

---

[569] "Jahressitzung des Vereins der deutschen Irrenärzte, Frankfurt a. M., den 25. und 26. Mai 1893," *Chronik der Christlichen Welt* 3, no. 23 (1 June 1893), 203.
[570] Ibid., 203.
[571] Ibid.

them. Specifically, he searched for doctors who were amenable to working within the "Bethel milieu," and who would be willing to treat the social workers as equal colleagues.[572] For example, before hiring an attending physician for Bethel, he contacted the doctor's previous employer to ask specifically about the candidate's religious background.. "We search for above all else… a doctor, who is of our mind and is a good example for our *Diakonen* and *Diakonissen*, and if possible someone who enjoys going to church."[573] In another case, Bodelschwingh tried to get a feel for the candidate's attitude toward the church by asking "about their personal attitude to God and the Savior, whether one can feel a warm love for the savior. So many physicians have applied to us, that we also have a selection of decidedly Christian men."[574] By conducting extensive background inquiries, Bodelschwingh hoped he could achieve a level of professionalization that would satisfy the state while maintaining firm control over Bethel's daily operations. Ideally, he hoped not only to eliminate the increasingly nasty conflicts that were threatening to tear apart Bethel, but to recruit a staff of docile physicians who would not challenge his authority.

One can understand Bodelschwingh's larger goals through the applications and letters of recommendation he received for potential hires within the institute. Candidates made a point of noting their roots within the church, implying that they would not object to working within the parameters of Bodelschwingh's philosophy. For example, a letter of recommendation for Dr. Martin Liebe noted that not only was he familiar with the Bethel culture, but that he also identified himself as a Christian. He "made an impression that was very quiet, in association being very amenable…. His decidedly Christian

---

[572] Schmuhl, *Ärzte in der Anstalt Bethel*, 17.
[573] Bodelschwingh to Anstalt Carlshof, 5 September 1898, *HAB 1 C/1*.
[574] Bodelschwingh to Steil, 19 September 1902, *HAB 1 C/1*.

attitude is also evident here."[575] Liebe's candidacy was not only bolstered by his warm attitude toward Christianity, but also by his reputation of being rather reserved. To Bodelschwingh, this implied that the doctor would not cause trouble for Bodelschwingh at Bethel. In the same vein as Liebe, Friedrich Carl Jungclauss also went out of his way to highlight his religious faith. In one of his application letters to Bodelschwingh, he specifically noted that he planned on studying theology in addition to medicine.[576] Other applicants frequently drew attention to their religious background by highlighting their service in overseas' missions. Given his own interest in mission work, Bodelschwingh found former mission doctors to be particularly appealing, and believed the mission background was evidence of their suitability to work in an institute like Bethel. Of the twenty-seven doctors Bethel hired before 1910, four had previously served in a mission.[577] By screening the backgrounds of applicant physicians for individuals with backgrounds in the church, Bodelschwingh was trying simultaneously to meet the minimum standards of professionalization required by the 1893 agreement while diluting the influence that the physicians exercised within the institution.

Nowhere were the stakes of this strategy more apparent than in Bodelschwingh's fight with the physicians in 1895–96 over the appointment of a new chief physician for the entire Bethel campus. The chief doctor not only had the final decision on whether or not to release patients, but also had a significant amount of input on prescribing a patient's course of treatment. For example, he determined how much freedom patients could have while at Bethel as well as their level of activity.[578] Thus, the appointment of a

---

[575] Letter to Bodelschwingh, 20 September 1892, *HAB 1/C 10*.
[576] Jungclauss to Bodelschwingh, 18 April 1904, *HAB 1/C 19a*.
[577] See for example the file of Friedrich Haerle, *HAB 1/C 12*.
[578] Schmuhl, *Ärzte in der Anstalt Bethel*, 15.

chief physician was considerably more important than that of a regular physician. With so much authority, he could have a significant influence on the role of Bodelschwingh's philosophy within the institution. For example, if he de-emphasized the importance of activity in a patient's course of treatment, it could severely affect the extent to which one could incorporate *Arbeitserziehung* into the treatment.

Unsurprisingly, the right to appoint the chief physician was subject to an intense battle between Bodelschwingh and his physicians. In fact, knowing that anyone he selected would automatically be met with fierce resistance, Bodelschwingh initially tried to bypass the decision altogether by proposing the chief physician be a rotating position filled by one of the senior physicians on staff.[579] Serving a two-year term, Bodelschwingh believed that the rotating position would prevent any chief physician from establishing any continuity, making it extremely difficult for him to undercut Bodelschwingh's authority within the institute. Aware of Bodelschwingh's long-term strategy, the physicians scuttled the plan by appealing to the state to use its contract with Bethel to intervene on their behalf. Ultimately, they hoped to transform the position into a second pole of authority through which they could challenge Bodelschwingh. In the interest of continuity, the state agreed with the physicians and rejected Bodelschwingh's proposal.[580]

Finally forced to nominate a new chief physician, Bodelschwingh eventually decided to elevate Paul Huchzermeyer, a physician who had joined the Bethel medical staff in 1887.[581] In many ways Huchermeyer was the ideal compromise candidate

---

[579] Ibid., 15.

[580] Regierungspräsidium Minden to Bodelschwingh, 21 August 1895, *HAB 1/C 1*; Verfügung der Regierung Minden to Bodelschwingh, 27 September 1896, *HAB 1/C 1*.

[581] Schmuhl, *Ärzte in der Anstalt Bethel*, 58–59.

because he passed Bodelschwingh's background investigation while also commanding the respect of the medical staff. His father not only was a prominent Westphalian pastor during the Awakening, but he was also a colleague of Johann Wichern. Thus, as far as Bodelschwingh was concerned, his background was beyond reproach. Furthermore, Huchzermeyer was also an early vocal supporter of Bodelschwingh's worker colony initiative, galvanizing the support of Westphalian conservatives to provide desperately needed financial support during the initiative's initial phase of development. Therefore, Bodelschwingh was certain that Huchzermeyer was the perfect choice:

> But by far the main thing for us is the inner side of the matter. All of our work is concerned with eternity, not only the temporal, and we must therefore have a doctor who agrees with us on these points. The educational task is one of our primary responsibilities to both the brothers as to the sisters, and especially to the epileptic patients, and in this we have to have the support of the physician. That we are just considering you, dear sir, is precisely the fact that you have our confidence ... that we are of the same mind on this point.[582]

In Huchzermeyer, Bodelschwingh could rest assured that he not only had a chief physician who would not challenge his authority, but who would use his position to keep the rest of the medical staff in-line and prevent them from subverting Bodelschwingh's philosophy.

Given Huchzermeyer's worldview and relatively relaxed demeanor, he quickly developed a close working friendship with Bodelschwingh. In this capacity, he played a vital role in reducing tensions within Bethel between Bodelschwingh and the physicians. On the one hand he was an effective advocate for the physicians because he could present their demands for increased status and authority in a way that Bodelschwingh did not immediately find threatening. Yet, on the other hand he had enough respect and standing

---

[582] Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, "Am Sarge von Geh.-Rat Dr. Huchzermeyer," *Beth-El* 16 (1924), at 43.

among the physicians to silence their criticisms of Bodelschwingh and the role of his philosophy in Bethel. In an obituary he wrote for Bodelschwingh in 1910, he went so far as to describe the Bethel leader as an ally of professional physicians: "So he stood as the mighty supporter of bodily and mental health next to the physicians, and his efforts were consistent with the highest ideals of our medical profession."[583] At the same time he also tried to dispel the notion that Bodelschwingh was fundamentally opposed to modern medicine.

> Such utterances were emanations of his impulses, of the influence of the environment, the sum of supporting manners in an era where he lacked the sufficient experience. In practice at the institutional network, he never brought such a one-sided and pastoral perspective, and never interfered with the medical treatment of the sick. His personal relationship with the physicians was always gracious and responsive, concerning both their membership and participation in the institute's administration as well as their material position.[584]

According to Huchzermeyer, if one could look beyond the bluster and outspokenness, one would see that Bodelschwingh actually took the opinions of his medical staff seriously. As a result of his ability to move effortlessly between the physicians and Bodelschwingh, Huchzermeyer not only quelled tensions within the institute, but also helped to usher in modern medicine and scientific practices in a way that Bodelschwingh did not find to be threatening.

As the elder Bodelschwingh gradually withdrew from daily life at Bethel between 1905–1910, Huchzermeyer played a similar role for the younger Bodelschwingh, as he helped the new head of Bethel to establish himself and navigate through potential conflicts with the medical staff. Although he sought to retire in 1908, Huchzermeyer

---

[583] Paul Huchzermeyer, "Friedrich v. Bodelschwingh†," *Münchener Medizinische Wochenschrift* 19 (10 May 1910): 1018-19.
[584] Ibid.

returned a year later following a serious conflict between his successor Albert Knapp and Fritz von Bodelschwingh. He continued to serve as Bethel's chief physician until his death in 1923 and, to the frequent dismay of his colleagues, continued to work closely with Bodelschwingh.[585]

Ultimately, as Bethel's leader Friedrich von Bodelschwingh wanted simultaneously to expand the community while firmly entrenching his philosophy of social welfare. Although he did not like the idea of a large, professional medical staff within the institute, he knew that they were a necessary evil if he was going to build Bethel into the leading center for Protestant social welfare in Germany. Their presence would boost the professional portfolio of the institution. In order to reserve the centrality of elements like *Arbeitserziehung* within the community, he performed extensive background checks on prospective physicians in order to hire only those individuals who would not challenge the primacy of his philosophy. Yet, even his insistence on maintaining tight control over the day to day operations of the institute was not enough to ensure that his philosophy remained the foundation of all the care it provided. Thus, despite his determination to embrace modern science insofar as it was necessary for Bethel to continue to thrive, Bodelschwingh nevertheless initiated a process that would allow eugenics gradually to make inroads into Bethel.

***

When Friedrich von Bodelschwingh's youngest son (also named Friedrich) effectively assumed control of Bethel's day-to-day operations in 1904, he made a point of trying to distinguish his tenure as the institute's leader from that of his famous father. Yet, by the time he took over this was much easier said than done. Very ambitious, his

---

[585] Schmuhl, *Ärzte in der Anstalt Bethel*, 58-9.

father had directed Bethel into a variety of new social welfare initiatives and expanded the institute's geographic footprint with the mission to East Africa. While the younger Bodelschwingh may have seen expansion of the foreign mission as one way to leave his stamp on Bethel, the outbreak of war in 1914 effectively short-circuited any practical effort to do this. With few options available through which he could define his tenure at Bethel, Fritz von Bodelschwingh ultimately decided to focus on incorporating modern science into the care that Bethel provided because it was one of the few fields his father left relatively unexplored.[586] Even though he remained committed to the Bethel philosophy, Bodelschwingh was much more open to the possibilities offered by modern scientific treatments. Shortly after his father's passing, the young Bodelschwingh clearly charted Bethel's new course in his 1910 *Verwaltungsbericht*. He proclaimed "that the institutions for the scholarly investigation and interpretation of the wealth of materials collected in our institute should be greatly expanded."[587] Fritz von Bodelschwingh not only sought to lead Bethel confidently into the twentieth century, but also to complete his father's goal of establishing Bethel as a leading, modern, internationally renowned center for social welfare.

Before he could work in earnest on expanding in the field of modern science, however, Bodelschwingh had first to secure his position as the new leader of Bethel. To this end, he initially demonstrated a strong willingness to follow his father's established precedent of supporting Bethel's pastors, and helped them to maintain their positions of privilege at Bethel. He also followed his father's practice of conducting extensive

---

[586] Ingo Stucke, "Bethel-Gemeinde und Bethel-Mission: Rückwirkungen und Einflüsse der Äußeren Mission auf die diakonische "corporate identity" Bethels 1906–1946," in *Bethels Mission (3) Mutterhaus, Mission und Pflege: Beiträge zur Geschichte der v.Bodelschwinghschen Anstalten Bethel*, ed. Matthias Benad and Vicco von Bülow, 171–252 (Bielefeld: Luther Verlag, 2003), 186–87.
[587] Fritz von Bodelschwingh, Verwaltungsbericht, 1910, *HAB 2/91–21*.

background investigations on prospective employees to ensure that he hired physicians with strong roots in the church. As a relatively young and inexperienced leader, he wanted to avoid hiring aggressive physicians who would seek to challenge him over questions of authority and influence. Bodelschwingh's fears were realized shortly after his father's death in 1910 when a long simmering conflict with newly appointed chief physician Albert Knapp finally came to a head. A devout Christian who also used modern scientific methods, Knapp appeared to be the ideal candidate to replace Huchzermeyer and unite Bethel's religious and professional communities. However, Knapp was also deeply ambitious, and Bodelschwingh worried that he would initiate a power struggle to take advantage of his relatively weak position as a new leader. Therefore, one of his first actions following his father's death was to remove Knapp and reinstate Huchzermeyer.[588] Even though Bodelschwingh wanted to expand the role of modern science in Bethel's care, in the short term it was more important for him to consolidate his power.

Furthermore, even though he wanted to facilitate the professionalization of care at Bethel, Bodelschwingh did not want to compromise the role of his father's philosophy within the institute. To this end some ideas, like eugenics, were simply too radical for Bodelschwingh and his Protestant colleagues to consider seriously. First coined by the British statistician Francis Galton in 1881, the term denoted "selective breeding for favored characteristics, and the breeding out of those traits deemed dangerous."[589] It grew out of a larger interest in racial science during the late nineteenth century, and by the turn of the century it had received widespread academic acceptance. It was "bandied

---

[588] Schmuhl, *Ärzte in der Anstalt Bethel*, 22–3.
[589] Eric D. Weitz, *A Century of Genocide: Utopias of Race and Nation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), 38–39.

about with ease in lecture halls and parliaments, newspaper columns and scientific journals. Learned societies were founded to promote eugenics and mass organizations formed to popularize it."[590]

In Germany Alfred Ploetz was primarily responsible for articulating eugenics, or racial hygiene, for German audiences.[591] In 1904 he became the editor of the journal *Archiv für Rassen und Gesellschafts-Biologie*, which was entirely devoted to publishing the latest research on eugenics. Billed as a primarily scientific journal, the editors solicited articles almost exclusively from academics with backgrounds in science or medicine.[592] In this sense, the journal was essential to establishing eugenics as a legitimate scientific discipline. In 1905, Ploetz built upon his success with the journal by co-founding the Berlin Society for Racial Hygiene. Therefore, it is something with which the professionally trained physicians would have been familiar before coming to Bethel. As Bernd Walter notes in his seminal work, *Psychiatrie und Gesellschaft in der Moderne*, eugenicists noticed the success of modern science in combating "infectious illness" and improving the general quality of life. "Because of its successes, hygiene was established as a science's leading discipline of preventative health care. In the fight against chronic disease through chemistry, physics and physiology, bacteriology however soon reach their limits."[593] Through eugenics modern science claimed that it could eliminate chronic

---

[590] Ibid., 39.
[591] Peter Weingart, Jürgen Kroll and Kurt Bayertz, *Rasse, Blut und Gene: Geschichte der Eugenik und Rassenhygiene in Deutschland* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1988), 189.
[592] Ibid., 199–200.
[593] Bernd Walter, *Psychiatrie und Gesellschaft in der Moderne: Geisteskrankenfürsorge in der Provinz Westfalen zwischen Kaiserreich und NS-Regime* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1996), 206–207; see also Paul Weindling, "Hygienepolitik als sozialintegrative Strategie im späten Deutschen Kaiserreich," in *Medizinische Deutungsmacht im sozialen Wandel des 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Alfons Labisch and Reinhard Spree, 37–55 (Bonn: Psychiatrie Verlag, 1989).

illnesses that posed a threat to society. In this sense, on the surface it appeared to be a scientific innovation that was highly applicable to Bethel's larger mission.

Yet, as Weitz illustrates, beneath the "cool veneer" of the lecture halls, journals and academic societies lay a "rough-hewn hysteria" as advocates of eugenics feared that the poorer classes were reproducing at rates significantly greater than the more wealthy components of society.[594] Academic scientists like Ploetz were not immune from these trends as they advocated in favor of the state actively regulating reproduction rates. They believed the state not only needed to encourage the upper classes to reproduce at higher rates, but also to discourage those of supposed inferior stock from reproducing and thus damaging the overall strength of the nation. If need be, scientists like Ploetz asserted that the state should even go so far as to mandate compulsory sterilization for the genetically unfit.[595]

As a result of the efforts by individuals like Ploetz, the late nineteenth century saw a proliferation of debates over how to utilize eugenics as a tool for social welfare. In this sense, the early history of eugenics is much more complex than a mere prelude to the racial policies of the Third Reich.[596] As Hans-Walter Schmuhl notes, leading eugenicists were already advocating in favor of a compulsory sterilization law as early as the late 1890s.[597] In some cases, doctors did not even wait for the state's approval to move ahead with eugenically motivated sterilizations. In 1892, one doctor already took the

---

[594] Weitz, *A Century of Genocide*, 39.
[595] Ibid., 41.
[596] See Hans-Walter Schmuhl, *Rassenhygiene, Nationalsozialismus, Euthanasie: Von der Verhütung zur Vernichtung "lebensunwerten Lebens", 1890–1945* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987); Michael Burleigh, *Death and Deliverance, Euthanasia in Germany: 1900–1945* (London: Pan Books, 1994); Robert N. Proctor, *Racial Hygiene: Medicine Under the Nazis* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988). For a more recent attempt to expand this debate see Edward Ross Dickinson, "Biopolitics, Fascism, Democracy: Some Reflections on Our Discourse About 'Modernity,'" *Central European History* 37, no. 1 (2004): 1–48.
[597] Schmuhl, *Rassenhygiene, Nationalsozialismus, Euthanasie*, 99.

initiative to perform sterilizations at his local psychological clinic. The practice was also not limited to Germany, as there are recorded incidents of US institutions in Kansas and Indiana performing mass sterilizations during the 1890s and early 1900s.[598]

Bethel, for its part, was certainly not insulated from these debates. Even though Bodelschwingh remained highly skeptical, individual physicians expressed interest in exploring the possibilities of applying eugenics to the care they prescribed. For example, in 1910 Walter Steinbiss was recruited by Albert Knapp (before he was ousted by Bodelschwingh), to serve as the new head physician at Waldlabor. Like Knapp, Steinbiss' place in Bethel was precarious almost from the beginning. Among other things, he arrived at Bethel as an outspoken advocate of euthanasia, the most extreme eugenic measure.[599] According to Hermann Feldmann, another physician at Bethel who gave Steinbiss a tour of the community, euthanasia came up multiple times as the two visited the institutions.

> As we left Ophra, Dr. Steinbiss remarked: "Do you realize, colleague, that we do not need this house. One or two spoonfuls of hydrocyanic acid [Blausäure] would suffice." …Dr. St[einbiss] further observed … that the treatment of the sick, particularly those sheltered at Bethel, did not concern him, that he was a anatomic pathologist and could not suppress the thought whenever he saw a sick person: "hopefully I will be soon getting your brain.[600]

Upon hearing Steinbiss' musings about euthanasia, Feldmann describes himself as being both shocked and abhorrent of such an idea. His reaction is noteworthy because it demonstrates that despite being an academically acceptable idea, eugenics was still considered largely taboo among Bethel's medical staff. Oddly enough, a shared aversion

---

[598] Ibid., 99.
[599] Schmuhl, *Ärzte in der Anstalt Bethel*, 24–25.
[600] Denkschrift Dr. Feldmann, 8 February 1910, *HAB 1/C 18h*.

to eugenics in the years before World War I may have been one of the few issues on which Bodelschwingh could agree with the physicians. Even if they were interested in learning about it, they were in no hurry to apply the ideas to care at Bethel.

If the challenge of guiding Bethel through a transitional period, coupled with the general skepticism toward new ideas like eugenics were not enough, Bodelschwingh's efforts to put his stamp on Bethel were further hindered by the outbreak of war in August, 1914. A deeply nationalist community, Bethel was quickly swept up in the enthusiasm for war that characterized nearly all of Germany in the summer of 1914. The residents enthusiastically "yelled out loud" the patriotic anthem "*Deutschland, Deutschland über Alles*" as they paraded down Bethel's main street to demonstrate their national pride. On 31 July, two days before Germany officially declared war, the Bethel community gathered together to sing "A Mighty Fortress is our God."[601] Fritz von Bodelschwingh demonstrated Bethel's support for the war by making arrangements to care for wounded soldiers at the institute as well as by rallying his parishioners from the pulpit in support of the war effort. "O century! It is a pleasure to live in you!" he proclaimed.[602] It was an atmosphere that would have made the elder Von Bodelschwingh proud. Yet, this surge in nationalist fervor was noteworthy because it essentially put any larger plans Fritz Bodelschwingh had for Bethel on indefinite hold. As long as there was a war, he would be unable to pursue his plans to expand the professionalized care within the institute.

Instead of working to build and expand the scientific initiatives within the institute, Bodelschwingh concentrated his energy on helping Bethel simply to survive the war. At first they believed they were well prepared to navigate a protracted conflict. The

---

[601] Walter Trittelwitz, "Ein halbes Jahrhundert im Dienste von Bethel, 1898–1948, Volume 7: Bethel im Weltkriege," in *Hauptarchiv der von Bodelschwingh'schen Anstalten Bethel* (*HAB*), 2/89–7, 641.
[602] Ibid., 641.

community had stored and preserved a significant amount of food, and the administrators hoped that Bethel's focus on self-sufficiency would insulate them from any pressures that could potentially result from rationing. Indeed, Bethel's agricultural infrastructure proved to be invaluable during the first months of the war. Despite his best efforts, however, Bodelschwingh's foresight could not overcome the state's utter lack of organization and preparation to marshal resources for a long war.[603] Bethel, like almost all of Germany, increasingly felt the devastating impact of the war as it continued into 1917 and showed no sign of ending quickly. As a result of the bad weather and subsequent poor harvest that plagued Germany, Bodelschwingh estimated that the war caused over three hundred patients to starve to death each year from 1916-1919.[604] In an attempt to show his solidarity with the larger community, Bodelschwingh regularly went without food so that the residents could have more to eat.[605] Such acts of self-sacrifice, however, did little to ease the pain experienced by Bethel's residents.

With Bethel's resources depleted, Bodelschwingh made every effort to acquire more food for its starving residents. This proved to be extremely difficult however, as Bodelschwingh not only needed to navigate a bureaucratic labyrinth to petition the state for more assistance, but he also needed to justify the reasons why Bethel deserved help. As an institute that primarily cared for people with severe mental and physical disabilities, only a small number of Bethel's residents contributed tangibly to the war effort. Some critics accused Bodelschwingh of purposely directing valuable foodstuffs to

---

[603] For more on starvation and German food policy see Avner Offer, "The Blockade of Germany and the Strategy of Starvation, 1914–1918," in *Great War, Total War: Combat and Mobilization on the Western Front, 1914–1918*, ed. Roger Chickering and Stig Förster, 169–88 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
[604] Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, *Saat und Segen in der Arbeit von Bethel: Ein Rückblick auf die Zeit seit dem Tode des Anstaltsvaters* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1932), 9.
[605] *Unser Pastor Fritz,* 37.

"useless eaters."[606] Later, when he described the suffering that the war produced at Bethel, people questioned how the experiences of the patients could be compared to those of the soldiers on the military front. "Certainly one could tell us: What does this mean to the uncounted thousands who have their healthy young life out there to sacrifice on the battlefield! Surely one has to agree in general."[607] As Bodelschwingh searched for help, he frequently encountered critics who argued that the residents of Bethel did not deserve any additional assistance from the state. While the reception Bodelschwingh received was frustrating, given the suffering he witnessed in Bethel, the sentiment would only grow louder during the 1920s, as more people questioned the logic of sharing scarce resources with individuals who did not tangibly contribute anything to greater society.

To justify his request for help, Bodelschwingh and his staff sought to tie Bethel's mission to the war as much as possible. In this respect, his 1914 announcement that Bethel would also care for wounded soldiers was an early attempt to connect Bethel tangibly to the larger war effort. Over the course of the war, nearly thirty thousand soldiers passed through Bethel for treatment.[608] Superficially, this served as excellent wartime propaganda, as it allowed the institution to trumpet its patriotism by portraying itself as an active supporter of the war effort. All of Bethel's publications proudly described how the community cared for wounded soldiers while it also sent several doctors and pastors to serve in the army. Behind the scenes, however, this was a shrewd move that better positioned Bethel to justify its claim for additional resources as the war

---

[606] Wilhelm Brandt, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, 1877–1946: Nachfolger und Gestalter* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1967), 83.
[607] Bodelschwingh, *Saat und Segen*, 9.
[608] Brandt, *Friedrich v. Bodelschwingh*, 82–83.

endured. No one could question the necessity of giving more food to a hospital that cared for wounded soldiers.

Hans Hanke, the head administrator of the worker colonies at Eckardtheim during the war, also struggled with severe shortages. With nearly all the able-bodied men either serving at the front or working in munitions factories, the worker colonies primarily housed individuals who were either infirm or elderly, which made it nearly impossible for them to be self-sufficient.[609] Thus, Hanke faced a steep challenge as he sought help for people who did not appear to contribute to the war effort. Following Bodelschwingh's lead, he tried to portray the colonists as "military suppliers," and in early 1917, he requested Bodelschwingh's permission to reorganize the workshops at Wilhelmsdorf to produce munitions. The only things missing were the machines and a staff to oversee production.[610] Hanke stressed that a munitions factory could convince federal authorities that Wilhelmsdorf was essential to the war, and thus win the colony additional rations from the state.[611] Worried about the impact of a potential decrease in agricultural productivity, should the colonies' clients devote themselves to weapons production instead of farming, the administration ultimately rejected Hanke's proposal.[612] Therefore, despite Hanke's best efforts, the worker colonies also suffered devastating shortages during the war.

Ultimately, the war had a complex and transformative effect on the Bethel community. In the short term it completely derailed Bodelschwingh's agenda to create

---

[609] Hans-Walter Schmuhl, "28. Im Ersten Weltkrieg," in *Bethel-Eckardtsheim: Von der Gründung der ersten deutschen Arbeiterkolonie bis zur Auflösung als Teilanstalt (1882–2001)*, ed. Matthias Benad and Hans-Walter Schmuhl, 438–49 (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2006), 443.
[610] Hanke to Bodelschwingh, 24 January 1917, *HAB 2/13–2*.
[611] Schmuhl, "28. Im Ersten Weltkrieg," 443–44.
[612] "Protokoll des Arbeitsausschusses," 30 January 1917, *HAB 2/13–2*.

his own legacy at the institute. Instead of creating an environment that was more open and receptive to scientific ideas, he was forced to devote all his energy simply to helping the community survive the war. Yet, in the long-term Bethel's experience during the war opened the door wide to the serious discussion of applying eugenic measures like sterilization to Bethel's greater social welfare philosophy. As Bodelschwingh noted after the war, the shortages affected "already their first victims among the sickest and weakest."[613] Eugenics was particularly attractive to Bethel's leaders because it theoretically promised to reduce the amount of future suffering by eliminating the segment of the community's population that felt the effects of the war most acutely. In the process, since Bodelschwingh and his colleagues needed to justify any requests for additional assistance, eugenics also offered to remove one of the largest obstacles Bethel's leaders faced when they appealed to the state for help. Thus, Bethel's experience during the war made eugenics acceptable in a way that it could never have been before 1914. Although it initially prevented Bodelschwingh from pursuing his larger agenda, it ultimately removed the stigma that surrounded scientific ideas like eugenics and made Bethel's leaders significantly more amenable to introducing them within the community.

As the noted Berlin psychiatrist Karl Bonhoeffer argued, this transformation was not unique to Bethel.[614] Rather, he noted a dramatic change in the postwar attitudes of social workers in general across Germany. Bonhoeffer, who was also the head of the German Association for Psychiatry after the war, argued that the widespread suffering within German mental asylums not only altered the way welfare providers cared for the

---

[613] Bodelschwingh, *Saat und Segen*, 32.
[614] Bonhoeffer was also the father of Dietrich Bonhoeffer, the famous Protestant resistance hero during the Third Reich.

mentally ill, but also influenced the way they understood humanity.[615] Given the suffering they experienced they began to wonder whether or not it would be more humane to deny aid to people with severe disabilities so that healthier individuals would have a better chance to survive.

> I mean just that, that we were compelled to assess differently than before the worth of the individual human life under the extreme experience of the war, and with it we had to review the famine years of the war to see that our sick patients in the institutions were dying en masse from malnutrition, and this almost endorsed the idea that through this sacrifice the remaining healthy could sustain life. In this emphasis of the right of the healthy to self-preservation, along with a time of need, lies the danger of overacting, the risk that the idea of the sacrificial subordination of healthy subjects under the needs of the helpless and the sick; which is the foundation of true nursing, loses out to the opposite claims of the healthy to their living strength.[616]

For Bonhoeffer, the suffering and challenges experienced by civilians during the war radically altered the ways in which they made sense of the world around them. For many individuals, the suffering was so great that sacrificing the unhealthy members of society so that the stronger could survive appeared to be an entirely humane solution. Specifically they questioned the logic of using scarce resources to care for people who were weak and incapable of living independently. In their minds, not only were these individuals incapable of understanding the war and the reasons for their suffering, but they were also the first to succumb to the chronic shortages. Thus, in the eyes of the social workers within institutes like Bethel, the policy of stretching limited resources did not alter the fate of the community's weakest members. Instead it merely inflicted

[615] Schmuhl, "28. Im Ersten Weltkrieg," 449.
[616] "Jahreshauptversammlung des Deutschen Vereins für Psychiatrie in Hamburg am 27. und 28. Mai 1920," *Allgemeine Zeitschrift für Psychiatrie und psychisch-gerichtliche Medizin* 76 (1920/21): 593–668, at 600.

needless suffering on everyone and created additional challenges for healthier individuals who could also contribute to the productivity of the community.

Ultimately, Bodelschwingh's desire to place his stamp on Bethel before 1914, coupled with the fundamentally transformative effect of the wartime experience in Bethel, are vital to understanding the larger development of Protestant attitudes to modern, scientific ideas like eugenics. They clearly demonstrate that Protestants were familiar with eugenic debates before 1914, and that the impact of the war on the home front made them amenable to implementing those ideas within Protestant-run institutes. When they were confronted directly with the suffering of the war, eugenics suddenly lost the stigma it possessed before 1914. Therefore, in contrast to much of the current literature on racial science and colonialism, Bethel demonstrates that the impetus to embrace eugenics did not always arise from experiences and encounters outside Europe. In this case it very clearly resulted from a combination of factors that were centered firmly in Bielefeld.

***

The Bethel that emerged from World War I in 1918 was a fundamentally different community than the one that entered the war in 1914. Before the conflict, despite his interest in modernizing the institute and bringing more professional physicians to Bethel, Fritz Bodelschwingh never intended Bethel to stray from the philosophy of his father. He still investigated the backgrounds of potential employees to ensure that they would mesh with the Bethel milieu. In this respect, Fritz von Bodelschiwngh was very much his father's son. After 1918, however, a combination of factors caused the environment within Bethel to change dramatically.

Heavily dependent on voluntary donations to fund its initiatives, Bethel was particularly vulnerable to the economic chaos and catastrophic hyperinflation that devastated Germany through the end of 1923.[617] As the institution's financial situation became increasingly precarious, its leaders were forced to adopt a variety of measures to help Bethel navigate the crisis. In addition to pursuing aggressively fundraising opportunities in the United States, they responded by emphasizing self-sufficiency and cost-effectiveness.[618] To this end, fundraising propaganda portrayed Bethel as a model of thrift and sound financial management. At the same time eugenics suddenly became attractive because of its claims to be able to eliminate future social welfare costs.

In addition to the new concerns about using resources as efficiently as possible, Bodelschwingh's role within the community also changed. With his health slowly deteriorating and overwhelmed by a myriad of other problems facing the institute, he delegated much of his authority to Gustav Dietrich, a senior pastor in charge of overseeing the worker colonies to the south of the city. Not known for his ability to deal with "delicate missions," Dietrich's rough personality and high ambition would shape Bethel's development into the 1930s.[619] By the end of the 1920s, he had established himself as Bodelschwingh's unofficial ambassador. In this capacity he represented Bodelschwingh at a number of major social welfare conferences during the early 1930s. Most notably, he attended the Symposium of the Inner Mission for Eugenics in 1932 and

---

[617] For more on hyperinflation and its impact on Germany see Eric D. Weitz, *Weimar Germany: Promise and Tragedy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007), 131-45.

[618] Wolfram Korn, ed., *Bethel und das Geld, 1867-1998: Die ökonomische Entwicklung der v. Bodelschwinghschen Anstalten Bethel* (Bielefeld: Bethel Verlag, 1998), 69-70, 85-7.

[619] Blümcke to Bodelschwingh, 27 March 1929, *HAB 2/33–549*.

the Central Association of German Associations for the Care of Wayfarers in 1933.[620] It was at these conferences that the leading members of the Inner Mission debated how Protestants should approach the question of eugenics. At the same time, Dietrich also displayed a growing enthusiasm for the Nazi party and its religious offshoot the German Christians.[621] Taken together, Dietrich's influence, openness to eugenics and attraction to Nazism had dire consequences in 1933 when Bethel became the center of a power struggle over the control of the Protestant Church and was required to implement the Nazi compulsory sterilization law.[622]

Among the responsibilities Dietrich assumed was oversight of Bethel's medical staff, including decisions over hiring. However, he found the recruiting and hiring process very different than it was before the war. He no longer had the luxury of choosing specific doctors who meshed with the Bethel philosophy, as Bodelschwingh had done before the war. After 1918, the confessional institutions of the Inner Mission, including Bethel, were not as attractive for physicians as their public counterparts. Instead of career destinations, physicians viewed the confessional institutions as stepping-stones to better positions at the top of the career ladders. As a result, confessional institutions like Bethel employed medical staffs that were notably younger

---

[620] Hans-Walter Schmuhl, "30. Eckardtsheim und der Nationalsozialismus (1931–1941)," in *Bethel-Eckardtsheim: Von der Gründung der ersten deutschen Arbeiterkolonie bis zur Auflösung als Teilanstalt (1882–2001)*, ed. Matthias Benad and Hans-Walter Schmuhl, 455–89 (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2006), at 459; Anneliese Hochmuth, *Spurensuche: Eugenik, Sterilisation, Patientenmorde und die v. Bodelschwinghschen Anstalten Bethel, 1929–1945*, ed. Matthias Benad (Bielefeld: Bethel Verlag, 1997).
[621] For more on German Christianity see Doris Bergen, *Twisted Cross: The German Christian Movement in the Third Reich* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996).
[622] For more on the Reichsbishop election see Thomas Martin Schneider, *Reichsbischof Ludwig Müller: Eine Untersuchung zu Leben, Werk und Persönlichkeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993); Klaus Scholder, *The Churches and the Third Reich, Volume One: 1918–1934, Preliminary History and the Time of Illusions, 1918–1934,* trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988); J. R. C. Wright, *"Above Parties:" The Political Attitudes of the German Protestant Church Leadership, 1918–1933* (London: Oxford University Press, 1974), 110–42.

than before the war with significantly higher turnover rates.[623] Lacking the internal cohesion and stability, these younger physicians were also considerably less deferential to Bodelschwingh and the Bethel philosophy.

As staff cohesion weakened with the high turnover rate, it became even more important to hire a strong chief physician who could help maintain stability within the hospital. Therefore, the position gained even more power and influence and made it easier for the chief physician to undermine Bodelschwingh's philosophy as he sought to implement his own vision for the institute. Dietrich was aware of this as well, and thus used his influence to hire chief physicians who were more sympathetic to his worldview. The two who were hired under his watch, Carl Schneider (1930–1933) and Werner Villinger (1934-39), were both university trained psychiatrists who had a strong interest in expanding the role of modern medicine at Bethel with a particular interest in eugenics. When Schneider arrived at Bethel in 1930 he had written on questions of psychiatry and racial hygiene, but appeared skeptical of eugenics.[624] However his attitudes completely changed in 1933 with the Nazi seizure of power, and before leaving Bethel in 1934 he used his influence to facilitate the implementation of the Nazi sterilization law.[625] Upon leaving, Schneider continued to pursue his interest in eugenics at the University of Heidelberg, and became one of the physicians responsible for implementing Operation T4 (Nazi Euthanasia). In February, 1941 he returned to Bethel as part of a commission tasked with selecting murder victims.

---

[623] Schmuhl, *Ärzte in der Anstalt Bethel*, 29.
[624] See for example, Paul Nitsche and Carl Schneider, *Einführung in die Abteilung seelische Hygiene der internationalen Hygieneausstellung Dresden 1930* (Berlin: 1930).
[625] Schmuhl, *Ärzte in der Anstalt Bethel,* 77–78; For examples of Schneider's writings on eugenics see, Carl Schneider, *Behandlung und Verhütung der Geisteskranken* (Berlin: Springer Verlag, 1939).

Following Schneider's departure, Villinger became the new chief physician. On the surface, he appeared to be a perfect fit with Bethel. Before coming to Bielefeld, Villinger worked at the Youth Welfare Office in Hamburg and served in an advising capacity at Wichern's Raue Haus. It was there that Villinger became acquainted with Bodelschwingh, who wanted him to serve as Bethel's head doctor as early as 1930. Yet Villinger also displayed a strong interest in eugenic practices, especially sterilization. Although he remained publicly skeptical of its applicability, he had established himself as a forceful advocate for sterilization by the late 1920s.[626]. It was his interest in eugenics that attracted Dietrich's attention. Together, they worked to implement the 1934 sterilization law at Bethel.[627] At the same time, Villinger also used his position to establish himself as a leading voice on eugenics at Inner Mission conferences.[628]

Together, Schneider and Villinger, in collaboration with Dietrich, used their increased autonomy to alter radically the environment in Bethel and reduce the influence of Bodelschwingh's philosophy. They worked hard to consolidate their own position of power as chief physician and increase the status and influence of the medical staff within the community. Both were also skilled at communicating in overtly religious language when necessary, which helped them to reassure the administration about their agenda. With Bodelschwingh preoccupied and Dietrich largely supportive of their agenda, Schneider and Villinger were able to accomplish things about which their predecessors

---

[626] See Werner Villinger, "Die Grenzen der Erziehbarkeit," in *Reform des Strafvollzuges. Kritische Beiträge zu dem Allgeminen Entwurf eines Strafvollzugsgesetzes,* ed. Lothar Frede, and Max Grünhut, 137-63 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1927), 146.
[627] Schmuhl, "30. Eckardtsheim und der Nationalsozialismus," in *Bethel Eckardtsheim*, 461.
[628] Schmuhl, *Ärzte in der Anstalt Bethel,* 83. Despite his advocacy of sterilization, Villinger remained skeptical of euthanasia. When Bethel became threatened by Operation T4, he served as a trusted contact for Bodelschwingh.

could only dream. They, more than anyone else, were responsible for facilitating the dramatic professionalization of care at Bethel during the late 1920s and early 1930s.

***

At the same time the composition of Bethel's medical staff received a significant make- over, German psychiatry also experienced a general reform that made it more attractive to Bodelschwingh and his colleagues. Most notable in this respect was the work of psychiatrist Hermann Simon, the director of the provincial institution at Gütersloh, a small city located just down the highway from Bielefeld. Simon was dismayed by the seemingly hopeless situation of institutionalized patients and designed a new approach to mental health care he called "active sick therapy (*aktivere Krankenbehandlung*)."[629] The philosophy was partially born out of necessity; Simon wanted to use productively the undeveloped land around the complex, but lacked the necessary labor force to carry out his vision. To this end, Simon employed the institution's residents as laborers to work on the surrounding land for the benefit of the entire community. The strategy thus had the dual benefit of developing the land while also getting the institution's residents outside and active.

Almost overnight, Simon and his staff noticed a significant difference in the atmosphere within the institution.

> In a general surprise, the increased labor input changed the familiar atmosphere in the institution: It was quiet and orderly, and the irritability and tendency to brutal acts of violence decreased.. Patients who had been previously loud, hostile inaccessible, were friendly and easygoing; "blunt" patients showed a greater alertness.[630]

---

[629] See Hermann Simon, *Aktivere Krankenbehandlung in der Irrenanstalt* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1929); A. Grütter, *Hermann Simon. Die Entwicklung der Arbeits- und Beschäftigungstherapie in der Anstaltspsychiatrie: Eine biographische Betrachtung* (Herzogenrath: Murken-Altrogge, 1995).
[630] Walter, *Psychiatrie und Gesellschaft in der Moderne*, 254.

When given the opportunity to leave their confinement, Simon contended that the patients were remarkably more amenable to treatment and able to engage in productive activity. In the same spirit as Bodelschwingh's worker colonies, Simon favored outdoor, agricultural labor because of the ease with which one could perform it and because of the supposedly liberating experience of leaving the confines of the institution and physically working with the soil. Once Simon had established his method at the institution in Gütersloh, he expanded it by articulating five different degrees of competency and the types of labor someone in each group could perform.[631] As a result, nearly everyone in the institution was actively engaging in some type of productive activity.[632]

Unsurprisingly, Simon's method attracted significant interest from both physicians and social workers. Faced with rising costs, institutional leaders embraced the therapy because it promoted productivity over bed rest. In theory, therefore, they could reduce care-related expenses by promoting the idea of self-sufficiency. Throughout Germany, most notably in the province of Westphalia, institutions eagerly implemented the so-called "Gütersloh model."[633] This was especially the case at Bethel, where Simon's ideas dovetailed nicely with its traditional philosophy of *Arbeitserziehung*. For Bodelschwingh, Simon's model provided the opportunity to reconcile Bethel's religiously trained social workers with its increasingly professionalized staff. At the same time, it also gave Bodelschwingh a way to navigate the postwar pressure to modernize and professionalize care without losing sight of its larger mission.

In many respects, Simon's approach to psychiatry closely paralleled the way in which the elder Bodelschwingh understood mental illness. By encouraging an active

---

[631] Simon, *Aktiviere Krankenbehandlung*, 24–27.
[632] Walter, *Psychiatrie und Gesellschaft in der Moderne*, 256.
[633] Ibid., 256–7.

lifestyle, and thus mitigating the negative aspects of their affliction, both men hoped to improve the quality of life of the patients.[634] For Fritz, Simon's method was merely "a work therapy of higher order."[635] In his mind, Simon had finally shown the greater medical community what Bodelschwingh had long known; that *Arbeitserziehung* was the correct way to treat people with mental disabilities. "What the father of our institute started 50 years ago with the epileptics and tested in a wider mass, it has now been widely recognized to be correct for the care of the mentally ill. So while medicine is in some cases therapeutic and necessary, bathrooms and bed rest good, it is equally important that every patient can be given a job…"[636] In other words, "*Aktivere Krankenbehandlungen*" was the scientific justification for the Bethel philosophy and thus provided the perfect opportunity to reconcile Bethel's religious and professional staffs.

For all its benefits, however, *Aktivere Krankenbehandlungen* also had clear limits. While it improved the living conditions of the afflicted individual, it did nothing to cure the actual affliction. Therefore, the patient remained institutionalized and continued to consume valuable resources. It was in this way that Simon opened the door for Protestants such as Bodelschwingh to embrace ideas like eugenics. When coupled with work therapy, eugenic measures such as sterilization and limits on marriage offered the opportunity for welfare providers to care for afflicted individuals while eliminating the possibility of having to care for future generations of ill individuals. "The eugenic prophylactic was, however, set out to tackle the evils of mental illness at its root and eliminate it in subsequent generations."[637] On the surface, the combination of work

---

[634] Schmuhl, *Ärzte in der Anstalt Bethel,* 32–33.
[635] Bodelschwingh, *Saat und Segen*, 31.
[636] Ibid., 31.
[637] Schmuhl, *Ärzte in der Anstalt Bethel,* 33.

therapy and eugenics appeared to be an approach upon which a large number of professional physicians and religiously trained social workers could agree.

In this sense, Schmuhl is correct to focus on the growing influence of *Reformpsychiatrie* to explain the open-mindedness of the Protestants at Bethel to eugenic measures. It fit nicely with the institution's emphasis on the work ethic, and reduced some of the opposition to Bodelschwingh's philosophy voiced by the professional medical staff. Yet, at the same time, it only provides a partial explanation to the dramatic shift in Protestant attitudes to eugenic ideas. A reading of many Protestant voices in support of eugenics, especially during the late Weimar era, shows that leading members of the Inner Mission were also very concerned about the impact of the war on the German national body. Deeply nationalistic, they were at a loss to explain the war's outcome and troubled by its impact on the nation.[638] In this context, eugenics appealed to them because it offered the opportunity to rebuild the national community.

While these fears were present through much of the Weimar era, it was not until the late 1920s and early 1930s that they bubbled up to the surface. Fritz von Bodelschwingh, for example, first voiced his support publicly for sterilization in a 1929 speech to the Society of Lutheran academics in Lübeck. The speech highlighted many of the fears Protestants had about Germany's future as well as their intense disapproval of the dramatic expansion of the Weimar welfare state.[639]

---

[638] For more on the impact of World War I on German Protestantism see Klaus Scholder, *The Churches and the Third Reich, Volume One: Preliminary History and the Time of Illusions, 1918–1934* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 3–20.

[639] While documentation of Bodelschwingh's political attitudes during the Weimar era is scarce, it is nevertheless clear that he detested the constant political maneuvering characteristic of Weimar politics. Bodelschwingh maintained a close relationship with the ruling Hohenzollern family through the end of the war and was highly skeptical of the new republic. For more see Brandt, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh*, 83, 178.

> Since Spengler has thrown in a word in the physically and mentally shattered world of the decline of the West, both nations and our people constantly ask the question: Is one correct, that it is irreversibly backwards for our people, for Europe, we are already degenerated or degenerating generation, and this path is unstoppable? As a Barometer for the signs of degeneration of our nation we are reminded time and time again that the number of the weak, the sick, the spiritually broken, and the inferior types continued to grow… For it is inherent in the times in which we live that the misery caused by the war has become more and more visible through modern welfare work and has thus come out of hiding into the public limelight. However, it generally appears that the number of physically and mentally weak, the inferior, is growing.[640]

On the face of it, Bodelschwingh should have applauded the changes to the Weimar welfare state. For example, it emphasized education and training; things that Bodelschwingh, in theory, supported.[641] Yet because it was not carried out in a religious context, he remained highly skeptical. Truly effective welfare policies, he maintained, should be motivated by religion in general and "Christian charity" in particular.[642] By indiscriminately helping anyone in need of assistance, Bodelschwingh believed the Weimar welfare state inadvertently harmed the nation as a whole because the aid was unconditional. In other words, the individual recipient had no motivation to take responsibility for his own fate.

Without eugenics, Bodelschwingh feared that Germany would move down an irreversible path that would see it lose its status as one of Europe's *Kulturnationen*. As he argued to the Society of Lutheren Academics, the human cost of the conflict made any victories pyrrhic at best.

---

[640] Fritz von Bodelschwingh, "Vortrag in Lübeck über Fragen der Eugenik (1929), *HAB 2/91-16, 22*.; Document reprinted in Anneliese Hochmuth, *Spurensuche*, 215-226.
[641] See Detlev J. K. Peukert, *The Weimar Republic: The Crisis of Classical Modernity* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1989), 129–46; Christoph Sachße and Florian Tennstedt, *Geschichte der Armenfürsorge in Deutschland, Band 2: Fürsorge und Wohlfahrtspflege, 1871–1929* (Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1988), 68–217; Young-Sun Hong, *Welfare, Modernity, and the Weimar State, 1919–1933* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998).
[642] Brandt, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh*, 179–80.

> You can easily see what a catastrophic development lies ahead if things continue as they have thus far… To be sure, it is true that the war has left a deep cut [in the German nation]. It called the competent and the physical useful to the front and let them die, while those who were physically and mentally of no use stayed home.[643]

Like many eugenics advocates, he thought the war placed Germany at a demographic disadvantage compared to other nations, and that it risked falling back to the "level of sub humans (Front der Untermenschen)."[644] One gets a sense of Bodelschwingh's extreme pessimism from the language he used during the 1920s to describe life at Bethel. Throughout the speech at Lübeck, one can clearly discern a strong sense of angst and foreboding, which stood in marked contrast to the way in which Bethel sought to portray itself in the years before the war. No longer was Bethel a refuge where even the most downtrodden person could find hope and a helping hand. Instead, Bethel and its leaders seemed overwhelmed by anxiety and doubt during the turbulent 1920s.

> We have 2200 epileptics at Bethel, and day in and day out there are not two minutes when one of our charges does not collapse with a loud cry. And if you should participate on Sunday in our religious services, you would experience for yourself that time and time again how we are startled by one of these cries of death [Todeschreie] to remind us that we live in a place where sickness, pain, suffering, misery, and guilt all come together.[645]

Rather than celebrating the lives of Bethel's poorest and sickest residents, like much of the propaganda before the war, Bodelschwingh bemoans their presence as a constant reminder of the miserable state in which Bethel seemed to find itself. In this sense he hoped that eugenic practices like sterilization would help to restore Bethel and Germany to the status they held before 1914.

---

[643] Bodelschwingh, "Lübecker Vortrag," *HAB 2/91–16*.
[644] Ibid.
[645] Ibid.

These concerns were also not limited to Bodelschwingh and his associates at Bethel. Hans Harmsen, one of the leading and most influential figures in the Central Committee for Inner Mission (Central-Ausschuß der Innere Mission), voiced similar concerns as he sought to shape the policy agenda of the organization during the early 1930s. Like Bodelschwingh, he was deeply concerned about the future of Germany's population. Not only did the number of births decline dramatically between 1910 and 1923, but Harmsen also speculated that the quality of the population that did reproduce was notably poorer than before the war. "Earlier the offspring of the antisocial inferior population groups was offset by the quality of social, capable families ... Now a high number of children usually shows only with drinkers, psychopaths, antisocial and the unrestrained."[646] Like Bodelschwingh, he also accused Weimar's bureaucratic social welfare system of exacerbating an already serious problem. Rather than try to restore the quality of the population, Weimar welfare "overwhelmingly served inferiors," leading "to a danger for the maintenance of substance for a healthy population."[647] As a result, Harmsen insisted that Protestant welfare was in dire need of a "radical change."[648]

As Joachim-Christoph Kaiser, one of the leading scholars on twentieth-century German Protestantism and social welfare, notes, one cannot ignore the postwar demands placed on the Inner Mission when trying to understand their sudden openness to eugenics.[649] When faced with the challenges posed by rising costs and demands for assistance, Protestant leaders like Bodelschwingh and Harmsen questioned the feasibility

---

[646] Hans Harmsen, "Grundsätzliches unserer Arbeit: Bevölkerungspolitische Neuorientierung unserer Gesundheitsfürsorge," *Gesundheitsfürsorge: Zeitschrift der evangelischen Kranken- und Pflegeanstalten* 5 (1931): 1–6, at 3–4.
[647] Ibid., 4.
[648] Ibid., 4.
[649] Jochen-Christoph Kaiser, *Sozialer Protestantismus im 20. Jahrhundert: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Inneren Mission, 1914–1945* (Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1989), 316–17.

of therapeutic measures like work therapy as long-term solutions. Indeed, in his invitation to the first "Symposium for Eugenics," Harmsen prominently noted the growing number of people relying on the Inner Mission for help.[650] Bodelschwingh also expressed such concerns in Lübeck when he warned against the danger of "petrification."[651] If a mental illness became progressively worse over successive generations, he feared an individual might completely lose the ability to work, thus making *Arbeitserziehung* completely pointless and irrelevant. In this worst-case scenario, from the point of society, there was no reason to help that individual and his ancestors. In this context, eugenics acted as a financially responsible agent that would benefit the national body both financially and biologically.

Furthermore, as Young-Sun Hong notes, the concern for larger "supra-individual entities," was a distinct characteristic of Protestant social welfare and distinguished Protestants from their Catholic counterparts.[652] While both groups embraced positive eugenic measures (i.e. those intended to boost reproduction in a population), Protestants tended to be much more open minded to negative practices (i.e. measures designed to restrict a group's ability to reproduce) out of concern for the health of entities like the *Volk*. For them, the *Volk* was an organic body created by God, and therefore it deserved the same amount of care as the individuals who composed the body. If some of these people were diseased, thus hurting the greater *Volk*, social welfare providers needed to find a way to eliminate the infection. To this end, Bodelschwingh described how

---

[650] "Einladung zur ersten Arbeitstagung der evangelischen "Fachkonferenz für Eugenik" vom 18. bis 20 Mai 1931 in Treysa," in *Eugenik, Sterilisation, "Euthanasie," Politische Biologie in Deutschland, 1895–1945: Eine Dokumentation*, ed. Jochen-Christoph Kaiser, Kurt Nowak, and Michael Schwartz (Halle: Buchverlag Union, 1992), 105–6.
[651] Bodelschwingh, "Lübecker Vortrag," *HAB 2/91-16*.
[652] Hong, *Welfare, Modernity and the Weimar State,* 256–57.

selective breeding practices had already resulted in a “noteworthy development” in the overall quality of plant and animal populations. When tasked with helping to solve Germany’s demographic crisis, eugenics “reported as an aid to the Fatherland.”[653] Over time, measures like sterilization and marriage restriction, rather than those designed to encourage reproduction, would give the national body a better chance to recover from the losses it suffered as a result of the war.[654]

At the 1931 symposium in Treysa on eugenics, Bodelschwingh built upon the points he laid out in Lübeck by providing a theological justification for eugenics. He insisted that "the God-given functions of the body have to be in absolute obedience, if they lead to evil and the destruction of the Kingdom of God in this or that element, that then the possibility or obligation holds that its elimination occur."[655] In other words, if a mental illness caused someone to commit a bad action (thus harming someone or something), one had an obligation to do whatever necessary to prevent that person from continuing to act. Bodelschwingh continued that he would “fearfully agree… if sterilization was implemented only in an emergency situation. I would like to recognize it as an obligation in conformity with the will of Jesus Christ.”[656] As Young-Sun Hong notes, it was not uncommon for Protestant social welfare providers to understand mental illness as a divine punishment for sin.[657] In this sense, Bodelschwingh’s attitudes were a logical extension of his father’s belief about the origin of mental illness. His position was

---

[653] Ibid.
[654] There were limits to Bodelschwingh’s interest in eugenics. In the same speech he staunchly opposed eugenically motivated euthanasia because of the ethical dilemmas associated with taking a life.
[655] “Beitrag F. v. Bodelschwingh,” Protokol der Fachkonferenz für Eugenik I, *Archiv des diakonischen Werkes (ADW), CA/G 1800/1*, 85; see also Schleiermacher, *Sozialethik im Spannungsfeld von Sozial- und Rassenhygiene*, 230–31.
[656] Ibid.
[657] Hong, *Welfare, Modernity and the Weimar State,* 256–57.

the perfect combination of his father's traditional philosophy and his interest in modern science.

Ultimately, the discussions at Treysa were compiled into a resolution outlining the position of the Inner Mission on questions of eugenics. While the document strictly rejected euthanasia and eugenically motivated abortion, it came out strongly in favor of surgical sterilization. Echoing the concerns of the conference's participants, it clearly stated that the economic crises resulted in a scenario in which the Inner Mission no longer possessed the resources to care for a substantial number of people. Therefore, sterilization could reduce the future costs that Protestant social welfare providers would have to bear.

Even more noteworthy, however, was the religious justification the resolution provided for surgical sterilization. Parroting Bodelschwingh's speech almost verbatim, it insinuated that mental illness was a form of sin and thus social welfare providers had an obligation to eradicate it at its root. "For the Holy Gospel does not demand the unconditional integrity of the body [die unbedingte Unversehrheit des Leibes]. Should its God-given functions lead in this or that member of the whole to evil or to the destruction of God's kingdom, there exists not just the right but the moral duty of charity toward others [Nächstenliebe] to sterilize, a responsibility that not only the current but also future generations have imposed upon us."[658] By providing material and theological arguments in favor of sterilization, the Treysa resolution heavily shaped the way in which

[658] "Die Treysaer Resolution des Central-Ausschusses für Innere Mission (1931)," in *Eugenik, Sterilisation, "Euthanasie,"* 106–10; see also "Niederschrift über die Beratungen der Fachkonferenz für Eugenik vom 18.-20. Mai 1931 in Treysa," *HAB 2/38–144*.

Protestants eventually interpreted and implemented the Nazi law for compulsory sterilization.[659]

For example, when the Nazis enacted the Law for the Prevention of Hereditarily Diseased Offspring (Gesetz zur Verhütung erbkranken Nachwuchses*)* on July 14, 1933, Paul Braune, the Director of the German Hostel Association and a close associate of Bodelschwingh's, voiced his support for its decision to target individuals deemed incapable of work for sterilization. In October 1933 he wrote:

> The unemployed beggar, morbid hikers and the notorious drinker. They have no right to migrate. The new Reich will have the power (which the Weimar Republic did not possess) to proceed against them with coercive measures. We will have to come to a Preservation Act also for those people. Perhaps medical measures are also needed that make these people harmless for the Volk. The improvement begins here today (1933).[660]

During the early years of the Third Reich, Braune even went so far as to advocate in favor of *"*Beggar KZs*"* so that one could "clean" the streets of migrant laborers who did not want to work.[661] Like Bodelschwingh, Braune was a sharp critic of the Weimar welfare state and worried about the potential damage migrant workers would do to the larger Volk. Although he later risked his life to protest the Nazi murder of the handicapped, Braune initially looked upon the Third Reich positively as a force that would do whatever necessary to restore Germany's demographic strength.[662]

At Bethel, following the law's passage, Dietrich and Villinger identified 2,510 candidates for sterilization by April 1935. Of those, Dietrich helped to file 512

---

[659] For more on the churches and Nazi era eugenics see Kurt Nowak, *"Euthanasie" und Sterilisierung im "Dritten Reich". Die Konfrontation der evangelischen und katholischen Kirche mit dem Gesetz zur Verhütung erbkranken Nachwuchses und die "Euthanasie"-Aktion* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1977).
[660] Paul Braune, "Die Wandererfürsorge im Dritten Reich," *Der Wanderer* 50 (1933): 174-87, at 182.
[661] Ibid., 186; Pohl, *Zwischen protestantischer Ethik*, 142–43.
[662] For more on Braune see Jan Cantow and Jochen-Christoph Kaiser, *Paul Gerhard Braune (1887–1954): Ein Mann der Kirche und Diakonie in schwieriger Zeit* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2005).

applications of which 308 were ultimately fulfilled.[663] As an early supporter of the German Christian movement, Dietrich likely would have agreed with the group's position on eugenics and sterilization.[664] In a 1932 group platform, the German Christian leader Joachim Hossenfelder proclaimed that the entities of "*Rasse, Volkstum und Nation*" were "gifts from God" and that the Inner Mission, as a Protestant organization, had a special obligation to defend and protect those entities.[665] It was no surprise then, that Dietrich played a "pioneering role" in implementing sterilization in Wilhelmsdorf and Eckardtsheim.[666]

***

Even though Bodelschwingh and the leaders of the Bethel institute had encountered eugenic ideas during the first decade of the twentieth century, they failed to take root in Bethel until after 1918. In this respect the outcome of the war was essential to explaining the dramatic shift in the attitudes of German Protestants to eugenics. Having believed they were ordained by God to emerge from the war victorious, Protestants closely aligned themselves with the state as they confidently predicted a German victory. In the end, however, they suffered a crisis of faith as they were at a loss to explain Germany's defeat.

At Bethel, this disaster resulted in the institute's leaders questioning the continued viability of the Bodelschwingh philosophy. Having witnessed immense suffering as they

---

[663] Schmuhl, "30. Eckardtsheim und der Nationalsozialismus," in *Bethel-Eckardtsheim*, 462–63.
[664] For more on the German Christian movement see Doris Bergen, *Twisted Cross: The German Christian Movement in the Third Reich* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996).
[665] Joachim Hossenfelder, "Richtlinien der Glaubensbewegung Deutsche Christen vom 26. Mai 1932," in *Eugenik, Sterilisation*, *"Euthanasie,": Politische Biologie in Deutschland, 1896-1945*: *Eine Dokumentation* ed. Jochen Christoph Kaiser, Kurt Nowak, Michael Schwartz (Berlin: Buchverlag Union, 1992), 110; see also Kurt Dietrich Schmidt, ed., *Die Bekentnisse und grundsätzlichen Äußerungen zur Kirchenfrage des Jahres 1933* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht,1934), 136.
[666] Schmuhl, "30. Eckardtsheim und der Nationalsozialismus," in *Bethel-Eckardtsheim*, 461.

were unable to procure enough resources to care for all of the community's residents, the social workers at Bethel turned to eugenic practices like sterilization as a way to eliminate future suffering and reduce the demands placed on the institute. At the same time, profoundly nationalistic Bethel's leaders, like many Protestants, were concerned about the long-term demographic impact of the war. By consuming the youngest and healthiest members of the nation, they feared that it left the weakest members of society to repopulate it. The expanded nature of the Weimar welfare state only exacerbated these concerns. Unless this tension was addressed aggressively, they worried it would cause Germany to fall even further in the pantheon of so-called *Kulturnationen*. Eugenics, therefore, was their only hope to prevent an irreversible fall from grace.

When Germany was rocked by yet another economic disaster in 1929, Bodelschiwingh and the leaders of the Inner Mission translated their rhetoric into action. In order to articulate a clear platform on eugenics, Hans Harmsen organized a series of conferences in which Protestant leaders reiterated their concerns over rising costs, increasing demand, and rapidly shrinking budgets. Reminding his colleagues about the impact of World War I, Bodelschwingh vividly recalled the suffering caused by shortages during the war and urged his colleagues to find a policy that would allow them to avoid reliving that nightmare. Furthermore, he and Harmsen insisted that the organization needed to use its resources efficiently and direct them at individuals who would do the most to help rebuild the weakened *Volk.* In this situation, eugenics was the silver bullet solution that simultaneously addressed both concerns.

In addition to addressing his larger concerns about the future of the nation, eugenics also appealed to Bodelschwingh for practical reasons. Since the later years of

his father's tenure, Bethel became embroiled in a growing conflict between the religious leadership and the professional medical staff. While both Bodelschwingh and his father were able to mitigate the conflicts related to professionalization through a selective hiring practice before 1914, this route was no longer open after the war. To the physicians, Bethel was no longer viewed as an attractive career destination. Faced with a medical staff that lacked cohesion, and was increasingly assertive and potentially hostile, Bodelshwingh used Simon's psychiatric reforms coupled with eugenic ideas to integrate the physicians into the community.

Despite the growing support for eugenics among Protestants in Germany, however, the attitude was far from unanimous. Upon returning to Germany from Africa in 1918, the Bethel missionaries had been almost entirely insulated from the professionalization debates at Bethel and the devastating experience of war. Based on their experiences in Africa, they still insisted that Bodelschwingh's traditional *Arbeitserziehung* philosophy should shape social welfare at Bethel. When they learned of the increased process of professionalization at Bethel, they used their access to Bethel's levers of power, especially the influential Dankort, to voice their concerns and defend Bodelschwingh's legacy. As a result, this struggle formed the core component of their postwar mission to the Heimat.

Chapter 6: Bodelschwingh's Philosophy Defended: The Bethel Missionaries and Eugenics, 1914–1933

The impact of World War I on the Bethel institute in Bielefeld was nothing short of devastating. Despite its best planning efforts, the community was not prepared to endure an all-consuming conflict that dragged on for more than four years. The toll was so great that it caused Bethel's leadership seriously to reconsider their commitment to Bodelschwingh's philosophy of *Arbeitserziehung*, community and religion. Not only did it fail to resolve the immediate problem of resource scarcity, but it also continued to create conflict with Bethel's growing staff of professional physicians. At the same time, it did nothing to revitalize the German national body, about which many Protestant leaders were especially concerned. Therefore, over the course of the 1920s, Bethel's leaders found themselves increasingly interested in scientific ideas like eugenics and its applicability to the care offered at Bethel.

When war broke out in the summer of 1914, the famous Bethel *Missionsinspektor* Walter Trittelwitz feared that if the war dragged on for years, it would also harm the mission to East Africa.[667] In his mind, the mission was the most vulnerable component of the greater Bethel community and a major war posed a lethal threat to its overseas mission work. Sure enough, the war did temporarily end the mission's work in East Africa when British soldiers evicted the Bethel missionaries and Germany was stripped of its colonies in the Versailles Treaty. Yet, Trittelwitz's dire prediction did not entirely come to pass. Upon returning to Germany, the Bethel missionaries believed it would

[667] Walter Trittelwitz, "Ein halbes Jahrhundert im Dienste von Bethel, 1898–1948, Volume 7: Bethel im Weltkriege," in *Hauptarchiv der von Bodelschwingh'schen Anstalten Bethel* (*HAB*), 2/89–7, 640–47.

only be a matter of time before they would allowed to return to their communities in Tanganyika and sought temporary appointments in Bielefeld that would allow them to leave again on short notice. At the same time, believing that many Protestants had gone astray, they devoted themselves to the idea of a *Heimatsmission* in order to bring their countrymen back to the church. In this context, many of them joined Bethel's Dankort, or public relations center, as a way to carry out their new mission.

Although they touched upon many themes, the missionaries were particularly upset about Bethel's decision to incorporate scientific ideas like eugenics into its notions of social welfare. Trained largely under the tutelage of "father" Bodelschwingh, they firmly believed that problems such as poverty were social in nature, not biological. Therefore, any solution that did not embrace his philosophy was both incomplete and ineffective. To this end, through a variety of methods, the missionaries devoted themselves to combatting the influence of eugenics at Bethel while reasserting the centrality of Bodelschwingh's philosophy to social welfare at Bethel.

This chapter will begin by briefly discussing the experiences of the Bethel missionaries during the war. While they suffered hardships, I argue that their wartime experience was not nearly as traumatic as that of their colleagues in Germany. Therefore, it never caused them to question their faith in Bodelschwingh's philosophy, and they emerged from the war just as committed to it as when they left for Africa. As a result, upon returning to Bielefeld they made the Bethel philosophy a core element of their *Heimatsmission* and in the process became the primary opposition to those Protestant leaders who were in favor of adopting eugenics. For them, issues like poverty, alcoholism, and mental illness all required intense spiritual therapy, which eugenics had

completely ignored. Through their work in the field with impoverished communities, numerous written publications, and an innovative film agency, the missionaries made it very clear that eugenics was not compatible with their vision of Protestant social welfare.

Ultimately, taken together with the attitudes of their colleagues in Bielefeld, the Bethel missionaries' opposition to eugenics demonstrates that interest in scientific racism and radical ideas did not always result from the colonial experience. In the case of Bethel, it was quite the opposite. On one level, the colonial experience reinforced their faith in the continued effectiveness of Bodelschiwngh's philosophy. Furthermore, by observing communities in the Usambara highlands the missionaries could see that one's capacity to work did not result from one's race. Therefore, the claims of reformers in Germany about the effectiveness of eugenics simply did not hold up when compared to the experiences of the missionaries in Africa. Furthermore, their activities upon returning to Germany significantly complicate our understanding of the colonial legacy in Germany and its influence on the racial policies of the Nazi regime. As this chapter will clearly demonstrate, there is no direct path from the colonies to Auschwitz.

***

As the Bethel community came alive in the summer of 1914 to demonstrate its support for the war, Walter Trittelwitz described a more subdued attitude within the mission. At a 25 August wedding ceremony for a missionary couple about to depart for Africa, he made a point of noting the somber atmosphere. "The Zions Church was without adornment. Without crown and veil, the bride stood before the altar in simple black clothes."[668] According to Trittelwitz, the missionaries were apprehensive because they recognized that of all the Bethel initiatives, theirs would be the most threatened by

---

[668] Ibid., 642.

an international conflict. Not only did the war severely curtail their ability to fundraise, but the state also requisitioned mission houses for use as military hospitals.[669] Furthermore, Bethel's leadership also recognized that the war made it significantly more difficult to commission new missionaries for service in Africa. As a result, it cancelled a planned departure of new missionaries that was scheduled for 28 August and decided to wait until after the war to resume sending missionaries to the colonies.[670]

One of the reasons why the Bethel leadership decided to stop sending new missionaries was because German East Africa became a theater of combat that was active through the end of 1916. Believing he could strategically divert British and French soldiers from Europe, the colony's Defence Force commander, Colonel Paul von Lettow-Vorbeck set out to provoke a full-scale war in East Africa in 1914.[671] The result was a brilliant four-year campaign that historians have recognized as one of the great examples of guerilla warfare.[672] For the Bethel missionaries, however, Lettow-Vorbeck's campaign effectively severed their ties with the main community in Bielefeld.

Despite their lack of regular contact with Europe, the Bethel missionaries were nevertheless able to continue their work relatively undisturbed through 1916. Initially, the missionaries focused their efforts in Africa on gathering information about the war in Europe and continuing their daily routines Ernst Johanssen wrote that his community in Rwanda first heard about the declaration of war late on the night of 8 August, and that his station did not directly experience the war through the end of 1914. Furthermore, he

---

[669] Ibid., 647.
[670] Gustav Menzel, *Die Bethel Mission: Aus 100 Jahren Missionsgeschichte* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Verlag des Erziehungsvereins GmbH, 1986), 233. Those missionaries who remained in Bielefeld tended to serve as pastors to wounded soldiers or military chaplains on the frontlines of combat.
[671] John Iliffe, *A Modern History of Tanganyika* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 241.
[672] For more on Lettow-Vorbeck and his campaign in East Africa see: William Weir, *Guerilla Warfare: Irregular Warfare in the Twentieth Century* (Mechanicsburg, PA: Stackpole Books, 2008), 46–58.

noted that the missionaries' main fear, that the Africans would rise up in revolt when they heard about the war, never came to pass.[673] Although they also worried about possible encounters with British and French colonial troops, Johansssen indicates that the missionaries continued to perform their regular tasks into the second year of the conflict. They even tried to support the war effort by gathering food for soldiers fighting on the Eastern front.[674] Even though they were on the geographic margins of the war, the missionaries still thought it important to do what they could to display their patriotism.

If the missionaries had one major fear about the war, it centered on the possibility they would be drafted into military service. As Trittelwitz explained, a "large number" of missionaries actively served in combat, and several of them sustained serious injuriess.[675] Johanssen vividly describes how one missionary was wounded in the stomach and spent a significant amount of time recovering.[676] Danger also did not end once a soldier escaped or surrendered to the enemy, as Trittelwitz graphically described the grotesque fate of one missionary who found himself captured by the Belgians. After being captured, Fritz Achtman "was brought to a prison camp by a black soldier. On the way, he was murdered by the Askari. His body has become prey to the hyenas, only a few remnants of it have been found and buried."[677] In addition to their fears about African violence, this story also reflects the German belief that the Belgians were especially brutal. In the end, however, only missionaries of military age would have been called into service and the Bethel mission was able to continue its work with little concern for the fighting.

---

[673] Ernst Johanssen, *Führung und Erfahrung in 40 jährigem Missionsdienst: Band II* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1935), 181–82.
[674] Ibid., 187.
[675] Trittelwitz, "Ein halbes Jahrhundert im Dienste von Bethel, 1898–1948, Volume 7: Bethel im Weltkriege," in *HAB*, 2/89–7, 685.
[676] Johanssen, *Führung und Erfahrung, Band II*, 183–86.
[677] Trittelwitz, "Ein halbes Jahrhundert im Dienste von Bethel, 1898–1948, Volume 7: Bethel im Weltkriege," in *HAB*, 2/89–7, 686.

By the middle of 1916 though, the fighting began to threaten directly the mission communities and the Bethel missionaries abandoned their stations under advisement from the colonial authorities. The lone exception was Johanssen, who refused to leave his station in Rwanda.[678] By the end of 1916 nearly all the Bethel missionaries had abandoned their stations, and and most of them became prisoners of war. Those who managed to evade capture had fled to more established communities in the remote Usambara highlands where they remained until 1917 when the region fell under British control.[679] Once they were captured, the missionaries were detained in prisoner of war camps until they were deported back to Europe. Once they arrived in Europe they remained imprisoned until the end of the war, at which point they were released back to Germany.

While the Bethel missionaries certainly experienced their share of stress and trauma throughout this period, their letters and memoirs indicate that they had a very different wartime experience than their colleagues back in Germany. Most notably, the missionaries very rarely complained about a lack of food. Even by the end of 1916, those individuals who evaded capture in the field insisted they had more than enough food to survive. "Every Saturday I can bake a cake, and we have also often slaughtered, sometimes a pig, sometimes a sheep or a goose; we also have enough potatoes."[680] Clearly, the missionaries were not struggling to negotiate the difficult decisions faced by Bethel's leadership in Bielefeld.

---

[678] Trittelwitz, "Ein halbes Jahrhundert im Dienste von Bethel, 1898–1948, Volume 7: Bethel im Weltkriege," in *HAB*, 2/89–7, 689.
[679] Trittelwitz, "Ein halbes Jahrhundert im Dienste von Bethel, 1898–1948, Volume 7: Bethel im Weltkriege," in *HAB*, 2/89–7, 691.
[680] Letter from W. Trittelwitz to die Angehörigen und Freunde unserer Missionsarbeiter in Usambara. 22 January 1917, *HAB* 2/51–8.

Even after their capture, the Bethel missionaries continued to enjoy significantly better conditions than those in Europe, despite their complaints to the contrary. Upon being captured by the Belgians, Johanssen's wife complained that the family lived in "strict confinement" in the camp.[681] She bemoaned the fact that the Belgians requisitioned most of the supplies the mission had meticulously accumulated before the war, and that the family was now dependent on their captors. When she complained about food, it was not that there was a shortage, but that the Belgians only shared a limited amount with her family. She relates that they had to go to great lengths to sneak potatoes and meat past their Belgian guards.[682] There was still plenty of food available, and if the Johanssens pressured individual guards long enough they almost certainly got more food, especially for the children.[683] Therefore, even under the supposedly brutal Belgians, the conditions experienced by the Johanssens were remarkably better than those that prevailed in Germany.

It is also unlikely that the missionaries purposefully withheld requests to relatives in Germany so as to avoid burdening them with additional concerns. They did not hesitate to send requests for things like books and tobacco.[684] At the same time it is also clear that they did not send these requests because they were woefully unaware of the state of the war. While communication may not have been great, missionaries nevertheless remained remarkably well-informed about the war and its impact on the

[681] Johanssen, *Führung und Erfahrung, Band II*, 191.
[682] Ibid., 193.
[683] Ibid., 203
[684] Copy of a letter from Herrn Pflanzer Hedde aus Usambara, Deutsch-Ostafrika – z. Zt. Kriegsgefangenen in Ahmednagar, Indien. 2 January 1917, *HAB* 2/51–8; Letter from Diakon (Reinhard) Grotz aus Ruanda, z. Zt. Kriegsgefangenen in Indien, 2 January 1917, *HAB* 2/51–8.

home front.[685] As he waited for a Belgian ship to take him back to Europe, Ernst Johanssen received permission to visit regularly the local library where he had access not only to French newspapers but also to telegrams from the continent. After a while he writes "with time we got a clear picture of our situation."[686] It is clear, therefore, that most missionaries made their requests with at least some knowledge of the situation back home.

Ultimately, most missionaries acknowledged that they were treated fairly well by their captors. While they did not hesitate to voice their frustration when they experienced problems, their complaints were relatively petty and bordered on ridiculous, especially when compared to the experiences of those in Germany. For example, as she left Rwanda as a Belgian prisoner of war, the wife of one missionary complained bitterly about the local African population. "We have lost everything on the way, and did not once have a porter. In Urundi the natives were very bad; I did not once have a porter for my child and had to carry him myself." Yet, even without servents, Frau v. d. Heyden acknowledged that the Belgians treated her well. "We received very good care; the Belgians even gave us European food. Until now it was not hard to be prisoners who were free."[687] Besides displaying an astonishing lack of self-awareness, ironically her letter effectively undermined German claims about Belgian brutality.

One of the major exceptions to this trend was Ernst Johanssen, who complained about his family's awful treatment by the Belgians as they traveled back to Europe. Even though his family stayed in a "first class" cabin on the steam ship that ferried them up the

---

[685] For confusion see Trittelwitz, "Ein halbes Jahrhundert im Dienste von Bethel, 1898–1948," Volume 7: Bethel im Weltkriege," in *HAB*, 2/89–7, 684; also see *HAB* 2/51–8.
[686] Johanssen, *Führung und Erfahrung, Band II*, 206.
[687] Letter from the Frau des Missions-Diakonen v. d. Heyden in Ruanda, z. Zt. Gefangenen in Tabora, 30 November, 1916, *HAB* 2/51–8.

Atlantic, they nevertheless felt horribly mistreated. Their cabin was entirely too small for a large family, he complained, forcing his two youngest daughters to sleep on the floor. To add insult to injury, Johanssen wrote that he awoke on the first morning of the journey only to discover that Belgian sailors had thrown their furniture overboard. "So we saw that the attitude was against us. Fellow passengers from England were appalled by the bad treatment that we received."[688] Unlike v. d. Heyden's complaint, however, Johanssen wrote his account several years after the fact as part of a larger memoir. By emphasizing the degree to which his family suffered on their voyage back to Europe, Johanssen is trying to show that even though they were on a different continent, the missionaries nevertheless shared a similar experience with his friends back in Europe. Like v. d. Heyden, Johanssen's complaints were notably banal compared to the challenges experienced on the German homefront. By trying to demonstrate to create a common bond with those who suffered through the war in Europe, Johanssen also exhibits a remarkable lack of self-awareness. The absurdity of these complaints became evident once the missionaries arrived back in Europe and transferred into POW camps. As Gustav von Bodelschwingh noted in 1917, the conditions in Europe were decidedly worse than those in Africa. "The situation of the imprisoned women and children in France remains bleak."[689] Once they arrived in Europe, the complaints lodged by missionaries about their treatment became noticeably more significant, and similar to their colleagues in Germany. In early 1917, the wife of missionary Grotz wrote that she and her children were held prisoner in the pig sty of a slaughter house. The conditions

[688] Johanssen, *Führung und Erfahrung, Band II*, 212–3.
[689] Letter from Gustav von Bodelschwingh, interned in Weggis, Switzerland (no date), *HAB* 2/51–9.

were extremely unsanitary and by late May 1917 Frau Grotz suffered from fever, dysentery and near constant illness.[690]

From his prison camp in Switzerland, Gustav von Bodelschwingh wrote that winter had brought with it a severe coal shortage, leaving nothing for the German prisoners. Curious about the situation in Germany, he asked his friends back in Bielefeld if the "civilian situation is different?" Furthermore, he also noted a food shortage in the camp, as the local, French civilian population protested the availability to the Germans of valuable food stuffs such as milk, eggs and butter. Interestingly enough though, Bodelschwingh never expressed any animosity against his French captors, writing that they were "correct" to be upset that German prisoners had access to valuable foods and that they did not.[691] For the first time, however, the missionaries began to realize just how much worse things were in Europe compared to Africa.

Still, not everyone recognized that the situation in Europe was dramatically different. In a letter to Bethel from May 1917 Ernst Johanssen's wife complained about the lack of furniture in a French POW camp. Specifically, she complained that no one gave her a chair on which to sit, forcing her to sit on her suitcase. "There has been a gross impertinence to the woman with a bad back, not even to let her have a chair."[692] At the same time, she also noted that while "the food was good and sufficient for healthy people," she "suffered much" from a headache and wanted a "special diet" as a result.[693]

---

[690] "Die Lage der gefangenen Missionare aus Ostafrika im Gefangenen Lager Saintes. Ergänzung," *HAB* 2/51-9; "Karte von Frau Grotz," 26 May 1917, *HAB* 2/51–9.
[691] Letter from Gustav von Bodelschwingh, interned in Weggis, Switzerland (no date), *HAB* 2/51–9.
[692] "Zur Lage der ostafrikanischen Missionare im Gefangenen-Lager Saintes. Ergänzung," *HAB* 2/51–9.
[693] "Die Lage der gefangenen Missionare aus Ostafrika im Gefangenen Lager Saintes. Ergänzung," *HAB* 2/51–9.

It is hard to imagine that the recipient of her letter in Bielefeld felt much sympathy for Johanssen's predicament.

When taken together, it is clear that missionaries experienced the war very differently than their friends and colleagues in Europe. Most of them were able to continue working through 1916 relatively undisturbed. While the escalating guerilla warfare eventually forced them to flee, they never experienced the devastating hardships that those at the main Bethel campus in Bielefeld endured. After they surrendered to the British and Belgians, they remained better off than those in Europe. At no point did they have to decide how they would stretch extraordinarily small supplies of food as far as possible. Even those missionaries who complained about food readily acknowledged that they had more than enough to eat. Their complaints were rooted in desire rather than need. Only when they returned to Europe did the missionaries begin to understand the serious pressure under which their families and colleagues lived on a regular basis. Suddenly food and heat became very real concerns. In their weakened states many of the missionaries also found themselves suffering from a variety of illnesses.

Ultimately, this disparity is essential to explaining why the missionaries emerged from the war equally devoted to Bodelschwingh's philosophy as when they initially departed for Africa. Bethel's leaders in Bielefeld who moved away from Bodelschwingh's philosophy after 1918 did so because of the numerous pressures they faced within the institute. The catastrophic shortages could not be resolved through a strict adherence to the traditional Bethel approach to social welfare. As their letters and memoirs demonstrate, the missionaries never experienced suffering to a degree that forced them to question their devotion to Bodelschwingh's ideas. Only after they arrived

at POW camps in Europe did the missionaries begin to understand the full impact of the war. This experience was one of the main factors that caused the missionaries to become such staunch critics of Bethel's philosophical shift during the 1920s.

***

While the missionaries' wartime experience was essential to explaining the development of their postwar attitude to ideas like eugenics, their faith in Bodelschwingh's philosophy would not have been so strong if they did not believe it was effective. To this end, their experiences in Africa only reinforced their belief in the ability of Bodelschwingh's philosophy to integrate marginalized populations. Paul Wohlrab, reflecting on a twenty-five-year career in the Usambara highlands, argued that Bodelschwingh's emphasis on education and family structure helped create the stable communities that were vital to converting people to Christianity.. In his experience, the creation and maintenance of strong Christian communities began with the principles of order, and family and "grew with the inner obligation of Christians to regular work in the community…"[694] Taken together, he believed these ideas were essential to any success the missionaries experienced in Africa.

There is even evidence that Africans who interacted with the Bethel missionaries believed that they helped to integrate them more into the greater imperial structure. Born right after the Bethel missionaries departed Africa, Wilson B. Niwagila describes how his community recalled how the missionaries played a vital role in relieving tensions between his community and the colonial authorities. "The arrival of the Bethel-Mission in Buhaja/Karagwe helped to bridge over the tensions between the German colonial

[694] Paul Wohlrab, *Usambara: Werden und Wachsen einer heidenchristlichen Gemeinde in Deutsch-Ostafrika* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Bethel Verlag, 1915), 130.

government and the evangelical Christians in this area."[695] The attitudes of people like Niwagila would have only reinforced the missionaries' confidence in their approach to social welfare.

The confidence of the missionaries in their methods is also clearly evident in Bokermann's accounts of his work at Lutindi, the centerpiece of the EMDOA. In his description of the first mentally disabled individuals, Kabenga and Mbruki, to arrive at the station for help, Bokermann distinctly noted that it was the individual who embraced the Bodelschwingh philosophy, Mbruki, who found redemption at Lutindi.[696] Although he refused to work when he first arrived, Bokerman noted that Mbruki was open to working with the missionaries.[697] Thus, Mbruki exemplified the positive aspects of Bodelschwingh's approach to social welfare. Furthermore, these experiences served to reinforce the faith the missionaries had in the redemptive potential of their methods.

In addition to their unwavering belief in the effectiveness of Bodelschwingh's philosophy, the missionaries' interaction with the Schambala also caused them to be very skeptical of claims that the capacity to work was a biological trait. When he observed Shambala villages in Usambara, Johannsen clearly noted that in his estimation the inhabitants were not averse to working. Not only did they value the importance of agricultural work, but they also made a point of instilling those values in their children. Although the Shambala organized their farms in a way that was different from Europeans, it did not symbolize an inability to work. In fact, Johannsen notes that the

---

[695] Wilson B. Niwagila, "Wie die Haya/Nyambo-Christen die Bethel-Mission erfahren haben," in *Die diakonische Dimension der Mission: Vorträge zum 100jährigen Jubiläum der Bethel-Mission*, 41-50 (Bielefeld: von Bodelschwingh'schen Anstalten, 1987), at 43.
[696] Wilhelm Bokermann, "Ein 'EBEN-EZER' der Irrenstalt in Lutindi in West-Usambera (früher Deutsch-Ostafrika," *VEM, MII 2.15 M274*, 4-6.
[697] Ibid., 6.

crops appeared “clean and well maintained.”[698] At the same time he also noted that when he looked to approach people, the subject of field work was also an effective way to break the ice.[699] Therefore, the claims made by advocates of eugenics simply did not hold up for the missionaries when compared to their own experiences in Africa.

When they returned to Bethel in 1918 the missionaries were disturbed to find a community not only embroiled in chaos, but one that also appeared to be moving away from Bodelschwingh’s philosophy. While they hoped to return quickly to Africa, by 1919 it was clear that the peace settlement would prevent them from doing so in the short term. While a select few managed to catch on quickly with a Dutch-Protestant mission to South East Asia, this number was never greater than half a dozen. The vast majority of missionaries sought employment in a variety of fields back in Germany. Those individuals who were formally trained social workers found new employment through Bethel’s Nazareth House, a center for training male social workers. Many other missionaries who had theological training found callings as small parish pastors in the surrounding region.[700]

Given all the chaos that surrounded Bethel in 1918, the Mission’s leaders feared that its future was in grave danger. As a result, they returned to the idea of the *Heimatsmission* (mission to the homeland), which was first articulated by Walter Trittelwitz in 1913 as something to hold the mission together while the poltical turmoil played out in Germany.[701] Initially, Trittelwitz promoted the idea of *Heimatsmission* as

[698] Ernst Johanssen, *Führung und Erfahrung in 40 jährigem Missionsdienst: Band II* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1935), 67.
[699] Ibid., 120.
[700] Trittelwitz, “Ein halbes Jahrhundert im Dienste von Bethel, 1898–1948,” Volume 7: Bethel im Weltkriege,” in *HAB*, 2/89–7, 779.
[701] W. Michaelis, “Pflüget ein Neues! Gedanken über Heidenmission und Heimatmission,” *Evangelisches Missions-Magazin* (1919): 249–53.

something that could tie the overseas mission more directly to the larger work of the Bethel community. To this end he asked:

> Should we no longer search for a tighter connection and thus become even more (i.e. in addition to the letters and lectures, which the mission society distributes across the homeland through its representatives) important people, in which we go here and there in Germany to serve with the Word, in order to awaken and care for Christian life?[702]

In this new context, using the theme of evangelization, the *Heimatsmission* encouraged the missionaries to engage public audiences through a series of lectures and discussions. Not only did these events give the missionaries an opportunity to raise spiritual questions, but it also allowed them to highlight publicly the importance of the mission to Bethel as well as the significance of Bethel's relationship to Germany.

At the same time, the Bethel Mission's *Heimatmission* dovetailed nicely with the emergence of an organized *Volksmission* in Westphalia after the war. An extension of the nineteenth century Awakening and the ideas of Johann Wichern, proponents of the *Volksmission* sought to combat the growth of "mass movements and the increasingly clearer tendency of secularization in society."[703] In an attempt to win disaffected invididuals back to the church, the Westphalian *Volksmission* emphasized the importance of ideas like the improvement of living conditions and the development of a strong work ethic. Aware of the similarities between their agenda and that of the Bethel Missionaries, the leaders of the *Volksmission* encouraged the returning missionaries to pursue their *Heimatsmission*.[704]

---

[702] Trittelwitz quoted in Menzel, *Bethel Mission*, 259.
[703] Wolfgang Günther, "Die Entwicklung der organisierten Volksmission in Westfalen während der Weimarer Republik," in *Aufbruch in soziale Verantwortung II: Beispiele kirchlicher sozialer Arbeit in Westfalen während der Weimarer Republik*, ed. Wolfgang Belitz, Günter Brakelmann, and Norbert Friedrich, 101–46 (Waltrop: Hartmut Spenner, 2004), 105.
[704] Ibid., 110.

On its surface, the much-heralded *Heimatmission* appeared to be nothing more than an elaborate propaganda effort on behalf of Bethel and the mission. "We were bound not only by our love of the mission, but also by the love of Bethel and honor for father Bodelschwingh."[705] In one case, Trittelwitz described how he took advantage of a contact in Württemburg so that he could "tell stories about father Bodelschwingh."[706] By speaking with Protestant congregations across Germany, the missionaries were sure to raise awareness of Bethel outside of East Westphalia and in the process encourage these congregations to support the community's work financially. To be sure, in a period of great financial uncertainty, this was certainly one of the *Heimatmission*'s main goals.

Yet at the same time the missionaries saw themselves engaged in a struggle in which the stakes were arguably much higher. When they returned, to Bethel they found a community that was very different from the one they left before the war. They were especially disappointed to discover the extent to which scientific ideas had made inroads within the community. To them, this represented an alarming move away from the philosophy that had defined Bethel for nearly fifty years. More than anything else, as Trittelvitz indicated in his memoirs, the goal of the *Heimatmission* was to guarantee Bodelschwingh's legacy as well as one of his most significant endeavors – the mission to East Africa. As Ingo Stucke notes, Bodelschwingh organized the community as if it were one large, extended family with himself as the father.[707] Those who worked at Bethel understood themselves largely as Bodelschwingh's students or children. The result of

---

[705] Trittelwitz, "Ein halbes Jahrhundert im Dienste von Bethel, 1898–1948," Volume 7: Bethel im Weltkriege," in *HAB*, 2/89–7, 784.
[706] Ibid., 784.
[707] Ingo Stucke, "Bethel-Gemeinde und Bethel-Mission: Rückwirkungen und Einflüsse der Äusseren Mission auf die diakonische "corporate identity" Bethels 1906–1946," in *Bethels Mission (3) Mutterhaus, Mission und Pflege*, ed. Matthias Benad and Vicco von Bülow, 171–252 (Bielefeld: Luther-Verlag, 2003), 176–77.

this organizational structure is that it engendered a strong devotion and deep sense of loyalty to Bodelschwingh and his ideas.

For the Bethel missionaries, therefore, the goal of their postwar *Heimatmission* was not only to effect a spiritual reawakening in Germany, but also specifically to teach Germans about Bodelschwingh's philosophy and reassert his legacy. Out of loyalty to a man they considered both a teacher and a father-figure, the missionaries were determined to ensure that his ideas did not become irrelevant as Bethel's leaders tried to redefine the institue's identity. Through the *Heimatsmission* they sought to reassert the relevancy of *Arbeitserziehung* to Bethel's philosophy while keeping Bodelschwingh as the public face of postwar Bethel.

Even though a number of missionaries found new callings after the war, many of them did not want to devote themselves to a cause that would tie them down indefinitely. They hoped their exile from East Africa would only be temporary, and that the British would quickly allow them to return to their mission stations. Therefore, rather than assume the role of a small parish pastor, the majority of the Bethel missionaries sought callings in Bielefeld that would allow them to support the *Heimatmission* but give them the flexibility to return to Africa as soon as possible. To this end, most of the missionaries took jobs in Bethel's vast public relations network called the Dankort.[708]

Initially the Dankort's name reflected its purpose within the Bethel community. When someone made a donation, the Dankort acknowledged the gift with a letter and some literature about the institute's mission. The Dankort, however, did much more than distribute thank-you cards. It also created a wide variety of informational material like

---

[708] For more on the origins of the *Dankort* see Martin Gerhardt, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, Ein Lebensbild aus der deutschen Kirchengeschichte: 2. Band, Das Werk/Zweite Hälfte* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1958), 409–10.

newspapers, journals, pamphlets, books and films intended to promote Bethel throughout Germany.[709] Furthermore, each publication was specifically designed to appeal to a different segment of society. As Wilhelm Heienbrok, the center's director through 1926, wrote: "This is the part of our management, which not only brings together all the work of asking and thanking, but also to supervise the duties of the letter mission of the Sunday Scripture sheet and newspaper business, insofar as they concern us."[710] Therefore, the Dankort had the potential to be both a very powerful and influential institution within Bethel.

The missionaries were certainly aware of its influence, and thought that its focus on public relations work positioned it perfectly to support their *Heimatmission*. As a result, they believed it was vital that they firmly controlled the levers of power at the Dankort. In 1925, when its director and former missionary Wilhelm Heienbrok indicated that he planned soon to retire, the missionaries, led by Walter Trittelvitz, insisted that the department needed to remain firmly in their control. To this end, they maneuvered quickly to ensure that another missionary, Curt Ronicke, would succeed Haienbrok as the head of the Dankort.

Ronicke's appointement was key for a couple of reasons. Not only would he keep the Dankort's energy focused on supporting the larger *Heimatsmission*, but he could also use the department's influence to shore up the Mission's increasingly dire financial outlook. As Trittelvitz stressed in a letter circulated among the Bethel missionaries in June, 1926, the mission had fallen on hard times since the end of the war. "It is not possible to deny that it is now much harder to win money for the mission, as before the

---

[709] Gerhard Jasper, *Wege durch Bethel* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1935), 4.
[710] Heienbrok to Faust (Lepzig), 13 August 1925, *HAB 2/37–10*.

war itself. This is a result not only of poverty in Germany together, but also with the loss of the colonies."[711] Germans simply were not interested in donating what little money they had to what appeared to be a lost cause. "For the works of charity here in the homeland, the donations flow in much more."[712] To this end he believed that the missionaries' financial quandary could be solved if they could clearly convey to the public that their new *Heimatsmission* was an integral part of Bethel's larger mission. "Only in close cooperation with Bethel could we fulfill our directives. That was certainly father Bodelschwingh's foundational thought."[713] With Ronicke in charge, the missionaries could use the Dankort's resources to further their mission while simultaneously restoring the mission's financial health.

Therefore, in July 1926 Curt Ronicke succeeded Wilhelm Heienbrok as the new leader of Bethel's Dankort.[714] He was quickly joined by several other prominent missionaries. Under the auspices of helping Ronicke with the "many little tasks" the position involved, Trittelvitz also transferred into the department. In reality though, this helped the missionaries to consolidate their control over public relations. "We both wanted to make the connection between the Dankort and the Bethel Mission more secure."[715] At the same time they also recruited Gerhard Jasper from the Moravian Mission in Herrnhut for a dual appointment in the *Dankort* and as the new mission inspector.[716] As Trittelwitz explained in a subsequent letter, Jasper was a particularly welcome addition to the mission because his youth and energy made him perfectly suited

---

[711] Rundschreiben von Trittelvitz, 14 June 1926, *HAB 2/37–10*, 5–6.
[712] Ibid., 6.
[713] Ibid., 6.
[714] "Neuordnung der Dankortleitung," *HAB 2/37–10*.
[715] Rundschreiben von Trittelvitz, 14 June 1926, *HAB 2/37–10*, 8.
[716] Menzel, *Die Bethel Mission,* 268.

to travel the country on behalf of the *Heimatsmission.*[717] To this end, Jasper's appointment letter specifically noted that his duties in the Dankort included working simultaneously in the "Bethel-mission" and "Bethel-institutes" in the pursuit of "*Volksmission* points of view."[718] Together, Trittelwitz was convinced that the triumvirate of himself, Ronicke and Jasper would enable the missionaries to exercise complete control over Dankort. Under their leadership, it would produce a steady stream of material that not only positioned the Mission as an integral part of the larger community, but also highlighted Bodelschwingh's philosophy as the defining element of Bethel's larger social welfare mission.

In addition to its implications for the *Heimatsmission*, the missionaries' reorganization of the Dankort was also significant because it demonstrated a remarkable adaptability and foresight regarding the way in which they pursued their larger agenda. As Trittelvitz noted, "the train of centralization" had grown increasingly stronger at Bethel over the preceeding years, and that interdepartmental collaboration would therefore be a necessity. By specifically noting that the Dankort's leadership held dual appointments with the mission, Trittelvitz believed this would place the missionaries ahead of the curve as the pressure grew to consolidate Bethel's vast bureaucratic network.[719] Their strategy not only insulated the mission from unwanted changes, but it also gave the missionaries a legitimate claim to maintaing control over one of the most influential parts of the Bethel network. Furthermore, it was also a harbinger of a larger

---

[717] Walter Trittelvitz, "Berufung von Pastor Jasper!" 18 October 1926, *Vereinigte Evangelische Missions Archiv* (*VEM*), M 39, Volume 1.
[718] "Dienstanweisung für Herrn Pastor Jasper." 29 August 1927, *VEM* M 39, Volume 1.
[719] Walter Trittelvitz, "Berufung von Pastor Jasper!" 18 October 1926, *VEM*, M 39, Volume 1.

strategy the missionaries pursued, as they were remarkably far sighted and open to embracing new ideas if it helped them to achieve their larger goals.

***

Having solidified their control over the Dankort, the Bethel missionaries concentrated on publicly portraying themselves as central to greater Bethel, representing the community's true conscience. This began with the missionaries maintaining a high public profile and engaging the greater public across Germany at every opportunity. "At larger assemblies throughout Germany the head of the Dankort must also serve with the Word." If Bodelschwingh was unable to appear at an event, "Pastor Ronicke must be his representative."[720] Like Gustav Dietrich, the leader of the worker colonies, Trittelwitz understood that acting as Bodelschwingh's unofficial ambassador was a position that offered significant prestige and influence. By positioning Ronicke to assume that role, Trittelwitz believed he could also enhance the influence exercised by the missionaries. Whereas Dietrich sought to use that role for greater power within Bethel, the missionaries sought to gain greater credibility with people outside the institute. In the eyes of public audiences Ronicke became the second most prominent figure in Bethel after Bodelschwingh. Thus, his presence as Bodelschwingh's alternative effectively moved the Bethel Mission from the geographic periphery of the community to its center while also positioning it as its spiritual and moral heart.

In the same vein, the Dankort's leadership produced a series of written publications that also consciously positioned the missionaries as the true heart and soul of Bethel. In a brief booklet titled *Wege durch Bethel*, Jasper takes readers on a walking tour of the Bethel campus. As he guides readers along, one can clearly discern which

[720] Ibid.

aspects of Bethel he holds up as particularly noteworthy. Unsurprisingly, the first building he describes is the Dankort's headquarters, "Bethel's open window to the outside world."[721] Just like Ronicke's position with relation to Bodelschwingh, Jasper portrays the Dankort as a mediator between the general public and the rest of the community. Furthermore, he also makes a point of tying the Dankort, and by extension the missionaries' *Heimatmission*, directly back to the legacy of Friedrich von Bodelschwingh. "The legacy of father Bodelschwingh, who understood like no other how to express thanks, should remain essential to the correspondence of Bethel with its circle of friends."[722] Thus, the Dankort was important because it both performed a task vital to Bethel's existence and kept in line with Bodelschwingh's greater agenda. Bodelschwingh "placed… a goal before our eyes," Jasper claimed. "Bethel should always remain aware, that the hand of God protects it, and that with God it stands and falls."[723] Given the momentousness of the task, Jasper specifically noted that Fritz von Bodelschwingh chose a missionary, Wilhelm Heienbrok, to lead the department. Furthermore, he noted that it was the Dankort's duty "to administer father Bodelschwingh's legacy, to participate in a competition for the souls of people whom they would like to win for God."[724] The reader would clearly understand that the Dankort, and by extension the missionaries, were the true guarantors of Bodelschwingh's legacy.

After he finished explaining the importance of the Dankort, Jasper continued his literary tour of Bethel by taking readers on a journey that emphasized the aspects of

[721] Gerhard Jasper, *Wege durch Bethel* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlaghandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1934), 3–4.
[722] Ibid., 4.
[723] Ibid., 4.
[724] Ibid., 4.

Bethel most important to the missionaries. In the process, he purposely deemphasized those ideas with which they disagreed. For example, at the buildings Nazareth and Sarepta, Jasper describes the great emphasis Bodelschwingh placed on training Protestant social welfare workers. It was at these buildings where students would have learned the importance of ideas such as *Arbeitserziehung*, and how to apply them practically to social work. To demonstrate their global reach, Jasper told readers how the women from Sarepta carried Bodelschwingh's philosophy well beyond the province of Westphalia, and that some even served overseas. "A large number of them also stand in the service of the Bethel mission in East Africa. Also, how diverse are their tasks: care for the sick and work with poorly educated girls…, artisan schools, schools for the house hold, etc."[725] Although the men did not travel as far from Bielefeld, Jasper asserted that they were equally as devoted to securing Bodelschwingh's legacy by working with "the difficult to educate" in the worker colonies.[726]

Within both the Bethel community and the greater Protestant Inner Mission, Sarepta and Nazareth have always maintained a special place of significance because of their mission to train Protestant social workers. At the same time they were also sites of conflict over the development of professionalized medical care at Bethel during the late nineteenth century.[727] Those in favor of hiring a professionalized medical staff and embracing modern scientific ideas sought also to abandon slowly Bodelschwingh's emphasis on *Arbeitserziehung* as a method with which to treat people with mental disabilities. By extension, this would have also diminished the status of the religiously

[725] Ibid., 6.
[726] Ibid., 6.
[727] Hans-Walter Schmuhl, *Ärzte in der Westfälischen Diakonissenanstalt Sarepta 1890–1970*, ed. Matthias Benad, Forschungsstelle für Diakonie-und Sozialgeschichte an der Kirchlichen Hochschule Bethel (Bielefeld: Bethel Verlag, 2001), 7–14.

trained social workers. By highlighting their close relationship with the mission and the idea of *Arbeitserziehung*, Jasper defined these houses for his readers in a way that clearly reasserted their significance and linked them explicitly with Bodelschwingh's legacy. For the missionaries, Nazareth and Sarepta were not sites of struggle over Bethel's identity, but rather they continued to embody Bodelschwingh's legacy.

Given its centrality to Bodelschwingh's philosophy, *Arbeitserziehung* remained a constant theme of Jasper's tour. After departing Nazareth and Sarepta, he guided readers through Bethel's workshop quarter, the neighborhood where Bethel's social workers implemented the ideas they learned under Bodelschwingh's tutelage. Here, he clearly articulated the missionaries' thoughts on the importance of the work ethic.

> Whoever goes down the craftsmen road and looks into the workshops, must see which industrious work prevails here. According to Father Bodelschwingh's word, working is the best medicine for the sick. Who is sick and can work often knows much more than a healthy person to value work as a gift of God.[728]

By noting that work was the "best medicine," Jasper implicitly rejected the use of modern science and medicine as social welfare tools. The connection to Bodelschwingh also endowed *Arbeitserziehung* with a special degree of authority for his readers, and reasserted its relevance to Bethel's work, despite the emergence of modern ideas like eugenics and psychiatry.

Arbeitserziehung also played a prominent role in Jasper's description of Bethel's Zion Church. Describing a stone wall on the journey up to the church, he noted that the wall was constructed by the "brothers from the highway," and that it was the first time Bodelschwingh employed unemployed migrant workers for an extended period of time. As the workers prepared to depart Bethel upon the project's completion, one of the

---

[728] Jasper, *Wege durch Bethel*, 9.

workers supposedly urged Bodelschwingh to keep the workers around for a longer period. As Bodelschwingh considered the claim, he saw a man "who stood before him in rags and his face was drawn by sin and shame" but someone who could also experience redemption through the offer of steady work. "So it resulted in the founding of Wilhelmsdorf and through it the beginning of Bethel's social work."[729] Using the anecdote about the wall, Jasper used *Arbeitserziehung* to define Bethel's identity and greater social mission.

Jasper's depiction of *Arbeitserziehung* at Bethel stood in marked contrast to his assessment of modern science's place within the institute. As he guided readers by Mara, Bethel's modern center for the care of people with epilepsy, Jasper only noted that the building contained "examination space for neurological exams, a house laboratory, etc. In the basement there was space for the water treatment."[730] Whereas he went to great lengths to describe the importance and legacy of *Arbeitserziehung* at Bethel, Jasper only briefly described the building devoted to the pursuit of scientific research. Indicating the building's true importance to the missionaries, Jasper noted how the basement contained the facilities for "water treatment." This brief encounter with the building Mara was the only time the reader encountered modern, scientific Bethel on Jasper's tour.

In an advertisement entitiled "*Ein Großbetrieb der Nächstenliebe,*" not only did Trittelwitz articulate many of the same themes as Jasper, but he went even further in his rejection of modern medicine at Bethel. Demonstrating a remarkable talent of embracing modern themes to defend traditional ideas, he began his piece by situating Bielefeld within the greater context of the modern, industrial city.

---

[729] Ibid., 18.
[730] Ibid., 11.

> It has a big business that in its way is surpassed neither in Germany nor the world. That is the big business of charity in Bethel near Bielefeld. This unique company is particularly so noteworthy because it shows how in the field of social care, when really help is to be taken, the generosity of the large operation and the loving details must work together.[731]

While Bielefeld did not have the massive steel plants of Essen and Dortmund, or the sprawling coal mines of Bochum, it was nevertheless home to the largest center of social welfare in Germany, and by extension it had its own unique place in a larger global network.

On the face of it, this would have been an excellent opportunity for Trittelwitz to tout the advantages and contributions of modern science at Bethel. Yet, Trittelwitz used the opportunity to explain to his readers why modern science did not contribute significantly to Bethel's significance and success. Despite the efforts of seventeen dedicated physicians at the institution, "only approximately seven per cent of our sick patients found healing."[732] Most people who came to Bethel, Trittelwitz explained, remained at the community for the duration of their lives, even with the treatment provided by modern medicine. In this respect the primary "task of Bethel is the care of the mentally ill those of nervous disorders" while they lived in the community.[733]

As if there were any doubt about the best therapy for Bethel's residents, Trittelwitz immediately followed his assessment of Bethel's medical establishment by describing the worker colonies. Even though Wilhelmsdorf was ten kilometers from Bethel, the "care" it provided for clients stood in "close connection with the care for the sick at Bethel." It was here, in the "moor region"of the Senne, that Bethel's social workers used work therapy to help people either cope with addiction or mitigate the

---

[731] Walter Trittelvitz, "Ein Großbetrieb der Nächstenliebe," *HAB 2/37–22*.
[732] Ibid.
[733] Ibid.

effects of mental illness.[734] In order to emphasize the importance of this work, he repeatedly noted that Bodelschwingh created both the colony and its guiding philosophy.

Of course *Arbeitserziehung* was only one aspect of Bodelschwingh's larger philosophy. In addition to work, it also emphasized the importance of a strong church and family life. Therfore, it also provided structure for life away from work, which Trittelwitz also made a point of highlighting. "Everything that can really make the heart happy, is provided at Bethel. There is no shortage of musical and special artistic offerings. Every house has a socalled 'family evening.'"[735] In addition to the numerous associations and clubs that Bethel offered residents, Trittelvitz also highlighted the Sunday morning church service as one of the central aspects of life in the community. It was a time when Bethel's residents could interact with people from outside the community (services were open to the public) and theoretically gather as equals. Ultimately, by focusing on one's social and spiritual health, Trittelwitz tried to demonstrate that Bodelschwingh's philosophy offered much more comprehensive care than the professional physicians.

In order to convince his audience that Bodelschwingh's philosophy was superior to the scientific ideas offered by the physicians, Trittelwitz also had to demonstrate that it was economically viable. This was especially important given the pressure social welfare providers faced to be as efficient as possible. He did this by showing readers that the residents performed tasks specifically chosen by the social workers to help the patient develop a strong work ethic while simultaneously benefitting the larger community economically. "For every craft there is also a workshop at Bethel. Brick masons and

[734] Ibid.
[735] Ibid.

carpenters, cabinet makers and wagon makers, blacksmiths and locksmiths, tailors, shoe makers, saddlers, painters, glaziers, butchers, melters and bakers practice their professions."[736] If one also considered the agricultural labor performed by the clients of the worker colony, Bethel used the practice of *Arbeitserziehung* to become a self-sufficient community. Everything produced in the work shops could later be purchased in the community's shops. In order to encourage this sense of self-sufficiency Bethel, like many German communities during the years after World War I even introduced its own currency.[737]

Trittelwitz emphasized the economic viability of *Arbeitserziehung* even further by noting that some of the community's workshops were so successful that they expanded into large factories, which subsequently employed additional clients of the worker colonies. For him, the growth of factories, and the additional employment they provided for members of the community was just further evidence of *Arbeitserziehung's* superiority. "But aside from the work in the workshop, the garden and field are one of the most important remedies for them and a rich source of satisfaction."[738] For Trittelwitz and the other missionaries, *Arbeitserziehung* was clearly a mutually beneficial practice that remained highly relevant to life at modern Bethel. Not only did it economically benefit the greater community, but unlike modern medicine it also held significant spiritual and social benefits for the patients.[739]

It was particularly important for the missionaries to convey this last point. In order to convince their audience that Bodelschwingh's philosophy was superior, they

[736] Ibid.
[737] Wolfram Korn, ed., *Bethel und das Geld, 1867–1998: Die ökonomische Entwicklung der v. Bodelschwinghschen Anstalten Bethel* (Bielefeld: Bethel Verlag, 1998), 69–70.
[738] Walter Trittelvitz, "Ein Großbetrieb der Nächstenliebe*," HAB 2/37–22*.
[739] See also Korn, ed., *Bethel und das Geld*, 85–87.

needed so show how it was different from eugenics. Therefore, in the same vein as Bodelschwingh, they insisted that people with disabilities suffered afflictions that were far greater than their physical symptoms. While modern science could help with the outward symptoms of an affliction, or in the case of eugenics eliminate the affliction in future generations, it did nothing to care for the individual. "We build beautiful institutes, we organize the care of the sick, we hold social organizations, but through it we forget God's empire. Exterior damage is healed, but one overlooks the deepest and innermost damage."[740] In this sense, when one factored in the theoretical cost efficiency of work therapy, Bodelschwingh's philosophy was superior in the eyes of the missionaries because it was the only one to address the larger spiritual concerns associated with the care. "If Bethel offers them not only external care during their slow death,, but also comfort for the heart, so the source should be sought where Pastor von Bodelschwingh once found it.[741] Literary tours of Bethel, such as those produced by Jasper and Trittelwitz were important therefore, because they make a public case in favor of the continued relevance of Bodelschwingh's philosophy and ensure that it did not take a back seat to Bethel's medical establishment.

In order to establish their credibility with outside audiences to speak on the subject of social welfare, the missionaries also needed to explain to audiences why their experiences in Africa gave them the authority to discuss questions of social welfare. To this end they also focused on developing materials that depicted the mission as an initiative shaped exclusively by Bodelschwingh and his philosophy. In practical terms, this would also benefit the mission through increased public exposure. Before Ronicke

---

[740] Walther Trittelwitz, "Eine grundlegende Freude," *Bote von Bethel* 130 (1927): 2–16.
[741] Walter Trittelwitz, "Ein Großbetrieb der Nächstenliebe*," HAB 2/37–22*.

published his *Afrika Ruft!* in 1931, the Dankort had not produced a general survey of the mission since Paul Döring's *Morgendämmerung in Deutsch-Ostafrika*, and Paul Wohlrab's *Usambara: Werden und Wachsen einer heidenchristlichen Gemeinde in Deutsch Ostafrika* in 1915.[742] By 1931, these had both been out of print for several years and the mission had changed dramatically since their initial publication.

Like the earlier tours of Bethel, *Afrika Ruft! re*-introduced general audiences to the mission and highlighted Bodelschwingh's philosophy as the foundation for its work in Africa.[743] To this end, Ronicke made a point of highlighting the mental hospital Lutindi as the centerpiece of the mission. Upon approaching the institution, he noted how it was surrounded by forests that residents had cleared as part of their work therapy.[744] As he further described life at Lutindi, Ronicke noted specifically how the staff provided both spiritual and physical care.

> In Lutindi, however, they initially have what they most need to return to inner peace: ordinary, regulated supply and moderate, patient treatment. This medicine in fact often works wonders. The patient is quiet ... and can participate in work ... and actually recognizes stable work as a good remedy.[745]

Like Bethel, Lutindi's directors organized life at the community around regular work, and when the work-day ended they encouraged residents to participate in religiously themed activities. Taken together, these tactics provided both spiritual and physical care. Noticeably absent from Ronicke's tour of Lutindi was any mention of modern medicine, and how one could apply it to life at the institution.

---

[742] See Paul Döring, *Morgendämmerung in Deutsch-Ostafrika. Ein Rundgang durch die Ostafrikanische Mission (Berlin III)* (Berlin: Verlag von Martin Warneck, 1901); Paul Wohlrab, *Usambara: Werden und Wachsen einer heidenchristlichen Gemeinde in Deutsch-Ostafrika* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1915).
[743] Curt Ronicke, *Afrika ruft: Ein Gang über die Felder der Bethelmission in Ostafrika* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1931), 3.
[744] Ibid., 30.
[745] Ibid., 35.

In order to establish the missionaries' credibility to discuss social welfare at Bethel, Ronicke made a point of clearly highlighting its similarities with Lutindi. Both institutions cared for people with disabilities, and both owed their significance largely to Bodelschwingh. "Lutindi is a beautiful testimony to it that also father Bodelschwingh and his community of the sick are allowed to help in this fight."[746] For Ronicke, the bond between the two was unmistakable and was represented in no small part by the emphasis they both placed on the value of *Arbeitserziehung*. Lutindi was so successful, Ronicke argued, because it embraced fully Bodelschwingh's philosophy while avoiding the temptations of modern science. In the mind of the reader, this would firmly establish the missionaries' credibility on matters of social welfare.

After the war, the mission's leadership decided to change its formal name from the *Evangelische Mission zur Deutsch Ostafrika* (Berlin III) to the Bethel Mission. Given that Bethel had assumed full control of its operations and staffed it with missionaries trained exclusively in the Bethel philosophy, the name change was a way to reflect more accurately the extraordinarily close ties between the two institutions. In 1936 Gerhard Jasper wrote *Das Werden der Bethel-Mission* to reflet on that transition and discuss how the values of Bethel influenced the work of the mission. Unlike Ernst Johanssen's three volume memoir *Führung und Erfahrung in 40 jährigem Missionsdienst*, which also described the greater goals of the mission, Jasper intended his work to focus exclusively on the influence of Bodelschwingh's philosophy on the mission.

In the spirit of Trittelvitz's earlier memorandum on the purpose of the *Heimatsmission*, Jasper described the importance of social work as an integral part of both the mission to Africa and the *Volksmission* in Germany, "so father Bodelschwingh

---

[746] Ibid., 31.

could see his diaconal work only from the perspective of evangelism and the *Volksmission*. Therefore, care for body and soul, as for soul and body."[747] Once again, he made it clear that social welfare needed to stress both spiritual and physical care. Jasper was keen to show his readers how the mission incorporated this idea into every aspect of its work, and made repeated references to this connection throughout the book.[748] Like Ronicke, Jasper also notably omits any reference to modern medicine as an aspect of the mission. "Father Bodelschwingh knew all people as debtors and in turn as body and soul. Therefore for him mission and service were one."[749] For the missionaries, it was the pure embodiment of *Diakonie* and the ideas of Friedrich von Bodelschwingh.

In order to convey to his audience Bodelschwingh's importance to the mission, Jasper portrays him as its literal savior. Not only did he endow it with its purpose of bringing Diakonie to Africa, but in the process he also helped to save it from insolvency. At the same time he also portrayed the missionaries as Bodelschwingh's true disciples; individuals that he purposely selected to spread his philosophy beyond Westphalia. Nowhere is this more evident than in his description of Trittelwitz, arguably the most famous and influential of Bethel's missionaries. "Father Bodelschwingh could have really moved fewer friends to greater offering for his work."[750] The act of casting Bodelschwingh as Bethel's messiah figure, and themselves as his disciples was yet another way in which the missionaries tried to cast themselves as authorities on questions of social welfare.

---

[747] Gerhard Jasper, *Das Werden der Bethel-Mission* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1936), 38.
[748] Ibid., 40, 54, 65, 68, 78.
[749] Ibid., 40.
[750] Ibid., 74.

To cement this relationship in the eyes of their audience, the missionaries published a series of books that emphasized their relationship with Bodelschwingh. In the process they also described the extensive experience the missionaries had using *Arbeitserziehung* with their communities in Africa. The earliest of these works was *Nicht so langsam! Missionserinnerungen an Vater Bodelschwingh*, a history of Bodelschwingh's influence on the mission by Trittelwitz. Of all the publications designed to connect Bodelschwingh with the Mission, it made the strongest effort to do so. Citing "*Brot für Steine*" program, which he describes as one of the missions' greatest successes, Trittelwitz told readers about the missionaries' devotion to the Bethel philosophy.[751] At the same time he described the station of Lutindi as Bodelschwingh's "favorite station," in part because "at this station, inner and foreign mission were bound close together."[752] In this sense, *Nicht so langsam!* was especially important for understanding how the missionaries saw their relationship with Bodelschwingh.

In *Vater Bodelschwingh, eine Zeuge Jesu für Ostafrika,* Ronicke touched on many of the same themes as Trittelwitz and Jasper as he sought to connect his work to Bodelschwingh's legacy. It portrayed the mission as one of his predominant passions, and argued that he modeled the mission to East Africa closely after Bethel in Bielefeld. Like the other volumes, it also portrayed the mission as a model of Diakonie abroad.[753] Yet in his conclusion Ronicke went further and argued that because of this shared history the missionaries were the best positioned to preserve and defend Bodelschwingh's ideas.

[751] Walter Trittelvitz, *Nicht so langsam! Missionserinnerungen an Vater Bodelschwingh* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1929), 73.
[752] Ibid., 124.
[753] Curt Ronicke, *Vater Bodelschwingh, ein Zeuge Jesu für Ostafrika* (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1940), 5, 13–15.

"Today his work is carried on by us. That happens not only in the German homeland, but also over there in East Africa."[754] He directly asserted that because of their close relationship with Bodelschwingh, it was the missionaries' obligation to continue his work and exert their influence in debates over health care in Bethel.

***

Through the Dankort's publication house, the missionaries seized control of a platform that enabled them to take their message far beyond the Bethel community. Yet, for everything literature allowed the missionaries to accomplish, the medium also had some built-in limitations. Bethel's leaders, including the missionaries, were aware that Bethel owed its reputation to Bodelschwingh's fame and charisma. When he died in 1910, they feared that the number of outside donations from people attracted to his personality would gradually decline.[755] While books may have been informative, they could not replace the void left by Bodelschwingh's death. The fears over declining outside interest in Bethel grew even more after the end of the war. Bethel's leadership was convinced that the secular republic, in its zeal to destroy Germany's religious life, would further damage Bethel's already strained support network. "Therefore Pastor Fritz also saw it as Bethel's task to strengthen the religious life of the community and to assist Christian publications in additional fields."[756] To this end, Bethel's leaders realized they needed to find new ways to engage with the greater public and commissioned the Dankort to expirment with new forms of media.

In their search for a new medium through which they could reach wider audiences, the Dankort's leaders saw film as especially promising because of its novelty

---

[754] Ibid., 23.
[755] Korn, ed., *Bethel und das Geld*, 85.
[756] Ibid., 65.

and growing popularity. Although in 1900 there were only two cinemas in Germany, by 1910 there were 480 and by 1913 that number increased to three thousand.[757] Unsurprisingly, the churches in Germany reacted with both skepticism and hostility to this new innovation.

> The tone of early religious attitudes to the film industry is already chipped, because the early opinions on cinematography were mostly shaped by negative criticism, which was inflamed at the supposed amorality as well as the criminal and antireligious tendency of the majority of cinema programs, which above all else posed an especially significant risk for the youth.[758]

Through the end of World War I, the Protestant organizations that voiced an opinion on German film were overwhelmingly pessimistic. Focused on the content of the films and skeptical of the large audiences attending cinemas, they were oblivious to the potential advantages the medium held for their own agendas. Only a small minority of Protestants initially saw the burgeoning film industry as a tool that could benefit the church.[759]

By the early 1920s, however, Protestant attitudes towards film became considerably more diverse. They realized that film offered new ways to make the church part of one's daily life, thus making it easier for the average German to remain religiously active. The threat of modernity that so many conservative Protestants associated with the Weimar Republic could be co-opted to their advantage. Searching for a new way to expand their *Heimatsmission* and promote the Bethel institute, the missionaries at the *Dankort* were the first Protestants to make this connection, and quickly became the vanguard of Protestant film. As early as 1918 Bodelschwingh was already discussing the

---

[757] Heiner Schmitt, *Kirche und Film: Kirchliche Filmarbeit in Deutschland von ihren Anfängen bis 1945* (Boppard am Rhein: Harald Boldt Verlag, 1979), 21.
[758] Ibid., 22.
[759] Ibid., 30.

use of projected photographs (slides), to advertise the institution.[760] Trittelwitz also enthusiastically expressed his support for using slide shows on behalf of the Mission. "The thought to allow one to present slide show lectures about Bethel in the neighborhood, I greet as positive, because one can exploit the speech at such presentations. Otherwise one does not have at their disposal a free speech to the masses."[761] He was clearly unfazed by the use of modern technology and realized immediately that it would encourage the missionaries to hold more public presentations about Bethel. Heienbrok wasted little time in implementing Trittelwitz's suggestion, and the practice grew rapidly as a result of its popularity.[762]

With considerable experience using images to advertise their work in Africa, the missionaries were well aware of the power that images held. The right image could evoke a powerful emotion more effectively than a well-delivered lecture, just as the wrong image could inadvertently give the audience a false impression of Bethel. For example, in an attempt to depict the community's goal of self-sufficiency through work, the missionaries displayed several agriculture-themed pictures. Some of these pictures contained images of livestock, which one missionary argued would "give a false image of wealth at the institute."[763] The audience would not be moved to donate money to Bethel if it assumed the community possessed large herds of animals. In the same vein, in an attempt to invoke the memory of Friedrich von Bodelschwingh in one of their lectures, the missionaries initially chose to use a picture of his grave in the Bethel cemetery.

---

[760] Letter to Zähler, 28 October 1918, *HAB* 2/37–31.
[761] Trittelvitz to Heienbrok, 27 November 1920, *HAB* 2/37–32.
[762] Bartolt Haase, "'Komm und Sieh!' Der Bethelfilm 1922–1941 und seine Relevanz für die Öffentlichkeitsarbeit in diakonischen Einrichtungen heute" (Diplomarbeit, University of Paderborn, 2004), 15.
[763] **"**Bemerkungen zum Film," Bethel bei Bielefeld, 16 August 1922, *HAB* 2/37–32.

However, they later changed the image to that of a monument fearing that his grave would be too boring. They hoped that the monument would create a more emotional connection with the audience.[764]

The Dankort's slide shows were immensely popular. By September, 1921 Heienbrok had to request a fifth slide projector to accommodate all the requests he received for slide presentations.[765] As a result of this popularity, the missionaries decided to place a greater emphasis on the use of visual imagery in their presentations, and seriously began to explore the use of motion pictures. In 1921, Bethel's leadership laid the foundation for expanded film production by creating the Bethel film service under the leadership of missionary Rudolf Poppinga.[766] Under his direction, the department immediately set to work on drafting a timetable for film production, and on 25 April 1922 a committee approved the creation of a film for the missionaries to use on their lecture tours. "The Dankort is empowered, to make moving slides of the institutes and acquire the appropriate apparatus."[767] It was this decision that would eventually lead to the film service's emergence as one of the largest producers of Protestant-themed films.[768]

By the summer of 1922, the film agency produced a collection of five short films under the collective title "*Bethel, ein Denkmal der Barmherzigkeit Gottes*."[769] By 1925, in conjunction with the technical support of the Berlin based *Deulig-Film AG*, the Bethel Filmservice produced a total of thirteen films, all of which depicted different aspects of

---

[764] Ibid.
[765] Heienbrok to Bodelschwingh, 9 September 1921, *HAB* 2/37–32.
[766] Schmitt, *Kirche und Film*, 123.
[767] Beschlussnotiz, 25 April 1922, *HAB* 2/37–32.
[768] Walter Trittelvitz, "Mit dem Bethelfilm durch Nordamerika," *HAB* 2/89–8, 792.
[769] The five films were titled *Heimat für Heimatlose - aus der Arbeiterkolonie Wilhelmsdorf* (1922), *Ein Tag im Weitingsmoor - Bilder aus der Fürsorgeerziehung* (1922), Bilder aus der *Liebesarbeit der Sareptaschwestern* (1922), *Aus dem Leben eines Fallsüchtigen* (1922), *Bethel, Der Werdegang eines Nazarethbruders*" (1922). Haase notes that while Schmitt also cites the names of the films, he fails to include the proper full title of each film.

the Bethel community.[770] An average film evening lasted a little less than two hours with the missionary reading off of a prepared text to ensure that the film remained the centerpiece of the presentation.[771] Frequently, the audience also sang hymns following the brief lectures that the missionaries presented.[772] The majority of film evenings through the beginning of 1923 occurred in the regions around Bethel in northern and western Germany.[773] The Dankort promoted the evenings heavily through posters in the community and advertisements in the pamphlet *Bote von Bethel*, which they sent to their network of donors. When it was cost effective, it even placed small advertisements in local newspapers.

In the same vein as their literary tours of Bethel, the missionaries used their control over the film agency to depict Bethel in a way that reinforced the continued importance and relevance of Bodelschwingh's philosophy.. The film evening began with a brief greeting from the missionary in which he contextualized the film within Bethel's larger mission, and drew the audience's attention to the importance of *Arbeitserziehung*. "Bethel is at the same time a unified, economic organism. We bake our bread ourselves, we print our own newspapers and books. We build our houses ourselves, etc."[774] Although the missionary also acknowledged the medical establishment, he limited the scope of their work to caring only for the "physical well being" of the patients.[775] Ultimately, as the missionary explained to his audience, the purpose of Bethel's existence was to "serve the sick. To provide to these sick individuals work and a homeland, was

---

[770] Schmitt, *Kirche und Film*, 123.
[771] "Kommentar," in *HAB* 2/37–32.
[772] "Feierstunden mit beweglichen Lichtbildern aus dem Leben und der Arbeit der Bodelschwinghschen Anstalten in Bethel bei Bielefeld," *HAB* 2/37–33.
[773] Haase, *"Komm und Sieh!"*, 17.
[774] Kurze Einleitungsworte zum Bethelfilm, *HAB* 2/37–36.
[775] Ibid.

the wish of Father Bodelschwingh… He tought us to use the smallest strength; in each sick person he saw a colleague."[776] Similarly to the Dankort's literary efforts, the film lectures proved to be a key element of the *Heimatsmission* as they provided the missionaries with the opportunity to portray Bethel in a light that reflected their agenda and understanding of the institution. Audiences would have undoubtedly come away with the understanding that Bethel was a community still shaped largely by Bodelschwingh's philosophy. While the medical establishment was certainly visible in this narrative, it took a back seat to those in the community who implemented Bodelschwingh's vision.

The message was reinforced further by the content of the films. For example, the film "*Aus dem Leben eines Fallsüchtigen*" tells the story of Walter Beckmann, a non-functioning alcoholic discovered by a group of children. When the village's pastor discovers Beckman, he sends one of the children to Bethel to ask for help. Naturally, its leaders are more than willing to accept Beckman and treat his alchoholism in accordance with Bodelschwingh's use of *Arbeitserziehung*. According to the synopsis of the film: "A few years later we find Walter in the cabinet workshop, his friend in the tailor's corner. They have conformed and want to learn carpentry."[777] Through work therapy, not only has Beckman overcome his alcoholism, but he has also rejoined productive society.

The same point comes through even clearer in "*Heimat für Heimatlose*." This film tells the story of two journeyman laborers who represent Bodelschwingh's quintessential "brothers of the highway." One of the laborers, tired of wandering, decides

---

[776] Ibid.
[777] "Feierstunden mit beweglichen Lichtbildern aus dem Leben und der Arbeit der Bodelschwinghschen Anstalten in Bethel bei Bielefeld," *HAB* 2/37–33

to go to Wilhelmsdorf for help "and immediately the outer person is transformed into a condition worthy of a human." The other "does not want anything to do with it."[778] While in the colony, the first individual tirelessly works outdoors and eventually, he realizes his goal of becoming a dairyman. His comrade, however, does not fare as well without the structure of the worker colony. "Ragged, sick and miserable, he has also finally made his way to Wilhelmsdorf." Not only does he suffer from a serious lung condition, but the film also reveals that the cause of his suffering is alcoholism, "the brother of the highway's worst enemy."[779] The film leaves little doubt that the primary cause of the second individual's condition is his rejection of the worker colony. Just as he arrives, his comrade departs as a completely reformed person. "His comrade, however, is outwardly and internally a new person and returns jubilantly to his homeland."[780] The film could not be any clearer about the importance of Bodelschwingh's philosophy. While modern medicine could treat the physical ailments associated with the journeyman's lifestyle, it could not provide him with the spiritual care and inner reform he needed to rejoin society.

The Bethel film service's first foray into film production was an unqualified success. Pedagogically, it made the missionaries' *Heimatsmission* extremely effective. One review commented "The Bethel film is an impressive piece of the *Volksmission.*"[781] One pastor at a prison from the nearby town of Werden/Ruhr wrote that the film also had a noticeable effect on the prisoners. "In the prison, we are all still under the influence of the Bethel film. It has made an extraordinarily deep impression on the prisioners, from

---

[778] Ibid.
[779] Ibid.
[780] Ibid.
[781] "Der Bote von Bethel ladet Dich hiermit herzlich ein zu der demnächst bei Euch stattfindenen Vorführung des Bethelfilms!" *HAB* B IV 5, 4 4.

which I hope that it leaves a long lasting, spiritually rich impact."[782] Just as important though, the film also helped to connect Bethel with audiences far from the city of Bielefeld. Reviews of the films produced at Bethel show that they reached not only people in the regions surrounding Bielefeld, but also in places such as Heidelberg, Pforzheim (in the Black Forest), the Ore Mountains in the East, and even the United States.[783] As Trittelwitz noted in his memoir, the film was vital for the "secularization" of Bethel.[784]

The contact with the United States was especially important because it enabled Bethel to survive the devastating hyperinflation crisis of 1922-23. Following a visit by American pastors to Bethel in 1922, the missionaries realized there was significant interest among American Lutherans in their film presentations and promptly arranged for Trittelwitz to tour the United States with the film. Of particular concern to them was the fate of the worker colonies, which experienced an acute shortage of resources in the face of a rapidly growing demand for help.[785] When Trittelwitz departed on 26 October 1922, therefore, his mission was to save literally the initiative that most represented Bodelschwingh's legacy at Bethel.[786]

All things considered, the trip was extremely successful. Despite his shock at the "unexpectedly strong fading knowledge of German" among the younger congregations, the novelty of the film helped Trittelwitz to overcome the linguistic barrier.[787] The

[782] "Bericht aus der Arbeit der Film-Mission der Anstalt Bethel," January 1929, *HAB* 2/37–34.
[783] "Der Bote von Bethel ladet Dich hiermit herzlich ein zu der demnächst bei Euch stattfindenen Vorführung des Bethelfilms!" *HAB* B IV 5, 4 4; "Der Bote von Bethel ladet Dich hiermit herzlich ein zu der demnächst bei Euch stattfindenen Vorführung des Bethelfilms!" *HAB* 2/37–33; "Bericht aus der Arbeit der Film-Mission der Anstalt Bethel," January 1929, *HAB* 2/37–34.
[784] Trittelvitz, "Mit dem Bethelfilm durch Nordamerika." *HAB* 2/89–8, 792.
[785] "Anregungen und Wünsche für die Werbearbeit in AMERIKA," 21 October 1922, *HAB* 2/37–264.
[786] Trittelwitz, "Mit dem Bethelfilm durch Nordamerika." *HAB* 2/89–8, 799.
[787] Haase, *Komm und Sieh!*, 23.

novelty also helped him to outmaneuver other German missionaries who travelled to American congregations in search of financial assistance.

> So I was one of the first here in America to go into the church with the film. I had never heard of any Christian film that was available in America. In this field, Bethel was truly trailblazing.[788]

Thanks to the film, Trittelwitz was able to distinguish himself and Bethel from potential rivals and raise enough money to ease the financial burden of the hyperinflation crisis at home. The trip was so successful that Bethel subsequently sent missionaries to the United States as part of a continuous fundraising effort.

The film initiative proved to be so successful that by 1927 Poppinga had acquired forty projectors for the lecture series and had produced thirteen films about Bethel.[789] In his 1929 yearly report on the Film Mission, Poppinga claimed that in 1927 alone the agency also directed twenty-eight films, or 22,000 meters of filmstrip, for seven different Protestant missions.[790] As a result, it clearly established itself as the leading producer of Protestant themed films, and produced an additional twelve films between 1927 and 1930.[791] Thematically, Poppinga ensured that the content of these films supported the missionaries' larger agenda. Two thirds of the films were about overseas' missions, and one fourth of the films advertised the Inner Mission.[792] He specifically noted that the films were "marked as especially appropriate for the service of the *Volksmission*."[793] He elaborated on this relationship by describing the ideas of the mission as the agency's guiding principle. "We have viewed our films as service to the mission, as a service to

---

[788] Trittelvitz, "Mit dem Bethelfilm durch Nordamerika." *HAB* 2/89–8, 817.
[789] Schmitt, *Kirche und Film*, 123.
[790] Poppinga, "Bericht aus der Arbeit der Film-Mission der Anstalt-Bethel," January 1929, *HAB* 2/37–34.
[791] Schmitt, *Kirche und Film*, 141.
[792] Ibid., 141.
[793] Poppinga, "Bericht aus der Arbeit der Film-Mission der Anstalt-Bethel," January 1929, *HAB* 2/37–34.

the people, and with every humility we are permitted to say that God has blessed even our weakest action."[794] One reason why Bethel acquired so many portable projectors was to maximize the potential number of presentations.

Yet, despite the number of new films produced by the agency, it never updated the film that missionaries used at their film evenings. By 1929, it was clearly no longer the attraction it once was. As Poppinga noted in his report, the offerings and donations that the film typically brought in had dropped significantly by the end of the decade. While the worsening economic status of the average German certainly factored into this decline, the increased competition from other films also played a significant role. The original Bethel film, "which earlier was viewed as the best in this area," was now almost seven years old, and had been eclipsed by the numerous other films that Bethel helped to produce.[795] Therefore, Poppinga urged Bethel's leadership to commission a new film about the institute.

For the missionaries in the Dankort, there was little doubt that this new film would be a vehicle through which they could re-emphasize the key points of their *Heimatsmission.* They clearly laid out their agenda in one of the first scripts for the new film, entitled "*Durch Liebe zum Glauben*." The draft tells the story of a young man named Karl, who is studying to become a pastor. One day he comes home to tell his parents "I have studied and studied, but science has torn my Bible to shreds and taken my belief."[796] Horrified by his attitude, Karl's mother concludes that the only way to rescue Karl is to send him to Bethel where his brother Hermann, also a student, will set him back on the right path.

---

[794] Ibid.
[795] Ibid.
[796] "Durch Liebe zum Glabuen. Wie ein Verirrter in Bethel den Weg fand," *HAB* 2/37–36, 4.

As Karl travels to Bethel with his brother, he descends on the community from a nearby hill, at which point an older man approaches them to say that Bethel is "a monument of belief," and that it would not have been possible had it not been for Bodelschwingh, who was a product of the Protestant Awakening.[797] The connection to Bodelschwingh and his legacy is clearly evident to the audience. Upon arriving, Karl and his brother receive a tour of Bethel, beginning with the building Patmos, the institute's modern, scientific center for the treatment of epilepsy and mental disabilities. Unlike its predecessor, this film directly confronts the role of science and eugenics in the institute. Once inside the house, its director approaches the pro-science Karl and says "These stupid children and the others are only a burden. Would it not be better, if one brought their lives to a painless end?"[798] Taken aback by the director's blunt assessment of the child, Karl turns to a social worker and asks for clarification, as if he cannot believe what he just heard. The manuscript then reads: "Shocked, the sister pressed the child to her and made a strong, defensive gesture."[799] The scene takes place under a heading entitled "Euthanasia" and was clearly intended by the film's authors to be a blunt rebuke of Bethel's medical establishment.

The missionaries' indictment of Bethel's medical establishment continued as the tour proceeded to another house that specialized in scientific care. This time, Karl observes several social workers from Nazareth caring for a sick patient who is bed-ridden. The film specifically notes that they have to feed the patient and then physically lift him on to a bed. Disgusted by what he observed, the medical director once again

[797] Ibid., 8.
[798] Ibid., 12.
[799] Ibid., 13.

comments: "These brutish people really no longer have any purpose."[800] This time however, one of the *Diakonen* overhears the director and provides a clear rebuttal of the medical establishment: "Father Bodelschwingh says: 'If our sick do nothing else, they have the task to teach us love and patience."[801] While the medical director reacts unimpressed, Karl takes the message to heart, declares that he has found his calling and that he wants to move to Bethel so that he can become a social worker.

The missionaries' message could not have been any clearer. Unlike their literary tours and the first Bethel film, the manuscript for "*Durch Liebe zum Glauben"* directly attacked the growing influence of the medical establishement at Bethel. When confronted by the bluntness of the medical director, the supposedly pro-science Karl is stunned. However, he is ultimately saved by Bodelschwingh's wisdom, which says that there is no such thing as "life unworthy of life." Thanks to Bodelschwingh, Karl returns to the church and decides to devote his life to practicing Bodelschwingh's philosophy. In the end, Bodelschwingh triumphs over the medical establishment and the missionaries successfully reassert his ideas as the guiding principles of Bethel.

Once Karl has decided to return to the church, the film follows his life at Bethel. Naturally, Karl goes to every aspect of the Bethel community as part of his training, including the worker colonies. Thus, through Karl, audiences also learn about what the missionaries understand as Bethel's larger mission. At one point an American psychiatrist comes to Bethel for a tour. The tour, led by Karl, includes both the modern laboratories as well as Bodelschwingh's old office. Upon reaching the latter, the doctor proclaims: "On an American image that shows the four best friends of the epileptic,

---

[800] Ibid., 14.
[801] Ibid., 14.

Bodelschwingh takes first place." The doctor appears to be less impressed by the modern facilities at Bethel than by the person of Bodelschwingh. In the office he explains to Karl how impressed he is by Bethel, and how Bodelschwingh's legacy still actively shapes the way American psychiatrists cared for epilepsy. "1. Your sick have a variety of work opportunities. 2. Your sick have more freedom. 3. Your sick experience more love. We also have a Bethel in America!"[802] Through the American psychiatrist, the missionaries not only argued that Bodelschwingh's philosophy was still highly relevant, and that it was also the main reason why Bethel was internationally renowned.

In the end, the selection committee opted not to produce *Durch Liebe zum Glauben*. In order to promote Bethel more effectively, it wanted something that focused more generally on Bodelschwingh's legacy. Since most people were aware of Bethel because of him, for fundraising purposes it made practical sense to make him the centerpiece of the film. Nevertheless, "*In den Spuren Vater Bodelschwinghs*" maintained many of the characteristics of the original draft. Karl remained the central figure of the film, but this time his dilemma centered on whether or not he wanted to become a pastor. A sister, Martha, who is interested in learning more about social work, also joins him. Together they go to Bethel in order to help them decide their futures. While Martha immediately decides to stay at Bethel and learn about Bodelschwingh's approach to social welfare, Karl remains uncertain until he attends a film event sponsored by the missionaries. Upon encountering the missionaries, Karl is convinced that his calling is to become a missionary, and the film ends with Karl departing for Africa. It concludes with

---

[802] Ibid., 24.

a portrait of Friedrich von Bodelschwingh and the message: "Until charity has returned, we will not rest."[803]

While the two drafts were very similar, one of the starkest differences is the portrayal of Bethel's medical establishment. In the original version, the authors clearly make the physicians out to be villains. They are heartless advocates of euthanasia, the most extreme form of eugenics. The medical director upsets those around him and must be corrected by a social worker trained in Bodelschwingh's philosophy. To the audience, the doctors appear to be a distant, isolated segment of the community that is merely tolerated by the other people at Bethel. In this sense, the original draft represented the missionaries' attitudes about their medical colleagues. Yet it did not necessarily translate into effective propaganda, and for this reason the authors rewrote it to be less confrontational.

In the final version of the film, the doctors appear an integral part of Bethel. When Karl visits the modern hospital building, Dr. Miller greets him and explains that Bethel is "the largest welfare organization that I have ever seen."[804] When compared to the first film, Bethel's medical establishment appears only briefly, but in a way that acknowledges their contributions to the community. The film's authors stress that the hospital provides modern care, and that the medical staff is very well educated. At the same time, however, the authors also make it clear that the the medical establishment is only a small part of Bethel's larger religious mission.

In the end, through their numerous literary publications and trailblazing film initiative, the missionaries made extraordinarily effective use of the *Dankort*. Under their

---

[803] Ibid., 40.
[804] Ibid., 39.

leadership, it became a platform from which they could voice their clear disapproval of eugenics and the inroads it hade made into Bethel. Their willingness to embrace novel ideas and technologies also allowed them to reach an exceptionally large audience that extended beyond Germany to the United States. As advocates of eugenics like Gustav Dietrich sought to push their agenda by increasing their influence within the institute, the missionaries used the Dankort and their *Heimatsmission* to make a much larger argument to German Protestants. To this end, by clearly positioning themselves as Bethel's spiritual conscience and moral authority they hoped to pressure Bethel's leaders into following their agenda.

***

Given their eagerness to return to Africa, most missionaries sought temporary employment in the *Dankort* because it would allow them to depart quickly once the international situation allowed them to return to Africa. One notable exception to this trend was Father Bodelschwingh's oldest surviving son, Gustav. Like his colleagues, Gustav was a firm believer in the importance of the *Heimatsmission* and defending his father's legacy at Bethel. To this end, in 1922 he wrote a biography of his father that clearly shaped his father's life in a way that would benefit the *Heimatsmission*, which limits its value as an accurate account of Bodelschwingh's life. Yet it is nevertheless extremely useful because it clearly shows how the missionaries remembered Bodelschwingh and used that memory to shape the public's image of Bethel's former leader.

In his account of his father's life, Gustav emphasized many of the same themes as the general surveys of Bethel and the mission. In order to establish the missionaries as

legitimate defenders of Bodelschwingh's legacy, Gustav repeatedly discussed the special fondness and passion he had for mission work. In this context he singled-out Lutindi as particularly important because it was the station to embrace fully Bodelschwingh's philosophy, thus serving as a "model" for future work in Africa.[805] As his father's health declined, Gustav also described how mission work remained his father's one passion right up to his last days of life.[806] Thus, Gustav used his biography to illustrate the centrality of the mission to greater Bethel, thereby making the missionaries legitimate defenders of Bodelschwingh's legacy.

Although the bulk of the biography consists of anecdotes that regularly appeared in the Bethel propaganda from the previous fifty years, they are nevertheless important because they work together to portray Bethel as a community built solely upon the idea of *Arbeitserziehung*. Like his father, Gustav believed that effective social welfare provided both physical and spiritual care. "Unemployment indeed belongs to the unique sorrow of the epileptic. They are kicked out of ther occupation and workshop, and their mental and physical strengths gradually become dull and die."[807] By providing people with epilepsy with an opportunity to work and move, Bodelschwingh's philosophy gave them a "new joy for life and a refreshed life." Through his discussion of *Arbeitserziehung's* role in Bethel's history, Gustav was also making an argument to readers about why it was still relevant,

Unlike the histories of Bethel that the Dankort produced, Gustav also dealt directly with the emergence of modern medicine at Bethel during his father's tenure.

---

[805] Gustav von Bodelschwingh, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh: Ein Lebensbild*, 12th ed. (Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1949), 261–62.
[806] Ibid., 383–85.
[807] Bodelschwingh, *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh: Ein Lebensbild*, 158.

Given the tension it created within the institution, it was a subject that he could not ignore. Gustav clearly stated that modern medicine was of secondary importance to Bodelschwingh's philosophy. "The sisters and brothers do the main tasks."[808] As leader, Bodelschwingh encouraged his social workers to work closely with the medical staff in order to ensure that the spiritual needs of the residents were not ignored.

Yet, unlike his colleagues, Gustav did not want to spend his time exclusively in the Dankort. He believed that be best way to demonstrate the continued relevance of Bodelschwingh's philosophy was to apply it practically to the challenges faced by communities of impoverished Germans. To this end, Gustav returned to Dünne, a small town in East Westphalia where he served as a pastor of a small parish from 1901–1909, before departing for Africa. Known as "Germany's cigar box," Dünne was home to forty-six cigar manufacturing plants with over two hundred branches in the surrounding area. Although the plants provided for the employment of over two thousand people, the cigar industry was notorious for its low wages, which made Dünne a relatively poor town.[809] On average, a cigar maker made a little more than half the wage of an industrial factory worker. Adding to the misery of the cigar worker's life, the average working conditions in the cigar industry were extremely poor. "A Westphalian worker has absolutely no idea, that there is more to life than working day and night."[810] Furthermore, the work itself took a heavy toll on the health of the cigar manufacturer. "Cigar work is unhealthy. The tabacco dust not only damages the respiratory system, but

---

[808] Ibid., 200.

[809] Wolfgang Belitz, *Gustav von Bodelschwingh: Der "Lehmbaupastor" von Dünne* (Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2007), 37.

[810] Monika Dickhaus and Martin Fiedler, "Aufstieg und Niedergang: Die Geschichte der Bünder Tabakindustrie im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert," in *Spuren der Zigarre: Bünde, ein Rundgang durch die Zigarrenkiste Deutschlands*, ed. Martin Fiedler, Monika Dickhaus, and Norbert Sahrhage, 11-47 (Essen: Klartext, 2000), at 27.

the constant sitting leads to blood clots, creates abdominal problems which also damage the respiratory system… so that tuberculosis develops, which carries the worst risks for the future."[811] If one also considered the active church life that characterized the working-class community of Dünne, Bodelschwingh's philosophy appeared to be perfectly suited for that situation.

More than any other issue, the cigar makers of Dünne believed that a lack of quality housing was their greatest challege. The living conditions for cigar workers were far from ideal, as housing construction failed to keep pace with the number of people who moved to Dünne in search of work. Frequently "the poorest and most primitive living situations prevailed," causing cigar workers to be especially frugal in the hopes of saving for their own house. Given the poor wages paid by the factories, few families were able to obtain this goal, and even then only with "great diligence and outer austerity."[812] Given the relative piety of the cigar workers in general, Gustav believed that they would be especially open to his brand of social conservatism, and therefore took a particular interest in their plight as a way to assert the continued relevance of his father's approach.

Gustav von Bodelschwingh laid out his approach to help the workers of Dünne in a 1908 lecture on the community's lving conditions. Because the cigar industry required workers to spend long hours in dark factories with extremely poor air quality, he insisted that access to fresh air and sunlight was essential to any solution. "That is the first thing that we must provide for is healthy accomodations! As much fresh air and bright light as

---

[811] Hanna Wilde, "Die Lage der Zigarrenarbeiter(-innen) zu Begin der nationalsozialistischen Zeit," *Neue Nettelstedter Blätter* 5 (1986): 7-14, 12.
[812] Ibid., 41.

possible for the accommodations of the cigar worker!"[813] Access to fresh air would help to mitigate the negative effects of cigar manufacturing. Like his father, however Gustav also believed that outdoor activities carried a spiritual benefit that was absent in the factories.[814] Without the attraction of outoor activities, Gustav feared that workers would seek relief from the long workday through a night at the pub, which would in turn threaten the individual's work ethic and the stability of his family.

Given his concern for the physical condition of the cigar makers of Dünne, Gustav exhibited an understanding of social welfare that drew heavily from the traditions established by his father and Johann Wichern. He believed that social welfare was most effective when its recpients could tangibly experience its benefits. To this end, if the working classes and people struck by poverty could see that pastors genuinely understood their problems, and that the welfare provided by the Church tangibly improved their material existence, they would be much more open to embracing other religious ideas. Therefore, just as his father lived in the slums of Paris to be with German workers, Gustav moved to Dünne and displayed genuine empathy with the plight of the cigar makers.

In order to illustrate the relevance of his father's philosophy to postwar social welfare, Gustav consciously modeled his efforts to help the cigar makers of Dünne after the elder Bodelschwingh's ideas. In a 1931 piece for his father's one hundredth birthday Gustav noted that: "It seemed much more important to him to work hard on the recovery of the whole national body. Therefore, he wanted to create a homeland for the German

---

[813] Gustav von Bodelschwingh, "Wohl und Wehe des Zigarrenarbeiters—Vortrag gehalten am 10. März 1908 im Gemeindehaus zu Dünne vor den Familienvätern der Gemeinde von G. v. Bodelschwingh, Pastor," reprinted in Belitz, *Gustav von Bodelschwingh*, 46.
[814] Ibid., 48.

people. One's own home on its own soil for the family of hand workers, that was his goal."[815] In this essay, Gustav made it clear that his father had a serious interest in helping working families to own their own homes, a goal that was directly in line with his approach to social welfare. Home ownership would not only force working men to accept the responsibilities of home ownership, but it would also encourage them to establish roots in a community.

In order to overcome the financial limitations faced by cigar making families, Gustav drew directly from his experience as a missionary in East Africa. As he was marching from his mission station in Rwanda to Dar es Salaam, he encountered a building technique called Lehmbau. A missionary named August Kraft from the Neukirchen mission had used the technique to construct buildings for the Neukirchen mission stations. Using a combination of clay and wood, the Lehmbau technique allowed an individual to construct a sturdy structure relatively cheaply. Gustav was immediately filled with enthusiasm as he thought about the possibilities of applying the technique to housing construction in Dünne.[816]

When he returned to Germany after the war, it became readily apparent that Gustav could not remain in Bethel. Extremely jealous of his younger brother, Gustav remained deeply bitter that his father had not selected him to become the new leader of Bethel, which in turn generated considerable tension within the community. As a result, he worried that he would no longer have any influence and that Fritz would not take his

---

[815] Gustav von Bodelschwingh, "Ein Heimathaus: Zum Gedächtnis Vater Bodelschwinghs" (Dünne, 1931), in Belitz, *Gustav von Bodelschwingh*, 50–51.
[816] Belitz, *Gustav von Bodelschwingh*, 62–63.

opinions seriously.[817] Therefore, Gustav purposely avoided Bethel after the war and instead focused on trying to construct his own legacy.

Instead, he decided to return to Dünne where he could apply practically his experience in Africa to provide housing to the families of cigar makers. To this end, he invited August Kraft to visit him so that the missionary could teach him first hand how to adapt the technique from East Africa for use in East Westphalia. Despite its affordability, Gustav initially encountered considerable resistance from the cigar makers. While they were eagar to build their own homes, they were unfamiliar with Lehmbau and skeptical about the quality of the structures. For them, a sturdy house consisted of solid stone, not flexible wood.[818] In an attempt to disabuse the cigar workers of their prejudices against Lehmbau housing, Gustav built one for his family when they moved to Dünne. Yet the initiative only gained momentum slowly. They hyperinflation crisis of 1922-23 made the typically fiscally conservative cigar makers even more apprehensive about making a significant financial investment.

For his part though, Gustav did not stand idly by during this period, and worked to ensure that housing reform, and by extension the Bodelschwingh philosophy, remained front and center on the agenda of German Protestants. In 1924, the annual Evangelical Church conference (held at Bethel) emphasized the importance of social questions, especially the housing shortage. One year later, thanks largely to Gustav's efforts, the German Evangelical Church issued a special declaration on the housing crisis. Among other things, it declared that: "The worst social crisis, under which we are currently suffering, is the shocking lack of housing. Its remedy is our most important social task

[817] Gustav von Bodelschwingh to Fritz von Bodelschwingh, 14 August 1921, *HAB* 2/93–4.
[818] Belitz, *Gustav von Bodelschwingh*, 62–63

and is an indespensible condition for the reconstruction of our national body."[819] At a time when Protestant leaders were increasingly focused on eugenics as a social welfare tool, Gustav's efforts were vital to asserting traditional ideas into the larger discussion among Protestants over how they would administer social welfare.

Eventually, as a result of Gustav's efforts, interest in Lehmbau housing began to grow. While there was only one house constructed in each year of 1923 and 1924 in the Minden-Ravensberg region, that number grew to twenty-eight in 1926. In 1928, seventy two new houses were built with a peak of ninety four houses constructed in 1929 before the depression effectively derailed the advances Gustav's program made. All together, between 1923-1937, three hundred and two new lehmbau houses were built in Minden Ravensberg, and by 1941 Gustav claimed it had passed five hundred.[820] In a 1930 article he wrote for a local calender, Gustav also presented statistical data which claimed that the overwhelming majority of houses were built by either workers in the cigar-making industry (95) or by so-called unskilled workers (65).[821] Thus, not only were people building Lehmbau houses, but they were from the poorer classes that Gustav had targeted.

The rapid growth of Lehmbau among working families was important because it gave Gustav the opportunity to demonstrate the effectiveness of Bodelschwingh's philosophy as a social welfare tool For example, one way in which *Lehmbau* construction saved on costs was through labor. Once an individual had saved up enough

[819] *Kundgebund* found in Jürgen Schneider, ed., *Kirchliches Jahrbuch für die evangelischen Landeskirchen Deutschlands*, Vol. 52 (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1925), 474–77. Kundgebung zur Wohnungsnot, June 1925 in Schneider, 474-–77.

[820] Belitz, *Gustav von Bodelschwingh*, 71; Gustav von Godelschwingh, "Bauten aus ungebranntem Lehm: Erfahrungen aus drei Jahrzehnten," *Bauwelt: Zeitschrift für das gesamte Bauwesen* 15 (11 April 1941): 239–42, at 239. Located in *HAB*, Sammlung B VIII 1, 5 Nr. X.

[821] Belitz, *Gustav von Bodelschwingh*, 73.

money to purchase land and building materials, he was responsible for actually constructing the house. Therefore, lehmbau helped not only to teach home owners the importance of fiscal responsibility, as they saved to buy the land and building materials, but also the virtue and benefits of having a strong work ethic. "The settling family creates through the work of their hands the easiest, palpable connection with Mother Earth."[822] Even more importantly, the entire family,"from the five-year-old child to the old grand mother," could participate in the construction process. The communal construction effort was one of the primary benefits of lehmbau.

> The clay would lose its soul if the work was passed off. The family that is is often held together only by companionship at the table and in the bedroom community, has suddenly once again a joint task that chains the family close together ... It requires the voluntary cooperation of the neighborhood and connects the houses with each other. One feels again incorporated into a larger association of neighborly community.[823]

Thus, Lehmbau not only achieved the practical benefit of helping working-class families to realize their goal of home ownership, but it also helped to instill Bodelschwingh's philosophy by encouraging self-reliance and fostering communal bonds. One built a house through one's individual efforts, or through the combined efforts of the community.[824]

Gustav reinforced this aspect of his project in a promotional book he designed with his daughter Adelheid in 1924 to promote the then fledgling initiative. Using short, rhyming verses along with full page illustrations, the book explained the benefits of lehmbau housing for a poor, working-class family. The story begins with a picture of a

[822] Gustav von Bodelschwingh, "Ein Heim aus Lehm," *Das Gottesjahr,* 86-91 (Kassel: Bärenreiter Verlag, 1932).
[823] Belitz, *Gustav von Bodelschwingh*, 89.
[824] Belitz, *Gustav von Bodelschwingh*, 55.

miserable family that is clearly cramped and unhappy in their one-room dwelling. It is accompanied by two stanzas that reflect the family's frustration with their living arrangements:

> In the apartment, narrow and close
> It is always anxious
> Even in the days of health
> It is almost impossible to bear.
> But disease enters,
> Thus, the pain doubled.
> Finally the woman says to the man:
> "William, listen, I'm telling you: build!
>
> And the man says, "Dear woman,
> Consider only one thing:
> In the days just like this year
> Is the building even too expensive.
> But it is pleasant to you,
> So let's try it with clay
> This is healthy and cheap
> And the woman says, "okay."[825]

Frustrated by their poor living conditions, but unable to afford a house made of stone, the family decides to pursue a lehmbau house as a reasonable alternative. After chroncling the family's collaborative efforts at lehmbau construction, the story ends with an illustration of the same family enjoying fresh air in front of their new house and a description of their newfound happiness:

> William and his wife now
> Sitting in the new building,
> Occupy their fresh hands
> With the work on the table.
> Their own home and their ownhearth
> Makes the job enjoyable and worthwhile
> And Auguste says to the man:
> "Just look at the kids!"

---

[825] Gustav von Bodelschwingh, *Ein alter Baumeister und was wir von ihm gelernt haben* . (Dünne, Kreis Herford: Verein "Heimstätte," 1924), 4.

> Yes, true, the dear children
> Are healthier day by day!
> And the mother, once plagued
> And almost work by the pain from gout
> Feels so warm and so chubby
> And noted: "It is funmy
> That the mud house in terms of cash
> It takes so little to get."[826]

The message of the story could not be clearer. By acting responsibly and working hard, a poor, working-class family was able to build their own home and improve dramatically their quality of life. In the final image, the father of the family proudly stands in front of his house with a shovel while a rainbow shines in the background. Not only did Lehmbau help to redeem a family that previously lived on the margins of society, but it did so by using Bodelschwingh's philosophy. Thus, Gustav effectively demonstrated to his audience that Bodelschwingh was still highly relevant to Protestant social welfare during the 1920s.

Like his father, Gustav also firmly believed that outdoor labor was preferable to factory work because of the bond it created between the land and the worker. The more one worked with the land, the deeper the bond between the individual and the nation. Although the cigar workers tended to be conservative when compared to their counterparts in other fields of work, Gustav was worried that their dismal living conditions would only alienate them further, thus driving them even further to the fringes of society. Should that happen, he feared that the cigar makers would turn to the Social Democrats for help, which would in turn lead to alienation from the Church. Lehmbau, however, served as the perfect solution to this problem. By emphasizing the importance of owning land and working outdoors, Lehmbau implicitly encouraged working-class

---

[826] Ibid., 26.

families to leave urban areas. In order to make this point extremely clear, Gustav concluded his story by explaining why a close connection to the soil was positive for the nation:

> An achievable goal for the benefit
> For family and country.
>
> The storm has moved on,
> And now the rainbow
> is over this dear house.
> Does not it look friendly enough?
> Outside there are streams and peace.
> Peace be granted to you too,
> You are also up on the hearth
> Once greatest happiness was bestowed![827]

Like his colleagues at Bethel, Gustav clearly understood the nation to be an organic entity that one needed to cultivate. Yet, instead of using eugenics to eradicate potentially harmful elements, he sought to use Lehmbau as a way to heal and reintegrate supposedly damaged elements of the nation.[828]

Gustav's desire to help and reintegrate working-class communities was rooted in a larger fear of socialism. Like his father and many of his contemporaries, Gustav believed that socialism posed a potentially lethal threat to the church and was genuinely shocked by the events of 1918. Unable to accept a state led by the Social Democratic Party, he indentified with what J.R.C. Wright describes as an "irrational element" in the Protestant church.[829] This segment tended to remain hostile to the new government and worried about its potential impact on the future of the national community.

---

[827] Gustav von Bodelschwingh, *Ein alter Baumeister und was wir von ihm gelernt haben,* 28; see also Gustav von Bodelschwingh, "Unser nächster Feldzug," *Bote von Bethel* 121 (1924): 16.
[828] For an extended discussion on the idea of Heimat, see especialy Celia Applegate, *A Nation of Provincials: The German Idea of Heimat* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990).
[829] J. R. C. Wright, *"Above Parties:" The Political Attitudes of the German Protestant Church Leadership, 1918–1933* (London: Oxford University Press, 1974), 49-50.

Gustav undoubtedly stood at the heart of this segment of German Protestantism. The German defeat in 1918 was nothing short of a personal catastrophe for the returning missionary. Describing the Versailles Peace Treaty he wrote: "The signature of Versailles I felt was above all else an immeasurable loss for evangelical Christianity."[830] As Klaus Scholder explains, German Protestantism invested itself heavily in the conflict and its outcome. "During the war the identification of the German cause with the will of God had reached such a height in German Protestantism that a German victory was made to seem virtually the fulfilment of divine righteousness."[831] The defeat confronted Protestants with a crisis of faith as they sought to explain how Germany lost a conflict which they were seemingly destined to win.

Unsurprisingly Protestants like Gustav, turned to apocalyptic predictions of doom for both Christianity and Germany in the wake of this inexplicable defeat:

> That is why the world war, with its monstrous proportions, is simultaneously the measure for the extent and depth of the moral decay of Christianity. The truly hellish powers that broke out during the war, are not outgrowths of a rabid destiny, no, the devil has obtained from God the right to chastise his Christianity that had become morally lazy. The bailiff, however, who is in the hands of the devil, but executes judgment in the name of God, are the Jews. They, once the chosen people of God, have become the chosen people of Satan, sent and ready to punish with blood and tears a world that has become lazy.[832]

Yet, whereas most of his contemporaries used this attitude as a gateway to exploring eugenics as a way to save the national body, Gustav instead doubled down on his father's philosophy. In his voluminous correspondence with his brother, he never raises the issue of eugenics. He firmly believed that social welfare in the tradition of Wichern and his

[830] Gustav von Bodelschwingh, quoted in Belitz, *Gustav von Bodelschwingh,* 30.
[831] Klaus Scholder, *The Churches and the Third Reich, Volume One: Preliminary History and the Time of Illusions, 1918–1934* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 6.
[832] Gustav von Bodelschwingh, quoted in Belitz, *Gustav von Bodelschwingh,* 32.

father was the only way to save the nation. Ultimately, Gustav's identification with "irrational" Protestantism ran so deep that he moved to Berlin so that he could be closer to Hitler, whom he believed to be the only one capable of rescuing the nation from the evils of socialism. From there he continued to lobby for support for Lehmbau until his death in 1943.

***

When the Bethel missionaries returned to Germany in 1918 they were deeply disappointed by what they encountered, Like their colleagues who spent the duration of the war at Bethel, they were shocked by the outcome of the war, worried about its impact on society, and feared for the future of the German nation. Yet, unlike their colleagues, who were convinced that the situation had become so dire that it called for a radical new solution in the form of eugenics, the missionaries maintained their devout faith in Bodelschwingh's philosophy. While the missionaries certainly experienced adversity during the war, it was not to the same degree as those who experienced the war in Germany. Therefore, their faith in Bodelschwingh, whom they viewed as a father figure, was never seriously shaken, and they returned to Germany just as devoted to him as when they left.

While the Bethel leadership took practical steps to introduce eugenic ideas to the institute, the missionaries adopted a very different approach. Believing they were the true defenders of Bodelschwingh's legacy, they publicly tied themselves to his memory, thus casting themselves as Bethel's spiritual and moral authority. They made Bodelschwingh's philosophy of work, responsiblity and family the centerpiece of their new *Heimatsmission*, and used their access to Bethel's public relations center to make a

public case about the continued relevance of Bodelschwingh's ideas. Through a variety of printed material and an innovative film inititative, they argued that by offering both physical and spiritual assistance, his philosophy went far beyond the promises made by eugenics. To make these arguments, they also drew extensively from their experiences abroad. In addition to their moral authority, which they argued was rooted in their identity as missionaries, they regularly invoked their experiences in Africa to legitimize their arguments.

While the overwhelming majority of returning missionaries sought employment in the Dankort*,* others, like Gustav von Bodelschwingh, tried to apply practically their experience in Africa to social work in Germany. Situating himself in the tradition of his father and Johann Wichern, Gustav used the Lehmbau technique he learned in Africa to teach working-class families about Bodelschwingh's philosophy while tangibly improving their living conditions. In the same spirit as the worker colonies, Gustav believed that Lehmbau could reintegrate a potentially marginalized population and transform them into loyal supporters of a Christian, conservative political agenda. The steady growth in Lehmbau houses appeared to confirm that Bodelschwingh's philosophy was still highly relevant to the postwar world.

Ultimately, the missionaries' skepticism of modern scientific ideas like eugenics demonstrates clearly that Protestants were deeply divided on the issue. While they agreed with their colleagues that Protestants faced a number of daunting challenges following the war, they firmly disagreed that eugenics was the silver bullet solution. At its best, it was an incomplete solution that failed to address the spiritual needs of an

individual. At its worst, the missionaries argued that it was a heartless innovation that rejected everything that Bodelschwingh worked to build.

Even more imporantly, the returning missionaries also greatly complicate the way historians view Germany's colonial legacy. Not everyone returned to Europe from the colonies with new, radical ideas. In this sense, the colonies were not always "laboratories of modernity" as Hannah Arendt argues. While Francis Galton frequently referenced his experience in Africa to justify his ideas, the case of Bethel demonstrates that time in Africa did not automatically lead one to mix scientific racism with social policy. As the missionaries demonstrate, Africa could just as easily serve as an insulated refuge from the problems of Europe as it could a laboratory of social experimentation. Therefore, at the very least, the experience of the Bethel missionaries warns against drawing a direct line from "*Erziehung zur Arbeit*" to "*Vernichtung durch Arbeit.*"[833]

---

[833] See Sebastian Conrad, *Globalisierung und Nation im Deutschen Kaiserreich* (Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 2006), 121–23.

Chapter 7: Conclusion

The development of German Protestant social welfare during the early twentieth century was truly a global phenomenon. Through the example of the Bethel Institute, which operated initiatives in both Germany and East Africa, and the ideas of its famous leader Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, it is clear that Protestant poor relief practices developed between the two continents. As he practically applied his philosophy, Bodelschwingh actively drew on the strategies of missionaries in Africa as well as his own experiences as a missionary to impoverished communities of Germans in the slums of mid-nineteenth-century Paris. After creating the worker colony, a closed environment organized entirely around Bodelschwingh's ideas, he transferred the philosophy to East Africa through the Bethel Mission. There, the Bethel missionaries used the same approach of *Arbeitserziehung* combined with an emphasis on Protestantism and notions of responsibility to the larger community to integrate Africans into the German colonial apparatus. When they returned to Europe in 1918, they brought Bodelschwingh's philosophy back with them and reasserted its relevance in a society that had changed dramatically since they had left decades earlier. In no way did their experience abroad support the belief of eugenics advocates that the capacity to work was a biological characteristic. Thus, through this series of transfers, Protestant social welfare at the turn of the twentieth century was very much a transnational process.

Yet at its core, the story of Bethel is about much more than the evolution of Protestant approaches to poor relief during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. When they returned to Germany following World War I, the Bethel missionaries were deeply disappointed to discover the Bethel leadership's interest in

modern, scientific ideas like eugenics. They viewed eugenics as a rejection of Bodelschwingh's philosophy and feared it would lead the Bethel community away from the ideas that had defined its mission for the previous half century. Thus, by providing the only audible critique of eugenics at Bethel, the missionaries illustrated the influence of Germany's colonial experience on domestic debates and how individuals with colonial experience exercised significant influence over processes back in Europe.[834]

Furthermore, the Bethel missionaries returned from Africa just as devoted to Bodelschwingh's philosophy as when they had initially departed. The continuity of their attitudes demonstrates that the colonies did not always serve as laboratories where Europeans could gain experience with radical ideas before implementing them at home. Instead, while they were in Africa, the missionaries saw no reason to question their faith in the effectiveness of Bodelschwingh's philosophy. When they returned to Germany, they remained unconvinced about the supposed benefits of eugenics, arguing that it was at best a partial solution. Therefore, individuals did not necessarily return from the colonies as radicalized racists. Germany's colonial legacy is significantly more complicated than a direct route to Auschwitz. By trying to understand it merely as a prelude to the Holocaust, historians miss the myriad ways in which the colonial legacy influenced German society during the first half of the twentieth century.

One can trace the origins of Bodelschwingh's philosophy and the greater goals of Protestant poor relief policies during the middle of the nineteenth century to the political and social chaos caused by the revolutions of 1848. Early Protestant social reformers like Johann Wichern believed that social welfare needed to provide both spiritual and material

---

[834] For a concise overview of this theme see Sebastian Conrad, *German Colonialism: A Short History*, trans. Sorcha O;Hagan (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

assistance to marginalized individuals. Without material assistance, he feared working-class communities would become interested in radical ideologies and potentially destabilize the political order of the conservative monarchies. In order to reach a population that was growing increasingly marginalized, Wichern drew on the methods of early nineteenth-century missionaries to Africa. He encouraged social workers to act like missionaries and live among the communities they served. He believed residing with their clients would demonstrate that Protestants genuinely understood the challenges that working-class families faced.

One generation later, Friedrich von Bodelschwingh built on Wichern's approach as a young missionary in the slums of mid-century Paris. In the tradition established by Wichern, he lived among a community of impoverished, working-class German families. After observing their lives first hand, he determined that the greatest challenge they faced was a lack of daily structure and organization. In response, he developed a philosophy that emphasized a strong work ethic, notions of responsibility to a greater community, and the importance of family. Taken together, he believed these values would transform working-class communities into active Protestants and loyal supporters of a conservative monarchy. Thus early Protestant poor relief policies were shaped by traditions and experiences outside of Germany. Bodelschwingh's philosophy was heavily influenced by early-nineteenth-century missionary practices as well as his own experiences in France.

In 1872 Bodelschwingh arrived at Bethel after a brief period as a parish pastor in the small village of Dellwig. With more resources and a larger platform at his disposal, Bodelschwingh developed his philosophy further and used it to transform a small asylum

for boys with epilepsy into Germany's largest center for Protestant social welfare by the turn of the century. Bodelschwingh, like Wichern, was particularly concerned about the potential threat posed by disaffected, impoverished migrant workers. If left unattended, he feared they would gradually drift to radical, left-wing political parties and threaten the conservative monarchy. Therefore, he drew on his experience in Paris to build an actual worker colony outside of Bielefeld. There, isolated from the temptations of the modern city, migrant workers would be immersed in the Bethel philosophy and transformed into active Protestants and loyal supporters of the state. Clients of the colonies performed physical, outdoor agricultural work, with the harvests supporting both the colony and greater Bethel. Wildly popular with conservative social reformers, the worker colony at Wilhelmsdorf formed the foundation for a nationwide network of colonies.

Bodelschwingh's worker colony generated so much excitement among German conservatives, it caught the attention of colonial officials in East Africa. Desperate to recruit African men to work on large colonial plantations, colonial authorities turned to Bodelschwingh in the hopes that he would use the same approach to transform Africans into willing wage laborers and loyal subjects of the greater German empire. They offered him full control of the *Evangelische Missionsgesellschaft nach Deutsch Ostafrika* (EMDOA) with the understanding that he would staff it with missionaries trained in his philosophy at Bethel. Upon arriving in Africa, the missionaries set out to replicate Bethel and create a network of stations based exclusively on Bodelschwingh's philosophy. The language the missionaries used to describe the clients of their stations was nearly identical to the language Bodelschwingh used to describe the clients of the worker colonies in Germany. Therefore, while the Bethel missionaries clearly viewed Africans

as children in need of their paternal guidance, they never used language that suggested they saw their clients as biologically inferior. Ultimately, Bodelschwingh used his philosophy in two very different geographical settings to achieve very similar goals. Taken together, they demonstrate how Bodelschwingh developed and perfected his philosophy through a series of transfers between East Westphalia and East Africa.

As Bodelschwingh expanded his initiatives through the first decade of the twentieth century, his philosophy also faced several significant challenges. As Bodelschwingh used his philosophy to transform the Bethel institutes dramatically, he inadvertently planted the seeds for a serious challenge to his role within the institution. In order to maintain its status as an elite center for Protestant health care, Bethel began to recruit professionally trained physicians, several of whom had backgrounds in eugenics. These physicians were skeptical of Bodelschwingh's approach and openly challenged him for power and status within the community. At the same time, an aging Bodelschwingh gradually withdrew from the daily administration of the institute and transferred authority to his son Fritz. Eager to distinguish himself from his father, Fritz was significantly more open to scientific treatments and modern medicine. And yet, there was enough taboo surrounding eugenic ideas before 1914 to prevent them from gaining credence at Bethel.

That all changed, however, with the advent of World War I. Faced with significant food shortages and suffering as the conflict dragged on, Bethel's leadership began to question seriously the logic of privileging ideas like the work ethic. Suddenly, eugenics became very attractive because methods like sterilization promised to reduce future populations of people in need. In the process, it also theoretically reduced the

likelihood that Bethel's leadership would ever experience another nightmare scenario like the one created by the war. Furthermore, profoundly nationalistic German Protestants were also very worried about the demographic impact of the war on the strength of the national body. Many Protestants, including Fritz von Bodelschwingh, took a serious interest in eugenic measures like sterilization as a silver bullet solution to all the challenges posed by the war and the turbulence of the early 1920s. Ultimately, Bethel's development through the early twentieth century demonstrates that the impetus among German Protestants to embrace eugenic measures was anchored firmly in Europe and was primarily the result of Germany's experience in the war.

As Bethel underwent a series of dramatic changes, the Bethel missionaries' experience in Africa reinforced their faith in the effectiveness of Bodelschwingh's philosophy. Through their work in the field, most notably at Lutindi, they became even more convinced of the redemptive ability of their methods. At the same time, they endured significantly less hardship during the war when compared to their colleagues in Germany. At no point did they ever experience a crisis great enough to challenge their devotion to the Bodelschwingh philosophy. As a result of their collective experience in Africa they returned to Bethel in 1918 with their faith in Bodelschwingh unshaken. Deeply disappointed by the Bethel leadership's decision to move away from the philosophy that defined Bethel, they used this experience to voice the only audible resistance to eugenics within Bethel during the Weimar era. Given their success at stations like Lutindi, they found no reason to abandon the approach that appeared to work so well for them in Africa

Worried about the inroads eugenics had made at Bethel during their absence, the Bethel missionaries launched a new domestic mission to blunt the influence of these new ideas. Through an extensive print media campaign and an innovative film initiative, they argued that despite eugenics' promises to prevent future suffering, it failed to address the needs of individuals who were currently suffering. Most egregiously, it did not even attempt to address an individual's spiritual needs. In their minds, eugenics was a clear rejection of Friedrich von Bodelschwingh and his legacy. In addition to the propaganda campaign, other missionaries used their experience in Africa to follow in Bodelschwingh's footsteps and assist materially poor and marginalized communities. Bodelschwingh's son Gustav, for example, utilized a house building technique he learned in Africa called Lehmbau to help poor working families build their own homes. Not only did Lehmbau materially improve the lives of working families, but the process of building the home helped expose them to Bodelschwingh's philosophy. Thus, the Bethel missionaries did not return from Africa as radicalized racists who were eager to make biological judgments about marginalized individuals.

In the end, the Bethel missionaries failed to prevent eugenics from making inroads both at Bethel and among the Protestant leaders of the Inner Mission. Protestants were especially amenable to implementing the compulsory sterilization law of 1933. Only when the regime initiated Operation T4, the murder of people with physical and mental disabilities, did they begin to voice their opposition. Even then, however, expressions of opposition were half-hearted and largely ineffective. Yet, unsuccessful should not automatically imply insignificant. By providing the only notable opposition at Bethel, they demonstrated that not all German Protestants embraced the false promises of

eugenics. Even more importantly, they demonstrate the extraordinary relevance of those on the geographic periphery of Europe to understanding all facets of life within the metropole. In this sense the Bethel missionaries illustrate the rich complexity of Germany's colonial legacy and its centrality to the emergence of modern Germany.

Bibliography

Archival Sources

Bielefeld

Hauptarchiv der von Bodelschwingh'schen Anstalten Bethel

B I 12

B IV 5

B VI 13

B IX, 9.2.

1/C 1

1/C 1, 2–3

1/C 1, 14–16

1/C 1, 33–36

1/C 9

1/C 10

1/C 12

1/C 18h

1/C 19a

1/E 138

1/E 300

1/E 308

2/13–2

2/33–549

2/37–10

2/37–22

2/37–31

2/37–32

2/37–33

2/37–34

2/37–36

2/37–264

2/38–144

2/51–8

2/51–9

2/52-3

2/52–5a

2/89–7

2/89–8

2/91-16

2/91–21

2/93–4

8/3–32a

Dankort 1

Sammlung B VIII 1, 5 Nr. X

Berlin

Archiv des diakonishen Werkes

BIIIg1 aaI

CA/G 1800/1

MII 3c 51a

M 750, 1-3

Annual Reports

General-Versammlung in Wilhelmsdorf, 1884

Die Arbeiterkolonie Wilhelmsdorf, 1887

Pamphlets

"Ansprache Pastor von Bodelschwinghs an die Festversammlung von Huffnungstal bei Gelegenheit der Einweihung des vom Kaiser geschenkten Bettsaals in Gegenwart der Kaiserin und des Prinzen Eitel Friedrich am 23. Mai 1906."

Bodelschwingh, Friedrich von. "Wilhelmsdorf im Jahre 1903/04." Bethel bei Bielefeld: 10 September 1904.

Bundesarchiv

R 1001/111

R 1001/118

R 1001/837

R 1001/842

Wuppertal

Archiv der Vereinte Evangelischen Mission

MII 2.15

M 39, Bd. 1

Walter Trittelvitz, "Berufung von Pastor Jasper!" 18 October 1926.

“Dienstanweisung für Herrn Pastor Jasper.” 29 August 1927.

M 217, Bd. 3

Lang-Heinrich, Friedrich. “Lebenserinnerungen (Wie ich Missionar wurde),” Bethel, 1921.

M274

Printed Sources

Die Arbeiterkolonie Wilhelmsdorf und die westfälischen Natural-Verpflegungsstationen. Bericht über die General-Versammlung der Arbeiterkolonie Wilhelmsdorf in Hamm am 7. August 1886 (Bielefeld: Verlag der Schriften Niederlage der Anstalt Bethel, 1886), 5.

“Aus Elisabeth Fatumas Leben und Sterben.” *Der Bote von Bethel* 3 (1897): 7-8.

Baumann, Oskar. *In Deutsch Ostafrika während des Aufstandes*. Vienna: Olmütz, 1890.

Bodelschwingh, Friedrich von. *Ausgewählte Schriften: 1. Veröffentlichungen aus den Jahren 1858 bis 1871*. Edited by Alfred Adam. Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1955.

__________. *Ausgewählte Schriften: 2. Veröffentlichungen aus den Jahren 1872 bis 1910*. Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1964.

__________. *Die Mitarbeit der Kirche an der pflege der Geisteskranken*. Bielefeld: Schriftenniederlage der Anstalt Bethel, 1896.

__________. “Natural-Verpflegungsstationen.” *Die Arbeiter-Kolonie* 4 (1887): 238–42.

__________. *Saat und Segen in der Arbeit von Bethel: Ein Rückblick auf die Zeit seit dem Tode des Anstaltsvaters*. Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt

Bethel, 1932.

__________. *Zu Schutz und Trutz gegen gute und böse Gerüchte.* Bielefeld: Siedhoff, 1897.

__________. *Vorschläge zur Vereinigung aller deutschen Arbeiter-Kolonien nach allgemeinen Grundsätzen zur einheitlichen inneren Ordnung und zu gemeinsamem Handeln nach außen, namentlich in Betreff der Organization der NAturalverpflegungstationen. Referat gehalten in der Versammlung der vereinigten Vorstände deutscher Arbeiter-Kolonien zu Hannover am 16. Oktober 1883 von Pastor von Bodelschwingh*. Bielefeld: Verlag der Schriften-Niederlage der Anstalt "Bethel," 1883.

__________. *Die Wanderarmen und Arbeitslosen*. Bielefeld: Verlag des deutschen Vereins "Arbeiterheim," 1895.

__________. "23 Thesen über Ziel und Zweck der Arbeiterkolonien und Verpflegungstationen." *Die Arbeiter-Kolonie* 1, no. 9 (1884): 257–66.

Bodelschwingh, Gustav von. *Ein alter Baumeister und was wir von ihm gelernt haben*. Dünne, Kreis Herford: Verein "Heimstätte," 1924.

__________. *Der Ruf eines Einsamen: Aus Leben und Gedanken des Erfinders Wilhelm Schmidt.* Stuttgart: J. F. Steinkopf Verlag, 1931.

__________. "Unser nächster Feldzug." *Bote von Bethel* 121 (1924): 16.

Braune, Paul. "Die Wandererfürsorge im Dritten Reich." *Der Wanderer* 50 (1933): 147-87.

Central-Vorstande deutscher Arbeiter-Kolonien, ed. "Die Arbeiter-Kolonie. Korrespondenzblatt für die Intressen der deutschen Arbeiter-Kolonien und

Naturalverpflegungs-Stationen." *Die Arbeiter-Kolonie* 1, no. 1 (April 1884): 1–7.

Crowner, David and Gerald Christianson, eds. and trans. *The Spirituality of the German Awakening*. New York: Paulist Press, 2003.

"Danklied Afrikas an den Kaiser." *Nachrichten aus dem ostafrikanischen Mission* 24, no. 8 (August, 1910): 154–55.

Döring, Paul. *Morgendämmerung in Deutsch-Ostafrika. Ein Rundgang durch die Ostafrikanische Mission (Berlin III).* Berlin: Verlag von Martin Warneck, 1901.

Harmsen, Hans. "Grundsätzliches unserer Arbeit: Bevölkerungspolitische Neuorientierung unserer Gesundheitsfürsorge." *Gesundheitsfürsorge: Zeitschrift der evangelischen Kranken- und Pflegeanstalten* 5 (1931): 1-6.

Hesiod. "Works and Days." In *The Poems of Hesiod*. Translated by R. M. Frazier, 91–142. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1983.

Huchzermeyer, Paul. "Friedrich v. Bodelschwingh†." *Münchener Medizinische Wochenschrift* 19 (10 May 1910): 1018-1019.

"Jahreshauptversammlung des Deutschen Vereins für Psychiatrie in Hamburg am 27. und 28. Mai 1920." *Allgemeine Zeitschrift für Psychiatrie* 76 (1920/21).

"Jahressitzung des Vereins der deutschen Irrenärzte, Frankfurt a. M., den 25. und 26. Mai 1893." *Chronik der Christlichen Welt* 3, no. 23 (1 June 1893).

Johanssen, Ernst. *Führung und Erfahrung in 40 jährigem Missionsdienst: Band II.* Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1935.

Kaiser, Jochen-Christoph, Kurt Nowak, and Michael Schwartz, eds. *Eugenik, Sterilisation, "Euthanasie," Politische Biologie in Deutschland, 1895–1945: Eine Dokumentation*. Halle: Buchverlag Union, 1992.

Merensky, Alexander. "Deutschlands Pflicht gegen seine schwarzen Unterthanen," *Afrika* 77-82 (1895): 82.

__________. "Was soll aus unsern befreiten Sklaven werden?" *Afrika* 68–76 (1894): 74.

__________. "Welches Interesse und welchen Anteil hat die Mission an der Erziehung der Naturvölker zur Arbeit?" *Allgemeine Missionszeitschrift* 14 (1887): 147–64.

__________. *Wie erzieht man am besten den Neger zur Plantagenarbeit?* Berlin: Wilhelm Süssrott, 1912.

Meyer, Hans. *Ostafrikanische Gletscherfahrten*. Leipzig: Dunker& Humblot,1893

Michaelis, W. "Pflüget ein Neues! Gedanken über Heidenmission und Heimatmission." *Evangelisches Missions-Magazin* 63 (1919): 249-53.

Mörchen, Karl. "Vorbericht für die vierte Verbandsversammlung und Arbeitsnachweiskonferenz, 9.-11.11.1905 in Wiesbaden, Berlin." Berlin: 1905.

__________. "Westfalen am Scheidewege. Eine Schlußbetrachtung des Herausgebers." *Wanderer* 26 (1909): 199–210.

Morgen, Major. *Verhandlungen des Deutschen Kolonialkongresses 1902, zu Berlin am 10. und 11. Oktober 1902*. Berlin: Verlag von Dietrich Reimer, 1903.

Peters, Carl. "Die afrikanische Arbeiterfrage." *Die Finanz-Chronik* (2 November 1901): 1633–34.

Prince, Magdalene v. *Eine deutsche Frau im Innern Deutsch-Ostafrikas*. Berlin: Ernst Siegfried Mittler und Sohn, 1908.

Report of the Scottish Christian Social Union Commission to Germany re Elberfeld System and Labour Colonie. June–July 1905.

Roscher, Wilhelm. *System der Armenpflege und Armenpolitik; ein hand-und Lesebuch*

fur Geschaftsmanner und Studierende. Stuttgart: F. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger, 1906.

Satzung des Evangelische Afrikavereins. Berlin: Vaterländische Verlagsanstalt, 1894.

Schmidt, Kurt Dietrich, ed. *Die Bekentnisse und grundsätzlichen Äußerungen zur Kirchenfrage des Jahres 1933*. Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht,1934.

Schneider, Carl. *Behandlung und Verhütung der Geisteskranken*. Berlin: J. Springer, 1939.

Schneider, Jürgen, ed. *Kirchliches Jahrbuch für die evangelischen Landeskirchen Deutschlands*, Vol. 52. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1925.

Simon, Hermann. *Aktivere Krankenbehandlung in der Irrenanstalt.* Berlin: Psyichatrie-Verlag 1929.

Tennstedt, Florian and Heidi Winter, eds. *Quellensammlung zur Geschichte der Deutschen Sozialpolitik 1867 bis 1914. 1. Abteilung, Von der Reichsgründungszeit bis zur kaiserlichen Sozialbotschaft (1867–1881). 1. Band: Grundfragen Staatlicher Sozialpolitik. Die Diskussion der Arbeiterfrage auf Regierungsseite vom preussischen Verfassungskonflikt bis zur Reichstagswahl von 1881.* New York: Gustav Fischer Verlag, 1994.

Trittelwitz, Walter. *An meine 80.000 Kinder in Deutschland*. Bethel, 1909.

__________. *Nicht so langsam! Missionserinnerungen an Vater Bodelschwingh*. Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1929.

Warneck, Gustav. "Zur Lage in Ostafrika." *Allgemeine Missionszeitschrift* 16 (1889): 3–20.

__________. *Modern Missions and Culture: Their Mutual Relations*. Trans. Thomas

Smith, 2nd edition. Edinburgh: J. Gemmel, 1888.

__________. "Nachwort des Herausgabers." *Allgemeine Missionszeitung* 14 (1887): 171–84.

Wichern, Johann Hinrich. "Address on Friday, September 22, 1848." In *The Spirituality of the German Awakening*. Edited by David Crowner and Gerald Christianson, 270-86. New York: Paulist Press, 2003.

__________. *Johann Hinrich Wichern: Sämtliche Werke. Band I: Die Kirche und ihr Soziales Handeln (Grundsätzliches und Allgemeines)*. Edited by Peter Meinhold. Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1962.

__________. *Johann Hinrich Wichern: Sämtliche Werke*, *Band 4, 1. Teil: Schriften zur Sozialpädagogik: Rauhes Haus und Johannesstift*. Edited by Peter Meinhold. Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1958.

Wohlrab, Paul. *Usambara: Werden und Wachsen einer heidenchristlichen Gemeinde in Deutsch-Ostafrika*. Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1915.

Zache, Hans. *Deutsch-Ostafrika (Tanganjika Territory)*. Berlin: Safari-Verlag, 1926.

Magazines, Newspapers, and Pamphlets

Allgemeine Missionszeitschrift, 1886-1889.

Beth-El, 1919-1924.

Bielefelder Tageblatt: Zeitung für Ravensberg und Minden, 1883.

Bote von Bethel, 1897-1927.

Daheim: ein deutsches Familienblatt und Illustrationen, 1882.

Evangelische Kirchen-Zeitung, 1861.

Evangelisches Monatsblatt fur Westfalen, 1858.

Der Sozialdemokrat. Zentral-Organ der deutschen Sozialdemokratie, 1883.

Der Wanderer (*Die Arbeiterkolonie*), 1933.

Usambara Post: Zeitung für die Nordbezirke Tanga, Pangani, Wilhelmsta, 1905.l

Zeitung für Innere Mission, 1883.

Secondary Sources

Altena, Thorsten. "Grenzüberschreitungen: Zum Beziehungsgeflecht von Innerer und Äußerer Mission in den Anfangsjahren der Bethel-Mission." In *Bethels Mission (3) Mutterhaus, Mission und Pflege.* Edited by Matthias Benad and Vicco von Bülow, 147–70. Bielefeld: Luther-Verlag, 2003.

__________. "*Ein Häuflein Christen Mitten in Der Heidenwelt Des Dunklen Erdteils": Zum Selbst- Und Fremdverstandnis Protestantischer Missionare Im Kolonialen*. Münster: Waxmann, 2003.

__________. "Missionare und Einheimische Gesellschaft: Zur Kulturbegegnung der Bethel-Mission in Deutsch-Ostafrika 1890–1916." In *Bethels Mission (1): Zwischen Epileptischenpflege und Heidenbekehrung. Beiträge zur Geschichte der v. Bodelschwinghschen Anstalten Bethel*. Edited by Matthias Benad, 1–74. Bielefeld: Luther Verlag, 2003.

Althammer, Beate, Inga Brandes, and Katrin Marx-Jaskulski. "Religiously motivated charitable work in modern times. Catholic congregations in the Rhineland and Ireland." In *Strangers and Poor People: Changing Patterns of Inclusion and Exclusion in Europe and the Mediterranean World from Classical Antiquity to the*

Present Day. Edited by Andreas Gestrich and Lutz Raphael. Bern: Peter Lang, 2009.

Applegate, Celia. *A Nation of Provincials: The German Idea of Heimat*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

Aly, Götz, Peter Chroust, Christian Pross, and Belinda Cooper. *Cleansing the Fatherland: Nazi Medicine and Racial Hygiene.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.

Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt, 1994.

Austen, Ralph A. *Northwest Tanzania under German and British Rule; Colonial Policy and Tribal Politics, 1889–1939.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968.

Bade, Klaus J. *Friedrich Fabri und der Imperialismus in der Bismarckzeit: Revolution-Depression-Expansion.* Freiburg: Atlantis, 1975.

_________. *Imperialismus und Kolonialmission: kaiserliches Deutschland und koloniales Imperium.* Wiesbaden: Steiner Verlag, 1982.

Barclay, David E. and Eric D. Weitz, eds. *Between Reform and Revolution: German Socialism and Communism from 1840 to 1990*. New York: Berghan Books, 1998). Bean, J. M. W. "The Black Death: The Crisis and its Social and Economic Consequences." In *The Black Death: The Impact of the Fourteenth-Century Plague*. Edited by Daniel Williman, 23–38. Binghamton, New York: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1982.

Beck, Hermann. *The Origins of the Authoritarian Welfare State in Prussia: Conservatives, Bureaucracy and the Social Question, 1815–70*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995.

__________. "Working-Class Politics at the Crossroads of Conservatism, Liberalism, and Socialism." In *Between Reform and Revolution: German Socialism and Communism from 1840 to 1990*. Edited by David E. Barclay and Eric D. Weitz, 63–86. New York: Berghan Books, 1998.

Beier, A.L. *Masterless Men: The Vagrancy Problem in England, 1560–1640*. New York: Routlege, 1985.

Belitz, Wolfgang. *Gustav von Bodelschwingh: Der "Lehmbaupastor" von Dünne*. Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2007.

Benad, Matthias. "Frömmigkeit und Familie in Bethel, Sarepta und Nazareth." In *Inter Legem et Evangelium. Theion-Jahrbuch für Religionskultur*, Vol. 3. Ed. Hans Stoodt-Christoph and Edmund Weber, 9–28. Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1994.

__________. "'Komme ich um, so komme ich um […]' Sterbelust und Arbeitslast in der Betheler Diakonissenfrömmigkeit." *Jahrbuch für Westfälische Kirchengeschichte* 97 (2002): 195–213.

__________. "Religiöse Grundlagen." In *Bethel-Eckardtsheim: Von der Gründung der ersten deutschen Arbeiterkolonie bis zur Auflösung als Teilanstalt (1882–2001)*. Edited by Matthias Benad and Hans-Walter Schmuhl, 36–70. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2006.

Benad, Matthias and Kerstin Winkler, eds. *Bethels Mission (2): Bethel im Spannungsfeld von Erweckungsfrömmigkeit und öffentlicher Fürsorge. Beiträge zur Geschichte der v. Bodelschwinghschen Anstalten Bethel,* Beiträge zur Westfälischen Kirchengeschichte, vol. 20. Bielefeld: Luther-Verlag, 2001.

Bergen, Doris. *Twisted Cross: The German Christian Movement in the Third Reich.*

Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

Blackbourn, David. *The Long Nineteenth Century: A History of Germany, 1780–1918*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Blackbourn, David and Geoff Eley. *The Peculiarities of German History: Bourgeois Society and Politics in Nineteenth-Century Germany.* New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989 (1984).

Blasius, Dirk. *"Einfache Seelenstörung" Geschichte der deutschen Psychiatrie, 1800–1945*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1994.

__________. *Der verwaltete Wahnsinn: eine Sozialgeschichte des Irrenhauses*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1980.

Bodelschwingh, Gustav von. *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, Ein Lebensbild*. 12th Edition. Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1949 [First Edition, 1922].

Born, Karl Erich. *Staat und Sozialpolitik Seit Bismarks Sturz: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Innenpolitischen Entwicklung des Deutschen Reiches, 1890–1914*. Weisbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1957.

Brandt, Wilhelm. *Friedrich v. Bodelschwingh, 1877–1946: Nachfolger und Gestalter*. Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1967.

Bruch, Rüdiger vom. "Bürgerliche Sozialreform im deutschen Kaiserreich." In '*Weder Kommunismus noch Kapitalismus,' Bürgerliche Sozialrefrm in Deutschland vom Vormärz bos zur Ära Adenauer*. Edited by Rüdiger vom Bruch, 61-217. Munich: Verlag C.H. Beck, 1985.

__________. "Einleitung." In *'Weder Kommunismus noch Kapitalismus,' Bürgerliche*

Sozialreform in Deutschland vom Vormärz bos zur Ära Adenauer. Edited by Rüdiger vom Bruch, 7-19. Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1985.

Burford, Alison. *Land and Labor in the Greek World*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.

Burleigh, Michael. *Death and Deliverance: Euthanasia in Germany, 1900–1945*. London: Pan Macmillan, 2002.

Burton, Richard. *The Lake Regions of Central Africa, Volume 2: From Zanzibar to Lake Tanganyika*. Santa Barbara, CA: The Narrative Press, 2001.

Cantor, Norman F. *In the Wake of the Plague: The Black Death and the World It Made*. New York: The Free Press, 2001.

Cantow, Jan and Jochen-Christoph Kaiser. *Paul Gerhard Braune (1887–1954): Ein Mann der Kirche und Diakonie in schwieriger Zeit.* Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2005.

Chevalier, Louis. *Laboring Classes and Dangerous Classes in Paris During the First Half of the Nineteenth Century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981. First English edition 1973.

Chickering, Roger. *We Men Who Feel Most German. A Cultural Study of the Pan-German League, 1886–1914*. Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1984.

Cohen, Jere. *Protestantism and Capitalism: The Mechanisms of Influence*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 2002.

Comaroff, John and Jean Comaroff. *Of Revelation and Revolution: Christianity, Colonialism and Consciousness in South Africa, Vol. 1*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

__________. *Of Revelation and Revolution: The Dialectics of Modernity on a South African Frontier, Vol. 2*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.

Confino, Alon. *The Nation as a Local Metaphor: Württemberg, Imperial Germany, and National Memory, 1871–1918.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Conrad, Sebastian. *Deutsche Kolonialgeschichte.* Munich: C. H. Beck Verlag, 2008.

__________. "Doppelte Marginalisierung. Plädoyer für eine transnationale Perspektive auf die deutsche Geschichte." *Geschichte & Gesellschaft* 28 (2002): 145–69.

__________. "Double Marginalization: A Plea for a Transnational Perspective on German History." In *Comparative and Transnational History: Central European Approaches and New Perspectives*. Edited by Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka, 52–76. New York: Berghan Books, 2009.

__________. *German Colonialism: A Short History.* Translated by Sorcha O'Hagan. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

__________. *Globalisation and the Nation in Imperial Germany*. Translated by Sorcha O'Hagan. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

__________. *Globalisierung und Nation im Deutschen Kaiserreich*. Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 2006.

__________. *The Quest for the Lost Nation: Writing History in Germany and Japan in the American Century*. Translated by Alan Nothnagle. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010.

Conrad, Sebastian and Jürgen Osterhammel. "Einleitung." In *Das Kaiserreich transnational: Deutschland in der Welt 1871–1914*. Edited by Sebastian Conrad

and Jürgen Osterhammel, 7–27. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006.

__________, eds. *Das Kaiserreich transnational: Deutschland in der Welt 1871–1914.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006.

Conrad, Sebastian and Dominic Sachsenmaier. "Introduction: Competing Visions of World Order: Global Moments and Movements, 1880s–1930s." In *Competing Visions of World Order: Global Moments and Movements, 1880s–1930s.* Edited by Sebastian Conrad and Dominic Sachsenmaier, 1–25. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Cooper, Frederick. "Colonizing Time: Work Rhythms and Labor Conflict in Colonial Mombasa." In *Colonialism and Culture*. Edited by Nicholas B. Dirks, 209–245. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992.

__________. *Plantation Slavery on the East Coast of Africa.* New Haven: Yale Unviersity Press, 1977.

Dannemann, A. *Geisteskrankheit und Irrenseelsorge. Ein Wort der Aufklärung und Warnung*. Bremen: Carl Schünermann, 1895.

Deutsch, Jan-Georg. *Emancipation without Abolition in German East Africa c. 1884–1914.* Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2006.

Dickhaus, Monika and Martin Fiedler. "Aufstieg und Niedergang: Die Geschichte der Bünder Tabakindustrie im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert." In *Spuren der Zigarre: Bünde, ein Rundgang durch die Zigarrenkiste Deutschlands*. Edited by Martin Fiedler, Monika Dickhaus, and Norbert Sahrhage, 11-47. Essen: Klartext, 2000.

Dickinson, Edward Ross. "Biopolitics, Fascism, Democracy: Some Reflections on Our Discourse About 'Modernity'." *Central European History* 37, no. 1 (2004): 1–

48.

Diefenbacher, Albert. *Psychiatrie und Kolonialismus: Zur "Irrenfürsorge" in der Kolonie Deutsch-Ostafrika*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 1985.

Dießenbacher, Hartmut. "Der Armenbesucher: Missionar im eigenen Land. Armenfürsorge und Familie in Deutschland um die Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts." In *Soziale Sicherheit und soziale Disziplinierung*: *Beiträge zu einer historischen Theorie der Sozialpolitik*. Edited by Christoph Sachße and Florian Tennstedt, 209–44. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1986.

Döring, Paul. *Morgendämmerung in Deutsch-Ostafrika: Ein Rundgang durch die ostafrikanische Mission*. Berlin: Verlag Martin Warneck, 1901.

Dross, Fritz. "Health Care Provision and Poor Relief in Enlightenment and 19tth Century Prussia." In *Health Care and Poor Relief in 18th Century Northern Europe.* Edited by Ole Peter Grell, Andrew Cunningham, and Robert Jütte, 69–119. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2002.

Eckert, Andreas. *Kolonialismus.* Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer Verlag, 2006.

Eley, Geoff. *Reshaping the German Right: Radical Nationalism and Political Change after Bismarck*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980.

__________. "The Wilhelmine Right: How it Changed." In *Society and Politics in Wilhelmine Germany*. Edited by Richard Evans, 112–35. New York: Barnes and Noble Books, 1978.

Eppler, Paul. *Geschichte der Basler Mission: 1815–1899*. Basel: Verlag der Missionsbuchhandlung, 1900.

Espagne, Michel. "Kulturtransfer und Fachgeschichte der Geisteswissenschaften."

Comparativ 10 (2000): 42-61.

__________. "Sur les limites du comparatisme en histoire culturelle." *Genèses* 17 (1994): 112–21.

Fabri, Friedrich. *Bedarf Deutschland der Colonien? Eine politisch-ökonomische Betrachtung*. Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1884.

__________. *Fünf Jahre Deutscher Kolonialpolitik. Rück- und Ausblicke*. Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1889.

Feierman, Steven. *Peasant Intellectuals: Anthropology and History in Tanzania*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1990.

Frie, Ewald. "Fürsorgepolitik zwischen Kirche und Staat. Wandererarmenhilfe in Preussen." In *Soziale Reform im Kaiserreich: Protestantismus, Katholizismus und Sozialpolitik*. Edited by Jochen-Christoph Kaiser and Wilfried Loth, 114–27. Stuttgart: W. Kholhammer, 1997.

__________. *Wohlfahrtsstaat und Provinz: Fürsorgepolitik des Provinzialverbandes Westfalen und des Landes Sachsen 188–-1930.* Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöning, 1993.

Friedlander, Henry. *The Origins of Nazi Genocide: From Euthanasia to the Final Solution*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Frohman, Larry. *Poor Relief and Welfare in Germany from the Reformation to World War I*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Geremek, Bronislaw. *Poverty: A History*. Cambridge: Blackwell, 1994.

Gerhardt, Martin. *Eine Jahrhundert Innere Mission: Die Geschichte des Central-Ausschusses für die Innere Mission der Deutschen Evangelischen Kirche*, 2 vols.

Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1948.

__________. *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh: Ein Lebensbild aus der deutschen Kirchengeschichte, 1. Band, Werden und Reisen*. Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlag der Anstalt Bethel, 1950.

__________. *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh: Ein Lebensbild aus der deutschen Kirchengeschichte, 2. Band, Das Werk/Erste Hälfte*. Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1952.

__________. *Johann Hinrich Wichern, ein Lebensbild*, 3 vols. Hamburg: Agentur des Rauhen Huses, 1927–1931.

__________. *Theodor Fliedner, ein Lebensbild,* 2 vols. Düsseldorf: Verlag der Buchhandlung der Diakonissen-anstalt, 1933–1937.

Gerhardt, Martin and Alfred Adam. *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh: Ein Lebensbild aus der deutschen Kirchengeschichte, 2. Band, Das Werk/Zweite Hälfte*. Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1958.

Gerwarth, Robert and Stephan Malinowski. "Der Holocaust als 'kolonialer Genozid'? Europäische Kolonialgewalt und nationalsozialistischer Vernichtungskrieg." *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 33 (2007): 439–66.

Gestrich, Andreas, Steven King, and Lutz Raphael, eds. *Being Poor in Modern Europe: Historical Perspectives: 1800–1940*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2006.

Giblin, James L. *The Politics of Environmental Control in Northeastern Tanzania, 1840–1940*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992.

Glassman, Jonathon. *Feasts and Riot: Revelry, Rebellion, and Popular Consciousness on the Swahili Coast, 1856–1888*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1995.

Grifford, Prosser and William Roger Louis, eds. *Britain and Germany in Africa: Imperial Rivalry and Colonial Rule.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967.

Gründer, Horst. *Christliche Mission und deutscher Imperialismus: Eine politische Geschichte ihrer Beziehungen während der deutschen Kolonialzeit (1884–1914) under besonderer Berücksichtigung Afrikas und Chinas.* Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1982.

Gründer, Horst. *Geschichte der deutschen Kolonien.* Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh Verlag, 1985.

Günther, Wolfgang. "Die Entwicklung der organisierten Volksmission in Westfalen während der Weimarer Republik." In *Aufbruch in soziale Verantwortung II: Beispiele kirchlicher sozialer Arbeit in Westfalen während der Weimarer Republik*. Edited by Wolfgang Belitz, Günter Brakelmann, and Norbert Friedrich, 101–46. Waltrop: Hartmut Spenner, 2004.

Grütter, A. *Hermann Simon. Die Entwicklung der Arbeits- und Beschäftigungstherapie in der Anstaltspsychiatrie: Eine biographische Betrachtung*. Herzogenrath: Murken-Altrogge, 1995.

Haase, Bartolt. "'Komm und Sieh!' Der Bethelfilm 1922–1941 und seine Relevanz für die Öffentlichkeitsarbeit in diakonischen Einrichtungen heute." Diplomarbeit, University of Paderborn, 2004.

Hamilton, Majda. *Mission im kolonialen Umfeld: Deutsche Protestantische Missionsgesellschaften in Deutsch-Ostafrika*. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen, 2009.

Harrington, Joel F. "Escape from the Great Confinement: The Genealogy of a German

Workhouse." *Journal of Modern History* 71, no. 2 (1999): 308–45.

Hennock, E.P. *The Origin of the Welfare State in England and Germany, 1850–1914: Social Policies Compared*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Hochmuth, Anneliese. *Spurensuche: Eugenik, Sterilisation, Patientenmorde und die v. Bodelschwinghschen Anstalten Bethel, 1929–1945*. Edited by Matthias Benad. Bielefeld: Bethel Verlag, 1997.

Hochstadt, Steve. *Mobility and Modernity: Migration in Germany, 1820–1989*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999.

Hoffrogge, Ralf. *Sozialismus und Arbeiterbewegung in Deutschland: Von den Anfängen bis 1914*. Stuttgart: Schmetterling Verlag, 2011.

Hong, Young-Sun. "The Challenge of Transnational History." 2006. http://h-net.msu.edu/cgi-bin/logbrowse.pl?trx=vx&list=hgerman&month=0601&msg=Ug5gaQJIb0mI99%2b4nOj7Ww Accessed September 7, 2012.

__________. *Welfare, Modernity and the Weimar State, 1919–1933*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998.

Howe, Timothy. *Pastoral Politics: Animals, Agriculture, and Society in Ancient Greece*. Publications of the Association of Ancient Historians 9. Claremont, California: Regina Books, 2008.

Hunecke, Volker. "Ueberlegungen zur Geschichte der Armut im vorindustriellen Europa." *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 9 (1982): 480–512.

Iliffe, John. *A Modern History of Tanganyika*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Irsigler, Franz. "Bettler und Dirnen in der staedtischen Gesellschaft des 14.-16. Jahrhunderts." In *Aspects of Poverty in Early Modern Europe*, vol. 2. Edited by Thomas Riis, 179–91. Odense: Odense University Press, 1986.

Isaacman, Allen. *Cotton is the Mother of Poverty: Peasants, Work and Rural Struggle in Colonial Mozambique, 1938–1965*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1995.

Jackson Jr., James H. *Migration and Urbanization in the Ruhr Valley, 1821–1914*. Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1997.

Jarausch, Konrad H. "Reflections on Transnational History." 2006. http://h-net.msu.edu/cgi-bin/logbrowse.pl?trx=vx&list=hgerman&month=0601&msg=LPkNHirCm1xgSZQKHOGRXQ Accessed September 9, 2012.

__________. "Zeitgeschichte zwischen Nation und Europa: Eine transnationale Herausforderung." *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* B 39 (2004): 3–10.

Jasper, Gerhard. *Wege durch Bethel*. Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1935.

__________. *Das Werden der Bethel-Mission*. Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1936.

Johanssen, Ernst. *Führung und Erfahrung in 40 jährigem Missionsdienst*, 3 volumes. Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1934.

Jones, Elizabeth Bright. *Gender and Rural Modernity: Farm Women and the Politics of Labor in Germany, 1871–1933*. Farnham/Burlington: Ashgate, 2009.

Jütte, Robert. *Poverty and Deviance in Early Modern Europe*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Kaelble, Hartmut. "Between Comparison and Transfers—and What Now? A French-German Debate." In *Comparative and Transnational History: Central European Approaches and New Perspectives*. Edited by Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka, 33–38. New York: Berghan Books, 2009.

Kaiser, Jochen-Christoph. "Fritz von Bodelschwingh als Diakoniepolitiker." In *Friedrich v. Bodelschwingh d. J. und die Betheler Anstalten: Frömmigkeit und Weltgestaltung*. Edited by Matthias Benad, 38–53. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1997.

__________. "Protestantismus und Sozialpolitik: Der Ertrag der 1890er Jahre." In *Soziale Reform im Kaiserreich: Protestantismus, Katholizismus und Sozialpolitik*. Edited by Jochen-Christoph Kaiser and Wilfried Loth, 94-113. Stuttgart: W. Kholhammer, 1997.

__________. *Sozialer Protestantismus im 20. Jahrhundert: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Inneren Mission, 1914–1945.* Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1989.

Kaiser, Jochen-Christoph and Wilfried Loth, eds. *Soziale Reform im Kaiserreich: Protestantismus, Katholizismus und Sozialpolitik*. Stuttgart: W. Kholhammer, 1997.

Kaminsky, Uwe. *Zwangssterlisation und Euthanasie im Rheinland: evangelische Erziehungsanstalten, sowie Heil- und Pflegeanstalten, 1933–1945*. Köln: Rheinland Verlag, 1995.

Kaniki, M. H. Y., ed. *Tanzania Under Colonial Rule*. London: Longman Group, 1979.

Kanther, Michael A. and Dietmar Petzina. *Victor Aimé Huber (1800–1869): Sozialreformer und Wegbereiter der sozialen Wohnungswirtschaft*. Berlin:

Duncker & Humbolt, 2000.

Kleeis, Friedrich. *Die Geschichte der sozialen Verischerung in Deutschland. Nachdruck Herausgegeben von Dieter Dowe mit einer Einleitung von Florian Tennstedt*. Berlin: Verlag J.H.W. Dietz Nachf. GmbH, 1981.

Kocka, Jürgen and Heinz-Gerhard Haupt. "Comparison and Beyond: Traditions, Scope and Perspectives of Comparative History." In *Comparative and Transnational History: Central European Approaches and New Perspectives*. Edited by Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka, 1–30. New York: Berghan Books, 2009.

Koponen, Juhani. *Development for Exploitation: German colonial policies in Mainland Tanzania, 1884–1914.* Hamburg: Lit Verlag, 1995.

Korn, Wolfram, ed. *Bethel und das Geld, 1867–1998: Die ökonomische Entwicklung der v. Bodelschwinghschen Anstalten Bethel*. Bielefeld: Bethel Verlag, 1998.

Körtner, Ulrich H. J. "Calvinism and Capitalism." In *John Calvin's Impact on Church and Society*, *1509–2009.* Edited by Martin Ernst Hirzel and Martin Sallmann. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2009.

Landau, Paul Stuart. *The Realm of the Word: Language, Gender and Christianity in a Southern African Kingdom.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1995.

Lees, Andrew and Lynn Hollen Lees. *Cities and the Making of Modern Europe, 1750–1914*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Lehmann, Hartmut. "Friedrich von Bodelschwingh und das Sedanfest. Ein Beitrag zum nationalen Denken der politisch aktiven Richtung im deutschen Pietismus des 19. Jahrhunderts." *Historische Zeitschrift* 202 (1966): 542–73.

__________. "Pietism and Nationalism: The Relationship between Protestant

Revivalism and National Renewal in Nineteenth-Century Germany." *Church History* 51 (1982): 39–53.

Leveque, Pierre. "The Revolutionary Crisis of 1848–1851 in France: Origins and Course of Events." In *Europe in 1848: Revolution and Reform*. Edited by Dieter Dowe, Heinz-Gerhard Haupt, Dieter Langewiesche, and Jonathan Sperber, 91–119. New York: Berghan Books, 2001.

Lindberg, Carter. *Beyond Charity: Reformation Initiatives for the Poor*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

Longenecker, Bruce W. *Remember the Poor: Paul, Poverty and the Greco-Roman World*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2010.

Maddox, Gregory, James L. Giblin, and Isaria N. Kimambo, eds. *Custodians of the Land: Ecology and Culture in the History of Tanzania* (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1996.

Marholdt, Anke Marholdt. "Diakonie und theologische Ausbildung. Die Initiativen Friedrich von Bodelschwinghs (1831–1910) und ihre Entwicklung bis 1914." In *Diakonie im Deutschen Kaiserreich (1871–1918): Neuere Beiträge aus der diakoniegeschichtlichen Forschung*. Edited by Theodor Strohm and Jörg Thierfelder, 396–420. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter Heidelberg, 1995.

Markmiller, Anton. *"Die Erziehung des Negers zur Arbeit" Wie die koloniale Pädagogik afrikanische Gesellschaften in die Abhängigkeit führte*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 1995.

Meilaender, Gilbert C. ed. *Working: Its Meaning and its Limits*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2000.

Menzel, Gustav. *Die Bethel-Mission: Aus 100 Jahren Missionsgeschichte*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1986.

__________. *Die Rheinisch Mission: Aus 100 Jahren Missionsgeschichte.* Wuppertal: Verlag der Vereinigten Evangelischen Mission, 1978.

Miller, Jon. *Missionary Zeal and Institutional Control: Organizational Contradictions in the Basel Mission on the Gold Coast, 1828–1917*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003.

Monson, Jamie. "Relocating Maji Maji: The Politics of Alliance and Authority in the Southern Highlands of Tanzania, 1870–1918." *Journal of African History* 39, no. 1 (1998): 95–120.

Motzkau-Valeton, Wolfgang. "Zur Geographie." In *Bethel-Eckardtsheim: Von der Gründung der ersten deutschen Arbeiterkolonie bis zur Auflösung als Teilanstalt (1882–2001)*. Edited by Matthias Benad and Hans-Walter Schmuhl, 92–106. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2006.

Müller, Sven Oliver and Cornelius Torp, eds. *Imperial Germany Revisited: Continuing Debates and New Perspectives*. New York: Berghan Books, 2011.

Neumann, Reinhard. "Die Senne und das Militär." *Bethel-Eckardtsheim: Von der Gründung der ersten deutschen Arbeiterkolonie bis zur Auflösung als Teilanstalt (1882–2001)*. Edited by Matthias Benad and Hans-Walter Schmuhl, 107–14. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2006.

Nipperdey, Thomas. *Deutsche Geschichte, 1866–1918: Erster Band, Arbeitswelt und*

Bürgergeist. Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1990.

__________. *Deutsche Geschichte, 1866–1918: Zweiter Band, Machtstaat vor der Demokratie*. Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1992.

Nitsche, Paul and Carl Schneider. *Einführung in die Abteilung seelische Hygiene der internationalen Hygieneausstellung Dresden 1930.* Berlin: de Gruyter, 1930.

Niwagila, Wilson B. "Wie die Haya/Nyambo-Christen die Bethel-Mission erfahren haben." *Die diakonische Dimension der Mission: Vorträge zum 100jährigen Jubiläum der Bethel-Mission*. 41-50. Bielefeld: von Bodelschwingh'schen Anstalten, 1987.

Nowak, Kurt. *"Euthanasie" und Sterilisierung im "Dritten Reich": Die Konfrontation der evangelischen und katholischen Kirche mit dem Gesetz zur Verhütung erbkranken Nachwuchses und der "Euthanasie"-Aktion*. Halle (Saale): VEB Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1977.

Nzalayaimisi, Gabriel K. "The Berlin Mission and the Destabilization of Power and Local Politics in Eastern and Southern Tanzania, 1887–1918." In *Mission und Macht im Wandel politischer Orientierung: Europäische Missionsgesellschaften in politischen Spannungsfeldern in Afrika und Asien zwischen 1800 und 1945*. Edited by Ulrich van der Heyden and Holger Stoecker, 211–27. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2005.

Oexle, Otto Gerhard. "Armut, Armutsbegriff und Armenfürsorge im Mittelalter." In *Soziale Sicherheit und soziale Disziplinierung*: *Beiträge zu einer historischen Theorie der Sozialpolitik*. Edited by Christoph Sachße and Florian Tennstedt, 73–100. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1986.

Offer, Avner. "The Blockade of Germany and the Strategy of Starvation, 1914–1918." In *Great War, Total War: Combat and Mobilization on the Western Front, 1914–1918*. Edited by Roger Chickering and Stig Förster, 169–88. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Offermann, Toni. "The Lassallean Labor Movement in Germany: Organization, Social Structure, and Associational Life in the 1860s." In *Between Reform and Revolution: German Socialism and Communism from 1840 to 1990*. Edited by David E. Barclay and Eric D. Weitz, 87–112. New York: Berghan Books, 1998.

Osterhammel, Jürgen. *Geschichtswissenschaft jenseits des Nationalstaats. Studien zu Beziehungsgeschichte und Zivilisationsvergleich*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001.

__________. *Kolonialismus: Geschichte, Formen, Folgen.* München: C. H. Beck Verlag, 2003.

__________. "Transnationale Gesellschaftsgeschichte: Erweiterung oder Alternative?" *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 27 (2001): 464–79.

__________. "A 'Transnational' History of Society: Continuity or New Departure?" In *Comparative and Transnational History: Central European Approaches and New Perspectives*. Edited by Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka, 39–51. New York: Berghan Books, 2009.

__________. *Die Verwandlung der Welt: Eine Geschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts.* München: C H Beck, 2011.

Paulsen, Ingwer. *Viktor Aimé Huber als Sozialpolitiker*. Berlin: Verlag Herbert Renner, 1956.

Perras, Arne. *Carl Peters and German Imperialism, 1856–1918: A Political Biography*. Oxford/New York: Clarendon Press, 2004.

__________. "Colonial Agitation and the Bismarckian State: The Case of Carl Peters." In *Wilhelminism and Its Legacies: German Modernities, Imperialism, and the Meanings of Reform, 1890-1930. Essays for Hartmut Pogge von Strandman*. Edited by Geoff Eley and James Retallack, 154-70. New York: Berghan Books, 2004.

Peterson, Derek. *Creative Writing: Translation, Bookkeeping and the Work of Imagination in Colonial Kenya*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2004.

Peukert, Detlev J. K. *Grenzen der Sozial-disciplinierung: Aufstieg und Kriese der deutschen Jugendfürsorge von 1878 bis 1932*. Cologne: Bund, 1986.

__________. *Jugend zwischen Krieg und Krise: Lebenswelten von Arbeiterungen in der Weimarer Republik*. Cologne: Bund, 1987.

__________. *The Weimar Republic: The Crisis of Classical Modernity*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1989.

Pohl, Karl Heinrich. *Zwischen protestantischer Ethik, Unternehmerinteresse und organisierter Arbeiterbewegung: Zur Geschichte der Arbeitsvermittlung in Bielefeld von 1887 bis 1914, Bielefelder Beiträge zur Stadt- und Regionalgeschichte,* vol. 8. Edited by Stadtarchiv und Landesgeschichtliche Bibliothek Bielefeld. Bielefeld: Stadtarchiv und Landesgeschichtliche Bibliothek, 1991.

Preller, Ludwig. *Sozial Politik in der Weimarer Republik*. Stuttgart: Franz Mittelbach Verlag, 1949.

Proctor, Robert N. *Racial Hygiene: Medicine Under the Nazis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988.

Rabenau, E. F. *Bodelschwingh als Erzieher: Welche Grundsätze über Schulbildung und Erziehung sind aus Bodelschwinghs Persönlichkeit und aus seiner Wirksamkeit zu entnehmen?* Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1924.

Ritter, Gerhard A. *Social Welfare in Germany and Britain: Origins and Development*. Translated by Kim Traynor. New York: Berg, 1986.

Rodney, Walter. "The Political Economy of Colonial Tanganyika, 1890–1930." In *Tanzania under Colonial Rule.* Edited by M.H.Y. Kaniki, 128–63. London: Longman, 1980).

Ronicke, Curt. "Kleine Erinnerungen an einen großen Mann." In *Kleine Erinnerungen an einen großen Mann. Zum Gedenken an Walther Trittelvitz.* Edited by Curt Ronicke, 14-16. Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung er Anstalt Bethel, 1959.

__________. *Vater Bodelschwingh, ein Zeuge Jesu für Ostafrika*. Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1940.

__________. *Afrika Ruft! Ein Gang über die Felder der Bethelmission in Ostafrika*. Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, n.d.

Rosenblum, Warren. *Beyond the Prison Gates: Punishment and Welfare in Germany, 1850–1933*. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 2008.

Roth, Ralf. "Bürger and Workers: Liberalism and the Labor Movement in Germany, 1848 to 1914." In *Between Reform and Revolution: German Socialism and Communism from 1840 to 1990*. Edited by David E. Barclay and Eric D. Weitz, 113–140. New York: Berghan Books, 1998.

Rothfels, Hans. *Theodor Lohman und die Kampfjahre der staatlichen Sozialpolitik (1871–1905).* Berlin: F. S. Mittler & Sohn, 1927.

Sachße, Christoph. *Mütterlichkeit als Beruf: Sozialarbeit, Sozialreform und Frauenbewegung, 1871–1929.* Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1986.

Sachße, Christoph and Florian Tennstedt. *Geschichte der Armenfürsorge in Deutschland, Band 1: Vom Spätmittelalter bis zum 1. Weltkrieg. Zweite, verbesserte und erweiterte Auflage.* Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1998.

__________. *Geschichte der Armenfürsorge in Deutschland, Band 2: Fürsorge und Wohlfahrtspflege, 1871–1929.* Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1988.

__________. "Sicherheit und Disziplin: Eine Skizze zur Einführung." In *Soziale Sicherheit und soziale Disziplinierung*: *Beiträge zu einer historischen Theorie der Sozialpolitik*. Edited by Christoph Sachße and Florian Tennstedt, 11–44. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1986.

Scheffler, Jürgen. "Die Anstalt Bethel und die 'Brüder von der Landstrasse': Anstalts-Diakonie und Wohlfahrtspflege am Beispiel der Wandererfürsorge." In *Bethels Mission (2): Bethel im Spannungsfeld von Erweckungsfrömmigkeit und öffentlicher Fürsorge*. Edited by Matthias Benad and Kerstin Winkler. Beiträge zur Westfälischen Kirchengeschichte 20. Series editor Bernd Hey, Matthias Benad, Martin Brecht, Wilhelm Neuser, and Martin Stiewe, 197–224. Bielefeld: Luther Verlag, 2001.

__________. "Die Arbeiterkolonie Wilhelmsdorf (1882 bis 1970)." In *Bethel-Eckardtsheim: Von der Gründung der ersten deutschen Arbeiterkolonie bis zur Auflösung als Teilanstalt (1882–2001)*. Edited by Matthias Benad and Hans-

Walter Schmuhl, 115–40. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2006.

__________. "Frommigkeit und Fürsorge: Die Gründung der Arbeiterkolonie Wilhelmsdorf und die Wohlfahrtspflege in Westfalen und Lippe um 1880." In *Diakonie: Geschichte von unten: Christliche Nächstenliebe und kirchliche Sozialarbeit in Westfalen*. Edited by Hans Bachman and Reinhard van Spankeren, 117-42. Bielefeld: Luther-Verlag, 1995.

__________. "Vom Herbergswesen für Handwerksgesellen zur Fürsorge für wandernde Arbeiter: Herbergen zur Heimat im Zeitalter der Industrialisierung, 1854–1914." In *Bürger und Bettler: Materialen zur Geschichte der Nichtsesshaftenhilfe in der Diakonie. Bd. 1, 1854 bis 1954, vom Herbergswesen für wandernde Handwerksgesellen zur Nichtsesshaftenhilfe,* edited by Jürgen Scheffler, 10–19. Bielefeld: Verlag Soziale Hilfe, 1987.

Schieder, Wolfgang. "Kirchengeschichte aus der Sicht des Historikers. *Neue Züricher Zeitung* 146 (47). June 1980

__________. "Religionsgeschichte als Sozialgeschichte. Einleitende Bemerkungen zur Forschungsproblematik." In *Religion und Gesellschaft im 19. Jahrhundert*. Edited by Wolfgang Schieder, 291–98. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1993.

Schlosser, Gustav. *Die Vagabunden-Noth*. Bielefeld: Schriften Niederlage der Anstalt "Bethel" bei Bielefeld, 1879.

Schmitt, Heiner. *Kirche und Film: Kirchliche Filmarbeit in Deutschland von ihren Anfängen bis 1945*. Boppard am Rhein: Harald Boldt Verlag, 1979.

Schmul, Hans-Walter. *Arbeitsmarktpolitik und Arbeitsverwaltung in Deutschland 1871–2002: Zwischen Fürsorge, Hoheit und Markt*. Nuremberg: Bundesanstalt für

Arbeit, 2003.

__________. *Ärzte in der Anstalt Bethel: 1870–1945*. Bielefeld: Bethel Verlag, 1998.

__________. *Ärzte in der Westfälischen Diakonissenanstalt Sarepta, 1890–1970*. Bielefeld: Bethel-Verlag, 2001.

__________. "Die Bethel-Mission in Ruanda (1907–1916): Informelle Kolonialherrschaft, sakrales Königtum und christliche Mission." In *Bethels Mission (1): Zwischen Epileptischenpflege und Heidenbekehrung. Beiträge zur Geschichte der v. Bodelschwinghschen Anstalten Bethel.* Edited by Matthias Benad, 177–203. Bielefeld: Luther Verlag, 2003.

__________. *Friedrich von Bodelschwingh*. Hamburg: Rowalt Taschenbuch Verlag, 2005.

__________. "Fritz v. Bodelschwingh, die Ärzte und der medizinische Fortschritt." In *Friedrich v. Bodelschwingh d. J. und die Betheler Anstalten: Frömmigkeit und Weltgestaltung*. Edited by Matthias Benad, 101–17. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1997.

__________. *Rassenhygiene, Nationalsozialismus, Euthanasie: Von der Verhütung zur Vernichtung "lebensunwerten Lebens," 1890–1945.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.

__________. "28. Im Ersten Weltkrieg." In *Bethel-Eckardtsheim: Von der Gründung der ersten deutschen Arbeiterkolonie bis zur Auflösung als Teilanstalt (1882–2001).* Edited by Matthias Benad and Hans-Walter Schmuhl, 438–49. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2006.

__________. "30. Eckardtsheim und der Nationalsozialismus (1931–1941)." In *Bethel-*

Eckardtsheim: Von der Gründung der ersten deutschen Arbeiterkolonie bis zur Auflösung als Teilanstalt (1882–2001). Edited by Matthias Benad and Hans-Walter Schmuhl, 455–89. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2006.

Schneider, Thomas Martin. *Reichsbischof Ludwig Müller: Eine Untersuchung zu Leben, Werk und Persönlichkeit*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.

Scholder, Klaus. *The Churches and the Third Reich, Volume One: 1918-1934, Preliminary History and the Time of Illusions*. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.

Schwartz, Michael. *Sozialistische Eugenik: Eugenische Sozialtechnologien in Debatten und Politik der deutschen Sozialdemokratie 1890–1933*. Bonn: Verlag J.H.W. Dietz Nachfolger, 1995.

Shanahan, William O. *German Protestants face the Social Question, Volume I: The Conservative Phase, 1815–1871*. Notre Dame, Indiana: Notre Dame University Press, 1954.

Sicard, Sigvard von. *The Lutheran Church on the Coast of Tanzania, 1887–1914*. Lund: Gleerup, 1970.

Steinmetz, George. "The Myth of an Autonomous State: Industrialists, Junkers, and Social Policy in Imperial Germany." In *Society, Culture, and the State in Germany: 1870–1930*. Edited by Geoff Eley, 257–318. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1997.

________. *Regulating the Social: The Welfare State and Local Politics in Imperial Germany*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Stoecker, Helmuth, ed. *German Imperialism in Africa: From the Beginnings until the*

Second World War. Translated by Bernd Zöllner. Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey: Humanities Press International, INC., 1986 (1977).

Stucke, Ingo. "Bethel-Gemeinde und Bethel-Mission: Rückwirkungen und Einflüsse der Äusseren Mission auf die diakonische "corporate identity" Bethels 1906–1946." In *Bethels Mission (3) Mutterhaus, Mission und Pflege*. Edited by Matthias Benad and Vicco von Bülow, 171–252. Bielefeld: Luther-Verlag, 2003.

Sunseri, Thaddeus. "Famine and Wild Pigs: Gender Struggles and the Outbreak of the Majimaji War in Uzaramo (Tanzania)." *The Journal of African History* 38, no. 2 (1997): 235–59.

__________. "Majimaji and the Millenium: Abrahamic Sources and the Creation of a Tanzanian Resistance Tradition." *History in Africa* 26 (1999): 365–78.

__________. "Peasants and the Struggle for Labor in Cotton Regimes of the Rufiji Basin, Tanzania (1890–1918)." In *Cotton, Colonialism and Social History in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Edited by Allen Isaacman and Richard Rhodes, 180–199. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1995.

__________. *Vilimani: Labor Migration and Rural Change in Early Colonial Tanzania*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2002.

——————. *Wielding the Ax: State Forestry and Social Conflict in Tanzania, 1820–2000*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2009.

Syrup, Friedrich and Otto Neuloh. *Hundert Jahre Staatliche Sozialpolitik: 1839–1939*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1957.

Thadden, Rudolf von. "Kirchengeschichte als Gesellschaftsgeschichte." *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 9 (1983): 598–614.

Their, Erich. *Die Kirche und die soziale Frage: Von Wichern bis Friedrich Neumann, Eine Untersuchung über die Bezhiehung zwischen politischen Vorgängen und kirchlichen Reformen*. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1950.

Thierfelder, Jörg. "Einführung in den Band 'Diakonie im Deutschen Kaiserreich." *Diakonie im Deutschen Kaiserreich (1871–1918): Neuere Beiträge aus der diakoniegeschichtlichen Forschung*. Edited by Theodor Strohm and Jörg Thierfelder, 9–17. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter Heidelberg, 1995.

Trenckmann, Ulrich. "Die institutionell-administrative Entwicklung der Unterbringung und Behandlung Geisteskranker in Sachsen von Absolutismus bis zur bürgerlichen Revolution." *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Hygiene und ihre Grenzgebiete* 25 (1979): 536–9

Trittelvitz, Walter. *Nicht so langsam! Missionserinnerungen an Vater Bodelschwingh*. Bethel bei Bielefeld: Verlagshandlung der Anstalt Bethel, 1929.

Türpitz, Helmut and Hans-Walter Schmuhl. "Von der Arbeiterkolonie Wilhelmsdorf in der Senne zur Zweiganstalt Eckardtsheim (1882 bis 1914)." In *Bethel-Eckardtsheim: Von der Gründung der ersten deutschen Arbeiterkolonie bis zur Auflösung als Teilanstalt (1882–2001)*. Edited by Matthias Benad and Hans-Walter Schmuhl, 428–37. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2006.

Villinger, Werner. "Die Grenzen der Erziehbarkeit." In *Reform des Strafvollzuges. Kritische Beiträge zu dem Allgeminen Entwurf eines Strafvollzugsgesetzes.* Edited by L. Frede, and M. Grünhut, 137-63. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1927.

Vogel, Walter. *Bismarcks Arbeiter Versicherung: Ihre Entstehung im Kräftespiel der Zeit*. Braunschweig: Georg Westermann Verlag, 1951.

Vries, Jan de. *European Urbanization: 1500–1800*. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1984.

Waltenberg, Hildegard. *Lutindi, die Stadt auf dem Berge*. Bielefeld: H. Waltenberg, 1997.

Walter, Bernd. *Psychiatrie und Gesellschaft in der Moderne: Geisteskrankenfürsorge in der Provinz Westfalen zwischen Kaiserreich und NS-Regime*. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1996.

Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Translated by Talcott Parsons. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958

Wehler, Hans-Ulrich. *Bismarck und der Imperialismus.* Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1984.

__________. "Transnationale Geschichte—die neue Königsweg historischer Forschung?" In *Transnationale Geschichte: Themen, Tendenzen und Theorien*. Edited by Gunilla Budde, Sebastian Conrad, and Oliver Janz, 161–74. Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 2006.

Wehr, Gerhard. *Herausforderung der Liebe—Johann Hinrich Wichern und die Innere Mission*. Stuttgart: Verlagshandlung der Diakonie, 1983.

Weindling, Paul. *Health, Race, and German Politics between National Unification and Nazism, 1870–1945*. Cambridge History of Medicine. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

__________. "Hygienepolitik als sozialintegrative Strategie im späten Deutschen Kaiserreich." In *Medizinische Deutungsmacht im sozialen Wandel des 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhunderts*. Edited by Alfons Labisch and Reinhard Spree, 37-55. Bonn: Psychiatrie-Verlag, 1989.

Weingart, Peter, Jürgen Kroll, and Kurt Bayertz. *Rasse, Blut und Gene: Geschichte der Eugenik und Rassenhygiene in Deutschland.* Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1992 (1988).

Weir, William. *Guerilla Warfare: Irregular Warfare in the Twentieth Century*. Mechanicsburg, PA: Stackpole Books, 2008.

Weitz, Eric D. *A Century of Genocide: Utopias of Race and Nation.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.

__________. *Weimar Germany: Promise and Tragedy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.

Welskopp, Thomas. *Das Banner der Brüderlichkeit: Die deutsche Sozialdemokratie vom Vormärz bis zum Socialistengesetz*. Bonn: Verlag J.H.W.Dietz Nachfolger, 2000.

Wilde, Hanna. "Die Lage der Zigarrenarbeiter(-innen) zu Begin der nationalsozialistischen Zeit." *Neue Nettelstedter Blätter* 5 (1986): 7-14.

Wildenthal, Lora. *German Women for Empire: 1884–1945*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001.

Wright, Gwendolyn. *The Politics of Design in French Colonial Urbanism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

__________. "Tradition in the Service of Modernity. Architecture and Urbanism in French Colonial Policy, 1900–1930." *Journal of Modern History* 59 (1987): 291–316.

Wright, J. R. C. *"Above Parties": The Political Attitudes of the German Protestant Church Leadership, 1918–1933*. London: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Wright, Marcia. *German Missions in Tanganyika: 1891–1941: Lutherans and Moravians in the Southern Highlands*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

__________. *Strategies of Slaves and Women: Life Stories from East Central Africa.* New York: L. Barber Press, 1993.

Zimmerer, Jürgen. *Von Windhuk nach Auschwitz? Beiträge zum Verhältnis von Kolonialismus und Holocaust*. Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2011.

Zimmerman, Andrew. *Alabama in Africa: Booker T. Washington, the German Empire, and the Globalization of the New South.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

__________. *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2001.