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Introduction

On 14 September, 1886, the second day of the General German Congress for the Advancement of Overseas Interests, a tall gentleman took the podium and addressed the attendees. Karl von Koseritz, a former 1848 revolutionary and current member of the provincial legislature of Rio Grande do Sul, delivered a speech entitled “The Situation of the Germans in Southern Brazil,” in which he praised the German Empire for gaining a formal colonial empire. However, Koseritz reminded those present that German colonization began long before 1884, since “German men have gone out into all parts of the world and colonized in the Greek sense,” via settlement through immigration. While Koseritz praised the work of all such German settlers, he argued that the colonists of Southern Brazil were exceptional, the paragons of civilizing Germanness: “The first arrivals have gone through the terrible times of hardship and deprivation. They were led into the jungle and to stand there every day on the “qui vive” against wild men and wild beasts! But, gentlemen, German strength and the German sense of duty conquer all obstacles, even those in nature. Those few thousand Germans who emigrated to Brazil more than sixty years and settled there, they were the standard-bearers of German culture in Southern Brazil, and to them we must thank for today’s achievements.”¹

Koseritz’ claims inspired applause throughout his speech, and reflected a transnational German vision of Southern Brazil, where the vast majority of Germans

¹ “Rede des Herrn von Koseritz im Congreß für Forderung überseeischer Interessen in Berlin (14 September 1886),” Koseritz’ Deutsche Zeitung, November 6, 1886.
settled, that began developing in the 1840s, one that emphasized settlers’ role as perfect models of German civilizing. The “jungle” and “wild men” of which Koseritz spoke were the targets of that civilizing, and “German culture,” specifically German work, was the means to achieve that end. Gabi Kathofer captures well the grounds for Southern Brazil’s exceptional position in the German nationalist imaginary: “What made the nineteenth-century German preoccupation with Brazil unique… was its complex combination of imaginative power and real occupation of Brazilian land by German emigrants.”

My dissertation explores the intersection of Germans’ imaginary and physical settlement of Brazil, or put in a more accurate way, I argue, colonization of Brazil.

Between 1820, when the first settlers arrived, and 1890, a year after the Brazilian Empire ended, nearly 90,000 Germans immigrated to the country, making Brazil the second largest recipient of Germans, behind only the United States. Unlike in U.S., however, Southern Brazil came to be seen as a kind of paradise of Germanness, where immigrants kept true to the Fatherland’s language and customs, especially the German love of work. In contrast to these paragons of industriousness, non-German-Brazilians appeared as indolent and incompetent, unable to advance the vast and bountiful country they inhabited. Slavery was at the heart of the alleged Brazilian incapacity to work; the institution made work dishonorable. German nationalists in Europe and Brazil claimed that settlers would remedy this and remake the country and its people. This was the settlers’ civilizing mission, and it was part of a transnational German colonial discourse.

---

concerning Southern Brazil. As Bradley Naranch writes regarding German colonialism, “[w]hat will advance our understanding… is not the cultivation of German colonial specialists but rather the ability to assess colonialism’s impact at those points of broader interest where it intersects.” This is a study, beginning in 1819 with the arrival of the first German settlers in Brazil and ending in 1888 with Brazilian abolition, of just such an intersection, specifically of slavery and German colonial discourse.

I argue that discourses regarding slavery and work defined transatlantic German presentations of Brazilians and German settlers, presenting the former as requiring help to advance and the latter as providing that help. This examination offers a novel addition to studies of German colonialism and identification as it relates to Germans overseas. It also places German-Brazilian integration, until now focused on the local and national settings, into a transatlantic context for the first time.

**The Role of Colonialism in German Historical Study**

In the early 1980s, there was a call for German historians to move beyond the nation-state as the defining unit of historical analysis. In his influential 1981 essay in the *Journal of Modern History*, James Sheehan argued that German historians tended, to their detriment, to conflate the political entity of the Bismarckian Kaiserreich with the nation: “We have… too often allowed the political sovereignty of the nation state to become the basis for the conceptual sovereignty of the nation as a way of thinking about the past.” We must, Sheehan argues, focus not only on the national, but also the local and (although

---

the term did not yet exist) transnational. According to Sheehan, using the nation-state to define analysis of German culture is particularly problematic, since this elides “a much wider pattern of connections, made possible by shared language and literature, and sustained by a complex web” that operated a multiple levels, including within the national and beyond it.

Geoff Eley echoed Sheehan’s view that the German Empire as a political entity had led historians to conflate the nation-state and the nation. Discussing especially the development and nature of German nationalism, Eley also proposes that changing historical perspective, focusing either on “the larger cultural area cutting across political frontiers, or the smaller locality within the state,” could move us past the dependence on the nation-state.

In the past three decades, the challenge of seeing beyond and within the nation state in terms of identification has been met. There are now several works examining how the local interacted with and shaped the German national(s). There are also works looking beyond the borders of Germany, examining how interactions both imagined and

5 Ibid., 18–20.
direct with people from abroad (defined broadly) influenced the contours of
Germanness.  

This dissertation, in part, explores how German settlements overseas, colonialism, and identification intersected. Until the 1990s, colonialism was a marginal topic at best in German historical scholarship. The German colonial empire was deemed too short lived (1885-1919), the settler population too small when compared to other European empires, and too economically unproductive to be of consequence. Furthermore, since the 1960s, the prevailing understanding of German colonialism was based on Hans Ulrich Wehler’s notion of “social imperialism,” wherein political elites organized the colonial movement of the 1880s so as to diffuse the political potential of an increasingly

---


9 As will be discussed below, I will generally avoid the term “identity,” preferring “identification,” which is less encumbered by the baggage of reification.

politicized working class. However, by the 1980s, research concerning the independent character of nationalist organizations challenged Wehler’s top-down model of German colonialism.

However, the spark that fueled a sea change in understandings of German colonialism came from outside the field of German history, instead arising in postcolonial studies. As Birthe Kundrus writes, “scholars in this field have contributed to creating a heightened awareness… of the interactive nature of relations between colonial powers and those who are colonized.” Postcolonial scholarship is especially revealing concerning the ways in which colonists and colonized interacted and impacted how each identified, as opposed to more traditional studies that see economics and politics as central in this process. The first wave of scholarship examining German colonialism


12 Geoff Eley, Reshaping the German Right: Radical Nationalism and Political Change after Bismarck (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1980); Roger Chickering, We Men Who Feel Most German: A Cultural Study of the Pan-German League, 1886-1914 (Boston, MA: Allen & Unwin, 1984).


14 Especially helpful in this regard are Bhabha and Said. See Homi K. Bhabha, The Location of Culture (London and New York: Routledge, 1994); Edward W. Said, Culture and Imperialism (New York: Knopf, 1993).
was mainly American, where postcolonial studies had its greatest initial impact.\(^{15}\) However, there is now a growing body of works out of Germany looking at colonialism that combine history with cultural and literary studies.\(^{16}\) Furthermore, the impact of colonies and colonialism in imperial German society is now well-established.\(^{17}\)

Along with (or related to) the rise of post-colonial studies, notions of German colonialism also benefitted from the rise of transnational history, which Matthew Jeffries describes as focusing on “the wide variety of links and influences that transcend state


boundaries: global trade and business patterns; ethnic diasporas; cultural and technological transfers; religious and political ideologies.” Seeing Germany, both prior to 1871 and after, from a global perspective has helped bring to light how globally connected Germans were. The history of German colonialism too has gained from this focus on global connections.

18 Matthew Jefferies, Contesting the German Empire, 1871-1918 (Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell Pub., 2008), 166–7.
Colonialism, Migration, and the Expansion of “Germanness”

As Susanne Zantop has demonstrated, Germany has had a long relationship with colonialism, one that is far deeper-rooted than the period of colonial agitation in the 1880s. Through assorted types of texts, Zantop argues, “a colonialist subjectivity emerged in Germany as early as the 1770s, during the so-called colonialpolitical half of the eighteenth century, and... it grew into a collective obsession by the late 1800s.” Through the creation of “colonial fantasies,” Germans, holding no colonies themselves, imagined a morally superior place for themselves in a world of violent colonial empires whereby Germans could engage in civilized abstract conquest. This “latent colonialism”, Zantop argues, anticipated the rise of formal imperialism in the 1880s.21

These colonialist notions began to shift from the realm of fantasy into that of reality in the nineteenth century, with the rise of colonial agitation. While earlier scholars of colonialism asserted that such campaigning did not begin until after German unification, more recent works reveal how German calls for colonies began in the 1840s, not the 1880s.22 As Matthew Fitzpatrick evidences, calls for colonial expansion were central to much of German liberals’ attempts to assert their concept of the nation-state as

21 Zantop, Colonial Fantasies: Conquest, Family, and Nation in Precolonial Germany, 1770-1870, 1-17.
dominant: “as liberalism’s oldest and most pervasive manifestation, German nationalist-liberalism… clearly sought to link parallel discourses of imperialism and nationalism.”

As these calls for colonies grew, the understanding of the relationship between Germany and emigrants also transformed. There was a growing sense among German liberal thinkers that mass emigration was draining Germany’s national strength and strengthening that of other nations, particularly the United States. Furthermore, the incapacity of the German states to protect emigrants once they left was a ringing reminder to liberal nationalists of German weakness. Beginning in the 1850s, the nature of emigrants in the German nationalist estimation changed; in middle-class periodicals, the term *Auslandsdeutsche* (Germans overseas) came to replace *Auswanderer* (emigrants), indicating a growing sense that those emigrating remained part of the German community, even after leaving the German states. Thus, by the 1860s, colonialism and emigration were strongly connected in the German liberal nationalist imaginary.

During this period of growing calls for colonies and increasing interest regarding emigrants, the image of Southern Brazil shifted from one of merely another potential destination for emigrants to one that portrayed the region as exceptional in terms of settlers ability to create a society wherein their Germanness flourished. Such claims regarding the strength of settlers’ Germanness were a central feature that made Brazil unique when compared to other sites of German overseas settlement. They fueled

---

24 Ibid., Chapters 2 and 3; Naranch, “Beyond the Fatherland,” especially Chapter 1.
25 Naranch, “Inventing the Auslandsdeutsche.”
European-German nationalist visions of an idealized space of *Deutschthum* abroad, making Brazil exceptional in German nationalist imaginary.

Describing the Germans of Southern Brazil, Dr. Wilhelm Breitenbach wrote that it appeared as if the “Ancient Germans were returned to earth when you see the young generation in the German colonies.”\(^{26}\) After exploring the German-settled region of Rio Grande do Sul, Oscar Canstatt asserted that “it cannot be denied that a sizeable New Germany worthy of respect has built up through German language, customs, and traditions on the South American continent.”\(^{27}\) German-Brazilian liberal nationalists also lauded Southern Brazil as a zone of exceptional Germanness, and in the closing decades of the Brazilian Empire, some travelled back to Germany to proselytize this message.

In his study of German communities throughout the world, Stefan Manz writes that such fantasies “of a large-scale New Germany overseas were arguably most pronounced in relation to Brazil,” while Sebastian Conrad notes how “[i]n many texts, ‘Brazil’ assumed a metonymic presence and implicitly evoked the promises of authenticity, simplicity, and national reawakening.”\(^{28}\) Hence, through the claims of German nationalists on both sides of the Atlantic, Southern Brazil became seen as a profoundly important zone of regeneration for the German *Volk*.


\(^{27}\) Oskar Canstatt, *Brasilien: Land und Leute* (Berlin: Ernst Siegfried Mittler und Sohn, 1877), 435.

Historical Specificities, Modeling, Terms, and Sources

While Chapter I goes into detail regarding German settlement, a short discussion of historical specificities is necessary here to clarify the complex reality of the “colonial” nature of German settlement in Southern Brazil. Beginning in 1824 and throughout most of the next six decades, the Brazilian government supported German settlement in the region through recruitment efforts and assorted forms of assistance for immigrants. Through these settlers, Brazil sought to populate the region and create a small-holding agricultural class. It should be noted that while a few of the earliest communities were relatively close to population centers, most settlements established in the Brazilian Empire were quite isolated. Thus, settlement by Germans in Southern Brazil was an explicitly colonial policy on the part of the Brazilian state.

However, during their opening decades, these government-sponsored settlements were often marked by ethnic and linguistic homogeneity, populated nearly entirely by settlers from German-speaking Europe; hence, while these settlements (called “colonias,” meaning “settlement” or “colony”) were established by the Brazilian state, continued use of German language and ethnically-based social structures were common. All parties, often including the Brazilian government, referred to the settlements as “German colonies,” but at no time were the settlements associated with the German state or part of a German government-sponsored effort at colonization; the settlements were politically Brazilian, but culturally German.

With this complexity in mind, a discussion of terms would be helpful. In his study of colonialism, Jürgen Osterhammel defines “colony” as “a new political organization created by invasion (conquest and/or settlement colonization) … Its alien rulers are in
sustained dependence on a geographically remote ‘mother country’ or imperial center, which claims exclusive rights of ‘possession’ of the colony.”\textsuperscript{29} Based on this definition, settlements established by the Brazilian state using mainly German-Brazilians would qualify as colonies.

However, Osterhammel would argue that while the settlements were colonies, their creation was not “colonialism,” due to the areas of German settlement lacking “indigenous population majorities.” He refers to cases wherein a colonial society develops wherein the colonizer is the majority as “colonies without colonialism,” due to the lack of the “system of domination” without which colonialism cannot exist.\textsuperscript{30} According to this model, without a majority oppressed by a minority, there is no colonialism.

Lorenzo Veracini finds this condition for colonialism unsatisfactory, especially in referring to settlement colonialism, which he argues defies a dependence on a majority/minority demographic focus: “According to these characterisations, colonisers cease being colonisers if and when they become the majority,” while “indigenous people only need to become a minority in order to cease being colonised.”\textsuperscript{31} He asserts that settler colonialism should not simply be seen as a form of colonialism, but rather that it deserves “dedicated systematic analysis.” Unlike Osterhammel’s model, which “emphasises the antagonisms pitting colonising metropole and colonised periphery, settler colonial phenomena… complicate this dyad by establishing a fundamentally


\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., 17.

triangular system of relationships, a system comprising metropolitan, settler, and indigenous agencies.”

Veracini’s triangular model is more helpful than Osterhammel’s digonal paradigm in examining German settlement in Brazil. However, in the German case, the terms “metropole” and “indigenous” were themselves in flux. Having been recruited and settled by the Brazilian state, the political metropole for German-Brazilians was Brazil, but in affirming their on-going identification as Germans, the German-Brazilians examined held Germany as their “cultural” metropole. Furthermore, in asserting their status as simultaneously German and Brazilian, German-Brazilian liberal nationalists blurred settler/indigenous lines for themselves and indigenous/metropole lines for non-German-Brazilians.

Figure 1: Models of German Colonization in Southern Brazil

---

32 Ibid., 5–6.
With this in mind, two triangular models (Figure 1) are required to capture the complexity of the German colonial situation: In the first, the “political” model, Brazil (led by the Portuguese-Brazilian elite) is the metropole, German-Brazilians represent the settler branch, and non-German-Brazilians (meant by the Brazilian elite to be influenced positively by the Germans) represent the indigenous branch. In this model, there is material colonization by Germans in the form of their creating colonies and occupying space, but, on the German side, this alone does not constitute “colonialism.” In the second model, the “cultural” model, Germany is the metropole (asserted as the “source” of alleged national characteristics by German-Brazilian nationalists), German-Brazilians remain the settler branch, while all non-German-Brazilians (elite and ordinary, Portuguese- and Afro-Brazilian, free and slave, etc.) serve as the indigenous. In this model, there is discursive colonization, wherein a clear colonial relationality exists between Germans (in Europe and Brazil) and non-Germans in Brazil.

I am not suggesting that the two realms are discrete. In fact, politics and culture were intertwined and informed each other in the German-Brazilian experience of this period. This dissertation will illustrate how German-Brazilians utilized claims regarding their alleged Germanness to assert their right to inclusion in the political sphere, while the Brazilian elite’s assumptions regarding the superior “cultural nature” of Germans played a central role in making Germans so appealing as settlers.

Lastly, a brief discussion of geographic focus and individual groups is necessary. This dissertation looks at two basic geographic regions. Concerning Europe, I will use the terms “German states” for prior to 1871, and “Germany” after 1871; both of these terms refer to the region that would become Germany following unification, in short, the “lesser
Germany” (kleindeutsch) region and not including German-language states such as Austria and Switzerland, unless specified. In looking at Brazil, the focus is the three southernmost provinces of Paraná, Santa Catarina, and Rio Grande do Sul, where the vast majority of Germans settled; in referring to the region as a whole, this study uses the proper noun “Southern Brazil” to emphasize its nature as a zone of special German interest and discursive construction.

In terms of people, a word of warning is first required. This study focuses on four distinct groups, and obviously, these categories are simplified and I have been obliged to treat them as discreet. I recognize that seeing “identity” as something singular and distinct is denying the complex reality of how individuals and groups see themselves and others, especially when race enters into the matrix; “identities” would be a more accurate description, but I try to avoid even that label. Instead, I take a suggestion of Rogers Brubaker and Frederick Cooper to heart, using “identification” instead, as it acknowledges fluidity and multiplicity, while avoiding the reification that “identity” suggests.\(^{33}\) That said, this study required specific and stable categories for its analysis. Please bear this in mind as you read.

That being said, this study focuses on four groups: German-Brazilians/Brazilian-Germs, European-Germs, Portuguese-Bra’, and Afro-Brazilians. “German-Brazilians” or “Brazilian-Germs” refers to either settlers born in Europe who immigrated to Brazil or those born in Brazil who identified as German. By “European-German,” I mean those Germans born in Europe who either remained there or travelled overseas temporarily. “Portuguese-Brazilian” signifies those who identified as non-

German-Brazilians and as culturally affiliated with Europeans more generally; in this study, it generally refers to the political elite. Lastly, “Afro-Brazilian” refers to those whom the other three parties identified as being of African descent. In general, in this study authors used it indicate not only slaves, but also phenotypically dark members of the free poor. Furthermore, in discussing slaves and “Afro-Brazilians,” this dissertation looks at discourses concerning these groups, not the actions and opinions of the groups themselves; while slavery runs throughout this work, it is ultimately a study of Germans, in the transatlantic sense.

While the meaning of “German” remains a question of debate among scholars, I must give a brief discussion of my constructed Portuguese-Brazilian/Afro-Brazilian divide. I recognize that an attempt to create a racial binary is questionable in any case, but in the Brazilian case especially it is hubris. The sexual mixing among Brazilian racial groups was widespread, creating a vast array of terms used to describe the numerous racial gradations; while in 1818, Brazil’s population was 60% black and 10% mulatto, by 1890, the census recognized mulattos as 40%. Furthermore, unlike in the United States, manumission was extremely common. Citing the tendency of Brazilian slave-owners to free slaves for a variety of reasons, Richard Graham estimates that by 1872, there were at least 4,250,000 free Afro-Brazilians, representing more than 40% of the total Brazilian

34 For example, see Confino, The Nation as a Local; Applegate, A Nation of Provincials; Boa and Palfreyman, Heimat: A German Dream.
population. This was in comparison to only 6% in the United States.\footnote{Richard Graham, “Free African Brazilians and the State in Slavery Time,” in \textit{Racial Politics in Contemporary Brazil}, ed. Michael Hanchard (Duke University Press, 1999), 30–2. For studies of manumission in specific regions, see Mieko Nishida, “Manumission and Ethnicity in Urban Slavery: Salvador, Brazil, 1808-1888,” \textit{The Hispanic American Historical Review} 73, no. 3 (August 1, 1993): 361–91; Peter L. Eisenberg, “Ficando Livre: As Alforrias em Campinas no Século XIX,” \textit{Estudos Econômicos} 17, no. 2 (1987): 175–216; Andréa Lisly Gonçalves, \textit{As margens da liberdade: estudo sobre a prática de alforrias em Minas colonial e provincial} (Belo Horizonte: Fino Traço Editora, 2011); Gabriel Aladrén, \textit{Liberdades negras nas paragens do sul: alforria e inserção social de libertos em Porto Alegre, 1800-1835} (Rio de Janeiro: Editora FGV, 2009).} Thus, unlike in the United States wherein blackness generally correlated to the status of slavery, in Brazil, while all slaves were of African descent, for millions, being of African descent did not mean being a slave.

Coming back to the categories of Portuguese- and Afro-Brazilian, this is a study of transnational German colonial discourse, and hence German discursive constructions drive the analysis. European- and Brazilian-Germans made reference both to Portuguese-\textit{(Lusobrasilianer} or simply referring to \textit{Portugiesischen}) and Afro-Brazilians (generally \textit{Neger}), but these categories were based on a combination of social status and race. In light of the fluid racial reality in Brazil, many Brazilians of Portuguese-descent were also of African descent, but German-language sources did not make such distinctions, instead using the category “Portuguese” to refer to those with political power (from the imperial to the local level) or to the free population as a whole, with the exception of those born into slavery and later freed. When Germanophone authors spoke of Afro-Brazilians, they were generally referring to slaves or former slaves (freemen). Thus, this study’s categorization of non-German-Brazilians, while unreflective of Brazilian social-historical reality, does echo the discursive reality of German classification of this period.
In terms of sources, this study draws from a vast array of published documents from across the German-language transatlantic public sphere, including travel accounts, immigration studies and handbooks, works agitating to colonies, the popular press, and fictional accounts. These specific kinds of sources are particularly fruitful when investigating colonial discourse and Southern Brazil; as the region was never a formal colony of Germany, colonial records, such as court documents, administration records, etc. do no exist for the area. However, Southern Brazil was a point of interest for many in European-German society. Additionally, these types of documents from Brazilian-Germans moved across the Atlantic and entered the European-German nationalist consciousness, while notarial documents or court records from colonies did not. This is a study of discourse constructed by literate and mobile elites, but as Susanne Zantop has shown us, such discourse had powerful effects throughout (transnational, in this case) German society as a whole. Still, despite the importance of such sources, they are skewed in terms of gender, having been written essentially only by men. While I acknowledge this weakness, discourses within the German-language public sphere in both Germany and Brazil nevertheless offer an important glimpse into colonial thinking by Germans in both locations.

As a study based on published sources written by middle- and upper-class men, often members of the intellectual or economic elite, this dissertation is in large part an intellectual history; it looks at how Southern Brazil became a colonial space in the German mind, and thus how German-Brazilian settlers there became models of Germans as colonizers long before Germany held formal colonies. As it looks at the intersection of ideas (discourses) and reality (the presence of thousands of German settlers in the
region), this dissertation is not a “conceptual history” (Begriffsgeschichte) of colonialism.\(^{37}\) It joins recent work that calls into question the previous model of understanding Germanness as a purely European affair. For example, in his study of Germans and their relationship to American Indians, H. Glenn Penny calls on historians of German nationalism and identification to take note of popular views since the nineteenth century connecting Germans with Amerinidians as kindred peoples, arguing that such views exemplify how Germanness developed in a global, not just European, context.\(^{38}\) Bradley Naranch’s exploration of the growing connection between emigrants and European-Germans in the European-German bourgeois nationalist imaginary bolsters this notion of expanding the horizons of study beyond Europe in looking at German identification.\(^{39}\) Studies examining how presentations of Others in literature, philosophy, and theology helped shape German understandings of national self and the role of Germans in the world have influenced this dissertation and its analysis of constructions of sameness and difference concerning Portuguese- and Afro-Brazilians.\(^{40}\) Heike Paul’s examination of discussions of African-Americans in German fiction was also significant in shaping how I approached the topics of race and Germanness, but unlike Paul’s study, this dissertation focuses on constructions of race and difference within non-fictional


\(^{39}\) Naranch, “Inventing the Auslandsdeutsche.”

\(^{40}\) For example, Kontje, German Orientalisms; Suzanne L. Marchand, German Orientalism in the Age of Empire: Religion, Race, and Scholarship (Washington, D.C.; Cambridge; New York: German Historical Institute; Cambridge University Press, 2009).
However, my study is distinct from such works by focusing both on a zone of German settlement (Paul’s work does look at the United States, while Kontje’s and Marchand’s studies look at the Middle East and Asia) and on discourses that connected the nature of that settlement with German identification.

Sebastian Conrad’s studies of German nationalism, identification, and Southern Brazil were foundational in informing my reading of sources concerning the region, as was Matthew Fitzpatrick’s examination of German liberalism, which fueled my curiosity to investigate colonial-thinking regarding Southern Brazil in the period prior to that studied by Conrad.42

In terms of organization, this dissertation is structured thematically instead of chronologically. While this leads to a flattening of change over time, losing some of the finer contours of the issues’ evolution during this period, the basic development of the topics and the importance of the conclusions reached remain clear. Still, I recognize the limitations this approach produces. For example, I argue that the 1840s marked a watershed in European-German discussions of Brazilian-Germans and slavery, wherein recommendations that settlers buy slaves, previously common, disappeared. I do not doubt that with greater research I could find examples of such recommendations post-1850, but it is sufficient for my argument to demonstrate that if there were European-German authors calling on settlers to buy slaves after 1850, they were in a very small minority. Additionally, I assert that by the 1860s European-German nationalists began seeing settlers in Southern Brazil as possessing a superior Germanness that made them

---

41 Paul, Kulturkontakt und Racial Presences.
unique in the world. However, as Conrad demonstrates, this feeling grew markedly in the decades following the unification of Germany.\textsuperscript{43} Within this study, I do not explore the evolution of degrees of intensity of this feeling toward Brazilian-German colonists, since demonstrating that such feelings existed by the 1860s is sufficient to illustrate how these views helped Germans on both sides of the Atlantic view Southern Brazil as a colonial space. Hence, while organizing the dissertation thematically does produce a less nuanced account of the topics, this study nevertheless demonstrates how slavery shaped the development of German colonial thinking, a connection overlooked prior to this study.

As a transnational study, this dissertation explores topics of interest to both German and Brazilian historians, although this remains more a study of German than Brazilian history. Scholars of German colonialism and how interaction with spaces outside of Germany helped shape German identification will be most interested in this work, as it illustrates both how this scholarship needs to integrate Brazil and how the impact of the global on Germanness began long before German unification in 1871. Historians of German perceptions of race will also find this study noteworthy, as it looks not only at the opinions of German thinkers, such as Kant and Cristoph Meiners, but also at how German perceptions of race existed at the point of interaction between settlers in Southern Brazil and Afro-Brazilians; as will be discussed, race molded the contours of the German civilizing mission in the region.

Scholars of Brazilian history will find this dissertation illuminating principally for its connecting slavery and politics among German-Brazilians; settlers’ claims regarding slavery and its effects on society were integral to colonists’ attempts to integrate into

\textsuperscript{43} Conrad, \textit{Globalisation and the Nation}, 275–333.
Brazil’s political and social system. This study also adds to the growing scholarship regarding the interaction between German-Brazilians and slavery, although this dissertation focuses on discourses regarding slavery instead of the practice of settlers’ owning slaves.

**Argument, Point 1: Southern Brazil as a zone of German discursive colonialism**

This dissertation argues four central points. First, Southern Brazil represented a zone of German discursive colonialism, but in the context of material colonization by the Brazilian state using Germans as settlers. In her study of Poland as German colonial space, Kristin Kopp makes the distinction between material and discursive colonization, defining the former as “various forms of economic, political, and/or cultural subjugation of a native population by a foreign minority entering their space.” This is distinct from discursive colonization, which she sees as “a historically situated process that repositions a specific relationship between self and Other into colonial categories.” Discursive colonization requires three elements: First, creating the image of the would-be colonizer as “colonizer”; second, making the native Other a legitimate target for colonization; lastly, asserting how the allegedly superior nature of the “colonizer” justifies their intervention with the Other.44 European- and Brazilian-Germans engage in all three of these actions. Germans were engaging in material colonization through settlements created by the Brazilian government. This is a matter of record.45

However, the nature of Southern Brazil as colonial from a specifically German (European- and Brazilian-German) perspective has been unrecognized by scholars. Susanne Zantop’s study of colonial fantasies talks extensively about South America, but does not address Brazil. In Colonial Fantasies: Conquest, Family, and Nation in Precolonial Germany, 1770-1870, she notes the connection between German identity and colonialism make no mention of Brazil.

Recent studies of the “imperialist imagination” and the connection between German identity and colonialism make no mention of Brazil. In The Imperialist Imagination: A Short History, Sebastian Conrad discusses Brazil as one of many places where “colonial lobbyists” called for German state intervention, but as part of his discussion of colonial expansion, so Conrad remains wedded to the notion of colonialism in the formal sense. While he does cite Southern Brazil as one of many places, including Australia and the Middle East, which “formed part of the German colonial imagination,” he fails to acknowledge the colonial relationality regarding the region that existed not only among European-German nationalists beginning at least two decades prior to German unification, but also among German settlers there as well.

In discussing colonial discourse, Homi Bhabha defines it as “an apparatus that turns on the recognition and disavowal of racial/cultural/historical differences…. It seeks authorizations for its strategies by the production of knowledges of the colonizer and colonized which are stereotypical but antithetically evaluated.” The purpose of colonial discourse, argues Bhabha, “is to construe the colonized as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin, in order to justify conquest and to establish systems of
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46 Zantop, Colonial Fantasies: Conquest, Family, and Nation in Precolonial Germany, 1770-1870.
administration and instruction… colonial discourse produces the colonized as a social reality which is at once an “other” and yet entirely knowable and visible.”

The alleged degeneracy of Portuguese- and Afro-Brazilians was foundational to German views. Furthermore, while German settlers were not in a position to create “systems of administration,” the notion of “systems of instruction” were central to German-language discussions of non-German- and German-Brazilians: Through their outstanding example, the industrious and skilled Germans would remake the lazy and incompetent Portuguese-Brazilians in their own image. Hence, while the formal elements of colonial rule cited by Bhabha were not present in the German-Brazilian case, the view of non-German inferiority and German superiority, as well as the need of the Germans to transform the non-Germans, echo Bhabha’s notion of colonial discourse.

This dichotomy of industrious/lazy, competent/inept, etc. that German liberal nationalists constructed regarding German- and non-German-Brazilians also fits the colonial discourse model of “Eurocentric diffusionism,” articulated by J.M. Blaut in his book, *The Colonizer’s Model of the World: Geographical Diffusionism and Eurocentric History*. Blaut defines Eurocentric diffusionism as the belief that “cultural processes… tend to flow out of the European sector and toward the non-European sector. This is the natural, normal, logical, and ethical flow of culture, of innovation, of human causality. Europe, eternally, is Inside. Non-Europe is Outside. Europe is the source of most diffusions; non-Europe is the recipient.” In this construction, the expansion of European powers and advancements within Europe occurred because of something within Europe, and Europeans, not due to interaction with other groups and regions. This divorces
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49 Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 70–1.
colonialism from development in Europe; colonialism occurred due to European advances, instead of the other way around. Instead, Europe (Inside) allegedly exported civilization to the rest of the world, thereby leading to the development and modernization of non-Europe (Outside). Blaut calls this placing of Europe at the center of the civilized world, from whence progress flow out into non-Europe, “quite simply the colonizer’s model of the world.”

The idea that the non-European Outside depended on the European Inside for any innovation was central to colonialism. The Outside was allegedly incapable of “independent innovation,” while the European Inside was the sole source of such innovation. Instead, the Outside depended on “diffusion” from Europe. In this way of seeing the world, Europeans appear as naturally inventive due to “European values,” some combination of internal factors (climate, intelligence, essence, etc.). However, non-Europeans, lacking those internal factors, are stagnant and uninnovative, essentially “ahistorical.” Based on this image, colonialism becomes not only legitimate, but fully necessary, “in fact the natural way that the non-European world advances out of stagnation, backwardness, and traditionalism.”

While German nationalists in Europe or Brazil never denied that the Portuguese were Europeans, they did present Portuguese-Brazilians as incapable of advancing their country and bringing Brazil into the rank of civilized nations; from the dismal condition of Brazilian roads to the ineffectiveness of Brazilian administration, German-language authors presented Portuguese-Brazilians as backward and inept. However, they did so
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51 Ibid., 11–6.
while presenting settlers as bringing order and prosperity wherever they colonized. Thus, using Blaut’s model, European- and Brazilian-German thinkers constructed the Portuguese-Brazilians as part of the Outside, and settlers as the Inside, thereby justifying German intervention in Southern Brazil.

**Argument, Point 2: Slavery was central to creating a colonial relationality regarding Southern Brazil**

The second point involves slavery: The institution was central to the construction of German colonial relationality regarding Brazil, in that German-language writers in Europe and Brazil attributed the alleged incapacity of Portuguese-Brazilians to develop their country to a dependence on slavery. According to European- and Brazilian-German authors, the institution had rendered non-German-Brazilians not only indolent, but had made work nothing less than shameful in their eyes; Joseph Hörmeyer, who served in the Brazilian army as a mercenary before settling in Rio Grande do Sul, wrote that in Brazil, “work is the symbol of the slaves… work dishonors. So much so that no free man would carry even a book in his hand, since carrying loads is labor for slaves.”

Swiss naturalist Johann Jakob von Tschudi claimed that Portuguese-Brazilian fathers would rather see their son become “an idler, gambler, and scoundrel, than a craftsman,” for which he blames the association of physical labor with slavery.

In addition to defining Portuguese-Brazilians’ alleged incapacity to develop their country, slavery was also central to the construction of the German civilizing mission. European- and Brazilian-German sources took either of two positions regarding the

---

interaction of settlers and slavery: They either denied directly that German-Brazilians held slaves, or they presented German slave-owners as kind and civilizing masters. In the first case, Germans remaining totally outside of the institution negates the need for concerns regarding the deleterious effect of slavery on slave-owners. In the second case, the purported crippling impact on the working and ethical spirit of the Portuguese-Brazilians is unacknowledged in German-language accounts, and instead slavery becomes a means by which settlers again demonstrate their exceptional capacity to civilize Brazil; while slavery transforms Portuguese-Brazilians, German-Brazilians transform slaves.

The topic of German settlers and Brazilian slavery has been frequently addressed in regional and local histories of Southern Brazil. During much of the twentieth century, many historians asserted that slavery did not exist among German settlers, calling the institution “alien to their traditions and type of economy” or citing the “German mentality” as being incompatible with the use of slaves.54 However, recent scholarship, based on legal and notarial documents, shows not only that German-Brazilians owned slaves, but that the practices of slave-holding among Germans mirrored that of non-German-Brazilians.55

55 For example, Maria Angélica Zubaran’s examination of 40 letters of emancipation issued by Teuto-Brazilians illustrates that German settlers used and liberated slaves in similar ways to their Luso-Brazilian neighbors. See Maria Angélica Zubaran, “Os teuto-rio-grandenses a escravidão e as alforrias,” in Os alemães no sul do Brasil: cultura, etnicidade, história, ed. Cláudia Mauch et al. (Canoas: Ed. ULBRA, 1994), 65-74. Angelica Tereza Sperb’s investigation of German-Brazilian last wills reveals how settlers passed slaves on after their deaths. See Angela Tereza Sper, “O inventário
Previous studies of slavery among German-Brazilians have focused mainly on the social and economic realities of the institution at the local level, while failing to address the political. This dissertation relates German-Brazilian claims to competence through work, and Portuguese-Brazilian incompetence, to settlers’ attempts to assert their right to political and social inclusion. Furthermore, Brazilian studies of German slavery do not study European-German exceptionalist claims regarding the institution and settlers, which my dissertation demonstrates acted to validate assertions concerning the Germans’ special mission in improving Brazil and Brazilians. Thus, my study bridges gaps in current Brazilian scholarship concerning German-Brazilians and slavery at both the local and transnational levels.

German-language scholarship has all but ignored the topic of German-Brazilians as slave-owners. The exception is Roland Spiesgart’s well-researched and insightful work on German settlers, religion, and acculturation in Southeastern Brazil devotes a
chapter to settlers as masters. Spliesgart reveals how German Protestants were as likely as Catholics to own slaves, and that both groups commonly integrated their slaves into the family’s religious community, baptizing them and even attending church together. Furthermore, unlike Brazilian scholars, Spliesgart examines European-German discussions of German-Brazilian slavery.\textsuperscript{57} However, he concludes that European-German acknowledgements of settlers’ owning slaves were quite common.\textsuperscript{58} My dissertation complicates this view of German (European- and Brazilian) discussions of slavery among settlers as homogenous; some German-language authors did recognize that slavery existed in the settler community, but other sources denied this fact explicitly. Seeing slavery in the context of German colonial thinking brings to the fore the identical result of this heterogeneity: With or without owning slaves, German-Brazilians are civilizing Brazil.

\textbf{Argument, Point 3: German Civilizing Mission in Southern Brazil}

First appearing in the 1830s but blossoming in the 1850s and beyond, German nationalists on both sides of the Atlantic asserted that settlers in Southern Brazil had a civilizing mission in the region, one that focused specifically on remaking the Brazilian notion of work: Due to slavery, Portuguese-Brazilians saw work as dishonorable, which in turn rendered them unable to develop their country. German settlers, however, were so allegedly industrious that not only were they creating a free labor economy based on small-holding and were transforming non-German-Brazilians through their diligent example; at a presentation before the Central Association for Commercial Geography in


\textsuperscript{58} Ibid., 344.
Berlin, A.W. Sellin, a former director of a German settlement in Rio Grande do Sul, argued that colonists were busy teaching their non-German neighbors the “value of free labor,” calling this German-Brazilians’ “cultural-historical task.” In this vision, German-Brazilians made both land and people into productive contributors to the transformation of Brazil, and were therefore the necessary catalysts for such a change.

European-German nationalists commonly asserted that Germans held a unique destiny to reshape the world for the better. However, in Brazil especially, where the settler community was both large and allegedly exceptionally “German,” the idea of a specifically German mission to civilize was pervasive on both sides of the Atlantic. This civilizing mission, so strongly based on culture, is in this regard more akin to the French model than the British. As Alice Conklin writes, while the introduction of technology and material improvement were part of the French view of their role overseas, the belief in their “unparalleled supremacy in the moral, cultural, and social spheres” was central; the French assumed the universality of their principles, and set out to change linguistically and culturally, not simply economically and politically, those they ruled.

In this way, many scholars cite the French as assimilationist, believing they could “make French” those under their rule. In contrast to French assumptions concerning the universality of their culture, British colonial thought focused less on making the world British as on reforms to make non-Europeans more European. This was especially true after 1850. As Karuna Mantena writes, British administrators and thinkers through the mid-nineteenth century supported redesigning native societies along Western lines. However, following domestic intellectuals shifts and political unrest in the colonies, the British moved “from a universalist stance to a culturalist stance,” wherein the emphasis on the inherent difference of the native became emphasized. Good governance, legal and educational reforms, and infrastructure development were the hallmarks of what the British called their mission to bring “moral and material progress.”


However, while “civilization” summed up France’s understanding of their imperial efforts and the British emphasized “progress,” the word that best expressed the German mission in Southern Brazil was “work”: Germans complained about poor Brazilian infrastructure, but blamed this condition on Brazilian incompetence spurred by the rejection of labor; German sources lamented Brazilian corruption and poor governance, but argued that respect for work would return a spirit of service to the government; German authors asserted that Brazil’s economic dependence on the plantation system could be broken by creating a small-farming sector, but a transformation of the Brazilian view of agricultural work as below a free man had to take place first. Work, both in action and in spirit, would remake Brazil and its residents. As George Steinmetz, Daniel Joseph Walther, and Andrew Zimmerman evidence, the notion of work was key in German efforts within the formal colonial empire. However, the case of Southern Brazil illustrates how Germans’ view of work, inside and outside of Europe, defined how they understood their place in the world long before Germany’s first colony in 1884.

While some German thinkers did question the capacity of Brazilians to improve, most German nationalists in both Europe and Southern Brazil believed that settlers could remake the Portuguese-Brazilians into industrious and effective workers and leaders through the transformative example of colonists’ exceptionally pure Germanness. In fact,

they believed settlers had an obligation to do so. However, there was a racial tension within this German civilizing mission that defined the boundaries of which parties would qualify for inclusion.

Discussions of Afro-Brazilians (slave and free) made clear that they fell outside the province of the German duty to spread civilization; European-Germans generally doubted the capacity of Afro-Brazilians to advance culturally, while Brazilian-Germans, acknowledging to a degree Afro-Brazilians’ ability to improve, argued that the state and slave-masters were responsible for leading such an effort. This was in sharp contrast to the much-promoted mission to civilize the Portuguese-Brazilians. Hence, geography influenced to a degree how German nationalists perceived Afro-Brazilians, but they remained excluded from the specifically German mission to civilize Brazil.68

**Argument, Point 4: Integrating the Local and Transnational**

The forth point of this dissertation demonstrates how those discourses of Germanness that defined German colonial relationality existed at the local and transnational levels. Stefan Manz rightly criticizes much of the current scholarship regarding the relationship between Germany and Germans abroad, arguing that authors either focus too much on Europe and ignore the specificity of overseas communities, or stress the local to the point of ignoring Germany.69 By examining Southern Brazil and Germany simultaneously, this dissertation avoids the one-sided model that marks the vast

68 For an examination of European-German view of African Americans, see Paul, *Kulturkontakt und Racial Presences*.
majority of previous studies. Scholarship exploring how European-Germans perceived Brazil, a topic central to this dissertation, generally do not discuss settlers’ perceptions, while studies focused on settler integration do not look at how colonists’ identification as German reflected thought in Europe.

This study reveals how at the local level in Brazil, German-Brazilian nationalists utilized claims concerning the alleged superior nature of Germaness and inferior nature of non-German-Brazilians to insist on full social and political inclusion in their Brazilian homeland. This dissertation builds on the work of Marcos Justo Tramontini and Marcos Antônio Witt by emphasizing how Deutschtm could serve political purposes for colonists. However, this study makes such politicizing part of a larger colonial relationality, based on discourses regarding slavery, which existed on both sides of the

70 For example, see Fritz Sudhaus, Deutschland und die Auswanderung nach Brasilien im 19. Jahrhundert (Hamburg: Hans Christian Verlag, 1940); José Fernando Carneiro, Imigração e colonização no Brasil (Rio de Janeiro, 1950); Roche, A colonização alemã, 1969; Oberacker and Ilg, “Die Deutschen in Brasilien”; Frederick C. Luebke, Germans in Brazil: A Comparative History of Cultural Conflict During World War I (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1987).


Atlantic. Within Europe, allegations concerning the purity of settlers’ Germanness, the concomitant claims regarding colonists’ capacity to civilize, and the stark contrast with non-Germans helped spur a European-German nationalist idealized perception of a truly German society overseas free of the divisions that marked that in Europe and potentially exhibiting an even purer form of *Deutschum* than that in Germany.73 Furthermore, claims regarding Southern Brazil supported the notion of a German-specific civilizing mission, thereby demonstrating Germans’ qualifications join the ranks of European colonizing worldwide; while those “colonial fantasies” Zantop studied “provided Germans with spaces for the inscription of their own identities as ‘different’ (=better) colonists,” Southern Brazil moved beyond, on some level, that of fantasy, providing a material example of Germans as ideal colonizer, and even better slave owner.74

However, my dissertation also looks at how in the case of German settlement in Brazil, the Atlantic represented a transnational social space, which Thomas Faist defines as a “relatively stable, lasting and dense set of ties reaching beyond and across the borders of sovereign states.”75 Based on Faist, Margit Fauser, and Eveline Reisenauer’s model of the types of such networks, the network formed by Germans in Europe and
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Brazil qualifies as a transnational community, wherein “solidarity is expressed in some sort of collective identity.”

Notions of work, slavery, and Germanness moved between Southern Brazil and Germany via colonization societies, print, individual travel between continents, and even political engagement by Brazilian-Germans in Europe. Concepts of Germanness were central to these exchanges. Each party’s discourse informed the other’s, thereby making images of Germans in Southern Brazil and their relationship with slavery genuinely transatlantic. By examining this transatlantic exchange, this dissertation complements Roland Spliesgart’s study of how religion and interaction with slavery among German-Brazilians in southeastern Brazil affected settlers’ integration and European-Germans’ perceptions. However, that region held far fewer settlers and never captured the German nationalist colonial imaginary as Southern Brazil did. Furthermore, while Spliesgart focuses mainly on European-German church organizations’ involvement in Brazil, this study emphasizes specifically nationalist exchanges across the Atlantic and how such exchanges related to political integration in Southern Brazil.

**Development within Chapters**

As a study involving German settlers in Southern Brazil, historical background to both German emigration generally and settlement in Brazil specifically is necessary. Chapter I introduces the basic contours of German overseas emigration between 1815 and 1890, as well as providing the history of German colonization in Brazil, including the details and rationale for Brazilian efforts to secure Germans for that purpose. Included is
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77 Spliesgart, “Verbrasilianerung” und Akkulturation.
a discussion of European-German thought connecting emigration to colonies, and how notions of a German civilizing mission arose from such concerns.

Chapter II examines the construction of Brazilian-Germans as the means by which Brazil and Brazilians could be remade. European- and Brazilian Germans asserted that settlers were transforming Brazil through their German love of work, an expression of the purity of colonists’ Germanness. Authors presented settlers as the lone source of order and development, making the jungle productive, building roads, farming, etc.; settlers were the discursive inverse of their non-German neighbors. Brazil thereby became the site of a German civilizing mission at least two decades prior to the first formal imperial German overseas colony. European-German nationalists projected Southern Brazil both as evidence of the German capacity to civilize and as a society free of the divisions plaguing Germany, while Brazilian-Germans argued that their position as civilizer justified their being granted full political and social rights in Brazil. Thus, while the concept of a German civilizing mission developed in transnational dialogue, it served specifically local purposes.

Chapter III looks at the construction of Brazil in the German nationalist imaginary as a country unable to develop from within. Brazil and Portuguese-Brazilians came to be associated with backwardness from the very onset of German settlement there in the 1820s. Decades before German-language discussion of the settlers and their allegedly pure Germanness, German travellers presented Portuguese-Brazilians as indolent and incompetent. While some authors believed climate was to blame, slavery became the central explanatory factor: The alleged Brazilian dependence on the institution rendered
its population incapable of work, which in turn led to the undeveloped and uncivilized state of the country.

Chapter IV reveals how discourses of settlers’ interaction with slavery, beyond claims regarding the institutions’ crippling of the Portuguese-Brazilians, were fundamental to interpretations of the German civilizing mission in Southern Brazil. Denials of settlers’ owning slaves discursively distanced colonists from the institutions deleterious effects, while affirmations of settlers’ slave-holding presented them as kind and educating masters. However, the alleged refining effects of Germans on their slaves demonstrated a persistent racial divide in the settlers’ alleged civilizing mission: While settlers could transform the Portuguese-Brazilians’ character, the inferiority of Afro-Brazilians could, in European-German eyes, be minimized but not overcome, and in the Brazilian-German view, was not the responsibility of the German community to address. Furthermore, German-language sources on both sides of the Atlantic asserted a connection between the early abolition of slavery in Rio Grande do Sul and the effect of the Brazilian-Germans there; Germans taught the province to work, so the province rejected slavery. German-Brazilian nationalists also often compared settlers to slaves, claiming that colonists enjoyed fewer rights than slaves and freedmen. Such claims were always in the context of assertions regarding settlers’ transforming Southern Brazil.

Through examining colonial relationality regarding Southern Brazil in German nationalist thought on both sides of the Atlantic and its relationship to slavery, this dissertation adds to our current understanding of German colonialism prior to 1884 and to the transcultural nature of Brazilian-German approaches to integration, as well exposing
the novel connection between transatlantic German nationalism and slavery, which has until now been unrecognized.
Chapter I
Introduction to Nineteenth-Century German Overseas Emigration, Immigration to Brazil, and Early German Colonial Thought

Before exploring the connection between Brazilian slavery, work, and German colonialism, a brief discussion of the historical context is necessary. This chapter will provide background first to German emigration in the nineteenth century, discussing the demographics and specifics of migration between 1815 and 1890. After this section on German emigration generally is a treatment of Germany’s relationship with Brazil prior to the beginning of immigration there in 1819, followed by a review of German settlement in the country between 1819 and the 1880s. Lastly, this chapter closes with a discussion of early German pro-colonial thought, examining how it developed and how it related to notions concerning German settlement in Brazil.

Introduction to the German Emigration (Auswanderung)

Over the course of the nineteenth century, the German states, like much of Europe, underwent demographic and socio-economic transformations that led to mass emigration. These changes were interconnected, whereby each shaped and stimulated the others, resulting in the “push” factors that drove millions of Germans overseas.

Regarding demographic shifts, across Europe, population underwent a massive period of growth beginning in the middle of the eighteenth century. Between 1750 and 1800, Europe’s population grew by 34%. This growth expanded in the nineteenth century; between 1800 and 1850, Europe grew from 187,000,000 people to 266,000,000 (42% growth), and by the beginning of World War I, Europe boasted 468,000,000 people,
greater than a 75% in only 63 years.¹ Like the rest of Europe, the German states also experienced a population upsurge.² According to Thomas Nipperdey, between 1750 and 1800, the number of residents in the German states grew by between 5,000,000 and 7,000,000 people, to between 18,000,000 and 20,000,000 total. By 1864, the German population doubled to 37,800,000. On a regional level, the gains were also considerable in this period: West Prussia grew by 121%, Saxony by 97%. With this growth in population came an increase in population density in many regions. For example, Saxony’s population density nearly doubled, from 80 people/sq. km in 1816 to 157/sq. km in 1865.³

This surge in population put strain on economic systems, already in flux, as well as on a rural society also in the midst of transforming. Land played an especially important role in this. Across Europe, there was a growing centralization of landholding. The same was true within Germany, wherein population grew while the number of independent landholdings remained basically the same.⁴ Common land, upon which all members of a community could graze their cattle, began to disappear and give way to enclosure. Within the German states specifically, the parceling of common land began principally post-1815 (East Frisian land was enclosed prior to 1800), but the impact if enclosure was extensive. Prior to states began enclosure reform, between 20% and 40% of land in Germany was collectively used. However, in some regions it was greater than

² The numbers listed exclude areas ceded to Austria, Denmark, and France between 1861 and 1870.
⁴ See Werner Conze, "Vom 'Pöbel' zum 'Proletariat,'” *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 41 (1954): 333–64.
that; in East Prussia and Westphalia, common land represented almost 50% of all land under cultivation.\(^5\) State governments saw the tax source such land would become if parceled out and settled. The Prussian government established regulations for enclosure by an edict in 1811 and an order in 1821. Württemberg established a similar law in 1822, Baden in 1823 and Saxony in 1832. The impact of enclosure varied depending on how much of the common land the small farmer could lay claim. When poorer farmers could not secure a portion of land, many of them had to emigrate.\(^6\)

The process of enclosure varied by region. In northwest Germany, division of common lands centered on legal rights more than customary privileges. Tenant cottagers (Heuerleute) had traditionally been able to graze cattle, gather wood, cut peat for heat and gather leaf mulch on common land. However, since no legal connections to these privileges existed, they were often disregarded in the division process. In the southwest, despite a much broader range of property holding due to partible inheritance, division was still administered by the peasant elite, and thus the results were often the same as in the northwest. In fact, even when the common land was left undivided, there was a growing practice of restricting the lower classes’ access.\(^7\) Within Prussia, the Division of


Common Lands Edict of 1821 led to some gains among peasant farms, but these gains were offset by losses due to changes in manorial relations discussed below.  

The enclosure of commons coincided with the emancipation of peasants east of the Elbe by Prussia through a series of edicts and declarations (1807, 1811, and 1816). However, the state required that peasants reimburse their former lords for their freedom, having to turn over generally between a third and half of their land or else pay compensation. The results were striking: between 1816 and 1850, some 1,000,000 hectares of land passed from peasants’ hands to that of proprietors, reducing Prussian peasant holdings by 70%. Many peasants could not survive on the smaller plots, or fell into debt during periods of falling food prices, hence prompting them to sell their land. Nearly 15% of Prussian peasants lost their entirely.

In the Southwest, the loss of common land was especially detrimental due to local inheritance practices. Partible inheritance (Realtteilung), or dividing property equally among all of one’s children, was common in the region. This led to progressively smaller farms, which in turn became less productive. Areas such as Rhenish Prussia and Württemberg, where partible inheritance dominated, demonstrate this, as productivity
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10 Steve Hochstadt, Mobility and Modernity: Migration in Germany, 1820-1989 (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999), 188.
there was quite low in relation to the density of their population.\textsuperscript{11} However, partible inheritance did not in and of itself lead to emigration; rather, the presence and strength of local industries, such as mining or textile production, often proved to be more important in determining if people emigrated from regions such as Württemberg.\textsuperscript{12}

Small-scale, rural industries often proved the difference between survival and emigration in the German states. Industries like weaving or working of flax supplemented incomes and became central to the rural economy, especially in light of the pressure brought on by population-growth. Within the northwest Germany principally and central and southwest Germany to a lesser extent, small-scale linen manufacturing was a staple of the economy. With the establishment of the Continental System during the Napoleonic Wars, the regional handloom industry grew considerably. Nevertheless, when the embargo against the British ended, German producers could neither expand into other markets, such as South America, due to near total British dominance, nor could they compete with growing mechanization in British production. Additionally, large landowners, reacting to rising food prices produced by rising population, increasingly substituted grain for flax. These factors helped the linen industry enter steep decline before 1850, and helped fuel the massive flow of emigrants from these regions when


agricultural crisis began in the 1840s. However, rural industry in cotton and later wool would not face mechanization until after unification in 1871, and hand weaving lasted in some areas, such as the Wuppertal, until nearly the end of the century.¹³

In addition to the growing importance of cottage industries as the number of landless and land-poor increased throughout Germany, the rhythm and nature of rural labor was also changing. The three-field system gave way first to the planting of forage plants, such as clover, and then by the rise of root crops, such as potatoes and sugar beets. These root crops, especially sugar beets, required far more labor (repeated hoeing) than grains, but also concentrated the work into the warmer months. Beyond the addition of root crops, the intensification and specialization of agriculture in general helped make rural labor in Germany an increasingly seasonal affair.¹⁴

This intensification intersected with the growth of landless and land-poor discussed above, helping encourage farmers to replace their current laborers with seasonal workers. Throughout the German states, short-term laborers supplanted groups who previously held year-round employment. In East Prussia, Insten (cottagers), who received a small plot, homestead, and part of the grain harvest, come to be replaced by landless workers (Deputat). In northwest Germany, workers paid in cash replaced the
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¹⁴ Hochstadt, Mobility and Modernity, 190–191.
Heuerleute, who lived on small parcels in exchange for labor.\(^\text{15}\)

Thus, in the opening decades of the nineteenth century, Germany experienced a period of instability and transformation, with a growing population putting strain on economic and social systems that were themselves changing. In the midst of this volatility, many Germans looked to emigration as a means to start a new and better life.

**Table 1: German Emigration from Europe, 1820-1859**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Number of Emigrants (In Thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1816-1824</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825-1829</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830-1834</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835-1839</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840-1844</td>
<td>110.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{16}\) Marschalck, *Deutsche Überseewanderung*, 35–36.
In terms of the ebb and flow of emigration post-1815, the first wave came principally from the southwest. In 1816, a cold, damp summer brought on by a volcanic eruption in Java, produced terrible harvests throughout much of Europe.\textsuperscript{17} Farmers faced starvation, especially in the Rhineland, where half their produce went to the state for taxes. As peasants stopped buying, local artisans suffered as well, demonstrating the interconnected nature of the rural economy; a problem within one part led to a problem throughout. By late 1816, 18,000 people in Baden received passes to emigrate, while an estimated 23,000 people left Württemberg between 1816 and 1820.\textsuperscript{18}

By 1820, rising harvest yields and falling prices helped reduce emigration markedly. However, the 1830s marked the beginning of a gradual and often uneven rise in migration overseas that culminated in the early 1850s. During the 1830s, the combination of population growth, farms too small to support families in the southwest, and the persistent decline of cottage industries continued to put pressure on rural farmers and artisans. In terms of where emigrants in this period originated, while the wave prior

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
1845-1849 & 308.2 \\
\hline
1850-1854 & 728.30 \\
\hline
1855-59 & 372.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{18} Walker, \textit{Germany and the Emigration}, 5–9; Marschalck, \textit{Deutsche Überseewanderung}, 104.
to 1820 was predominantly only from the southwest of Germany, the rise that began in
the 1830s saw emigration spread both northward and eastward into areas such as Hesse-

In the 1840s, an agricultural crisis brought a huge increase in emigration. Potatoes
proved essential to many in Germany (and Europe in general) to their survival in the face
of rising population and shrinking farm size. In 1842, the potato blight began to appear in
Germany, and by 1845, it spread throughout much of the region, including to eastern
Germany (Prussia) by 1846. Faced with soaring food prices and the possibility of
starvation, unprecedented numbers emigrated. While the harvests of 1847, 1848, and
1849 proved better, those between 1850 and 1853 were less productive than expected,
and emigration grew even more. Between 1845 and 1854, more than 1,036,000 Germans
went overseas. Between 1852 and 1854 alone, the Palatinate lost 4\% of its total
deutsche überseeische Massenauswanderung,” 265–266; Moch, \textit{Moving Europeans: Migration in Western Europe since 1650}, 114.}

In addition to the regional expansion of emigration at this time, the
emigrants themselves changed; in general, they were poorer, both in terms of their
situation in Germany, with rising number of landless emigrating, and with what they
brought with them, as they emigrated with less money saved than previous groups.\footnote{Mönckmeier, \textit{Die deutsche überseeische Auswanderung}, 159–160; Walker, \textit{Germany and the Emigration}, 74–75.} In
1855, this wave broke and emigration began to ebb. While land prices fell, food prices
continued to fluctuate. With this in mind, Mack Walker argues that external factors best
explain this leveling, specifically a rise in antiforeigner sentiments and growing
unemployment in the US. Some German states, such as Baden and Hannover, took action to limit emigration to the US, especially of paupers.²²

Table 2: German Emigration from Europe, post-1860

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Number of Emigrants (In Thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1860-64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865-69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870-74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875-79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880-84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885-89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During this period, an estimated more than 2,750,000 Germans emigrated overseas, and a shift occurred both in terms of the origin of emigrants and of their economic profile.²⁴ In the mid-1860s, emigration began to spread from southwest Germany towards eastern Germany, into areas such as Mecklenburg, East Prussia,

---

²³ Marschalck, *Deutsche Überseewanderung*, 35–36.
²⁴ Ibid., 36; 48.
Pomerania, and Silesia. Between 1850 and 1854, only 7.3% of the total German emigration originated in eastern and northeastern Germany, but between 1855 and 1859, the same area accounted for 19.7%. That number grew by 1864 to 25.9%, and to 39.3% by 1875. Additionally, increasing numbers of day laborers and sharecroppers began to emigrate, joining the independent peasants and craftsmen from southwest Germany who had to this point dominated the ranks of Auswanderer.

The swing from the southwest to the northeast was related to differences in socio-economic arrangements between the two regions. Partible inheritance, which helped shrink the size of farms in the southwest, did not exist in eastern Germany. Additionally, cottage industries, such as weaving, grew later in Prussia and did not collapse until the 1870s, surviving far longer than in the western German states. Lastly, strain created by population growth did not become a serious issue in eastern Germany until the 1860s. As discussed above, a requirement of peasant emancipation in eastern Prussia was reimbursing lords with land. This resulted in lords’ estates growing, and they filled vacant land with Insten (cottagers) who exchanged labor for a small plot of land, some payment in cash, and a portion of the harvest. Many of these cottagers established families, helping fuel population growth. Still, a combination of increasing land under cultivation (in part possible through the division of common land) and an increase in food production, brought about through the spread of root crops and changes in farming techniques, prevented the “crisis” conditions which population fueled in southwest Germany decades before. However, by the mid-1860s, the move by large-landowners to

---

25 Köllmann and Marschalck, “German Emigration,” 520; 535.
27 Moch, Moving Europeans, 123.
seasonal labor and a flood of cheap agricultural goods proved devastating for much of eastern German society, and a wave of emigration began from this region.28

This period saw two identifiable spikes in emigration: between 1864 and 1873, and then 1880 and 1893. The 1864-73 wave began as the U.S. Civil War came to an end, which not only meant a return of peace but also a large-scale movement westward. Beginning in 1873, a major recession hit the U.S. and Europe, including Germany, and emigration slowed until the recession’s end in 1879. German overseas emigration rapidly picked back up in 1880 and continued to rise until 1893.29 In terms of demographics, by the 1870s and through the 1890s, emigrants were more likely to be from rural northern and eastern Germany. West and southwest Germany continued to supply emigrants, but never in the proportions they had through the 1850s.30

By the 1880s, a new type of migration began in Germany, that of internal migration instead of migration overseas. Over the next two decades, Germany’s rapidly expanding industrial base produced a major demand for labor, leading to large-scale urbanization and a marked slowing of emigration. While between 1900 and 1914 nearly 381,000 Germans emigrated overseas, this number, occurring over a fifteen year period, was still 110,000 less than that between the five years of 1885 and 1889.31

30 Bade, "Die deutsche überseeische Massenauswanderung," 276; Walker, Germany and the Emigration, 184–85.
Background to the German Relationship with Brazil

The connection between Brazil and the German imaginary began long before the first Germanophone settlers arrived in Bahia in 1819. Germans first became popularly aware of Brazil in the sixteenth century, when Hans Staden published *Warhaftige beschreibung eyner Landschafft der wilden nacketen, grimmigen menschenfresser leuthen, in der newen welt America gelegten* in 1557. Staden was a sailor and mercenary born in Hesse who travelled twice to Brazil. During his second voyage there, a group of Tupinambá Amerindians captured and held him for nine months. Following his escape, he recounted his experiences, including his witnessing cannibalism, in the *Warhaftige beschreibung*, which became a bestseller, with multiple editions published over the centuries in numerous languages.\(^32\)

While works regarding Brazil continued to publish in the German states in the centuries that followed,\(^33\) the nature of these shifted in the eighteenth century, wherein German travel literature began to focus less on individual experience and more on the collection of knowledge regarding contemporary conditions overseas, including in Brazil.\(^34\) Following this shift, German works regarding South America, and Brazil especially, became increasingly common. Obviously, the most famous of these travelers

\(^{32}\) Kathöfer, “Travel Writing,” 136–137.

\(^{33}\) For example, Johann Georg Aldenburgk’s *West-Indianische Reiße und Beschreibung der Beläg- und Eroberung der Statt S. Salvador in der Bahie von Todos os Sancots in dem Lande von Brasilia* (1627), Ambrosius Richshoffer’s *Brassilianisch- und West Indianische Reisse Beschreibung* (1677), as well as translations such as *Beschreibung des Portugiesischen Amerika vom Cudena* (1780), which was translated from the Spanish writings of Pedro Cudena. Ibid., 154.

\(^{34}\) Zantop, *Colonial Fantasies: Conquest, Family, and Nation in Precolonial Germany, 1770-1870*, 34–35.
was Alexander von Humboldt, but other German scientific, geographic, and anthropological studies of Brazil were numerous. Interest was sufficient even to open a museum regarding the country in 1832 in Vienna.\textsuperscript{35}

Hence, before substantial numbers of Germans immigrated there, there was a long history of German interest in Brazil. With the beginning of German migration to the country in 1819, a new type of Germanophone literature regarding Brazil arose; joining the host of scientific studies were works that focused specifically on social and economic conditions in the country.\textsuperscript{36} Most of these were first-hand reports, although the authors’ experiences were generally quite different from that of most immigrants.\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{35} For example, Ludwig von Eschwege, who was sent to Minas Gerais to develop the region’s mining and map the area, published \textit{Brasilien die neue Welt in topographischer, geognostischer, bergmännischer, naturhistorischer, politischer und statistischer Hinsicht während eines elfjährigen Aufenthaltes von 1810 bis 1821: mit Hinweisung auf die neueren Begebenheiten in 1830}. German artists played an important role the creation of knowledge regarding Brazil. For example, Christian August Fischer’s two volume \textit{Neuestes Gemälde von Brasilien} (1819) contained both pictures and written descriptions of the country. Johann Moritz Rugendas, who accompanied the Langsdorff expedition, published \textit{Malerische Reise nach Brasilien} in 1825, which offered German readers images of the animals, flora, and people of Brazil. See Dietrich Briesemeister, "Das deutsche Brasilienbild im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert," in “Neue Welt” - “Dritte Welt”: interkulturelle Beziehungen Deutschlands zu Lateinamerika und der Karibik, ed. Sigrid Bauschinger and Susan L. Cocalis (Tübingen: Franke, 1994), 67–70.

\textsuperscript{36} This is not to say that all scientific works did not comment on Brazilianian society. For example, Spix and Martius’ account features many observations regarding the Brazilian population, institutions, etc. See Johann Baptist von Spix and Karl Friedrich Philipp von Martius, \textit{Reise in Brasilien auf Befehl Sr. Majest Maximilian Joseph I. Königs von Baiern in den Jahren 1817 bis 1820}, vol. 1, 3 vols. (München: M. Lindauer, 1823).

\textsuperscript{37} For example, George H. von Langsdorf was the Imperial Russian consul to Brazil. Carl Schlichthorst, while a mercenary like many of those emigrants arriving in the 1820s, was an officer in the Brazilian army who did not settle there, returning to Europe after two years abroad. Although he was involved in farming, J. Friedrich von Weech was a trained agronomist and wealthy enough to travel to Argentina as well as Brazil. See Georg Heinrich von Langsdorf, \textit{Bemerkungen über Brasilien. Mit gewissenhafter Belehrung für auswandernde Deutsche} (Heidelberg: Verlag von Karl
Following the beginning of German settlement in Brazil, the country also appeared in European-German fiction. Amalia Schoppe published *Die Auswanderer nach Brasilien oder die Hütte am Gigitonhonha* in 1828. The story involves the Riemanns, a poor family from Württemberg who live in a small shack and are struggling with growing debt. The family decides to leave for Brazil, but without enough money for the transatlantic trip, the oldest son agrees to sell himself into slavery upon arriving in Rio de Janeiro. The family settles in the diamond-mining region of Minas Gerais, along the Gigitonhonha (Jequitinhonha) river. Thanks to the help of a German-Brazilian official, a German mercenary, and even the Brazilian empress (who was a Hapsburg), the family is reunited and prosperous by the end of the story.  

Thus, in Schoppe’s presentation, Brazil was a land where Germans faced both new perils (in this case, the unlikely selling of a settler into slavery) and new opportunities (the Riemanns move from poverty in Europe to success and stability in their new homeland).  

---


This notion that Germans faced enslavement in Brazil became popular in the 1840s through the 1860s, with the advent of the sharecropping (*parceria*) system on coffee plantations in São Paulo. See Walker, *Germany and the Emigration*, 177–8; Frederick C Luebke, *Germans in the New World: Essays in the History of Immigration* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990), 11–2; Béatrice Ziegler, *Schweizer statt Sklaven: Schweizerische Auswanderer in den Kaffee-Plantagen von São Paulo (1852-1866)* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1985); Reinhardt W. Wagner, *Deutsche als Ersatz für Sklaven: Arbeitsmigranten aus Deutschland in der brasilianischen Provinz São Paulo 1847-1914* (Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert, 1995).
As discussed below, beginning in the 1830s, German interest in overseas spaces, including Latin America, moved from the scientific to the commercial, and even the “manifestly” imperial. Many German liberal thinkers believed that colonies (either official or privately administered) could solve the assorted issues (economic, demographic, social, etc.) facing the nation. Books, pamphlets, and newspaper articles in journals such as the Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung and later the Gartenlaube became the means by which these thinkers expressed their ideas.

**German settlement in Brazil: Background and Practice**

**Table 3: German Immigration to Brazil, 1820-1890**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Number of Emigrants (In Thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1820-30</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831-50</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-60</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

40 This is in contrast to the “latent colonialism” on which Zantop focuses. See Zantop, *Colonial Fantasies: Conquest, Family, and Nation in Precolonial Germany, 1770-1870*, 2–3.


42 Marschalck, *Deutsche Überseeewanderung*, 50.
German immigration to Brazil commenced only a few years after the end of Napoleonic Wars, although the desire for European immigrants as settlers predated Brazil’s independence. King João VI, king of Portugal and Brazil (until Brazilian independence in 1822), favored the use of immigrants from Europe to bolster Brazil’s agricultural economy and populate the region. Under his rule, an 1808 decree formally opened Brazil to non-Portuguese immigration and granted non-Catholics the right to own land. Germanophone settlement in Brazil began in the northeastern province of Bahia with the founding of three villages (Leopoldina, São Jorge dos Ilhéus, and Frankental) between 1819 and 1822. However, due to a combination of internal strife, conflict with neighboring Brazilians, and disease, these communities failed to flourish, and many emigrants left to settle elsewhere in the country. The same can be said of Nova Friburgo, created in 1819 in Rio de Janeiro using principally Francophone Swiss, most of whom abandoned the colony within two years. Realizing that the settlement was in danger of collapse, the Brazilian government reinforced the population with 284 Germanophone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1861-70</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-80</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-90</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

settlements from the German states in 1824.\textsuperscript{44} That same year, Germanophone settlement began in the southernmost province of Rio Grande do Sul, with the founding of São Leopoldo, north of the provincial capital of Porto Alegre. Unlike previous settlements, São Leopoldo prospered relatively quickly, growing large enough to be elevated to the status of município in 1846.\textsuperscript{45}

A host of objectives fueled the Portuguese and later Brazilian Imperial crown’s desire for European settlers. Regarding settlement in southern Brazil, the initial drive was two-fold. The Brazilian government turned to foreign immigrants as soldier-settlers, meant first to serve in the Brazilian army and later to settle the poorly populated border region with what would become Argentina. Having declared independence from Portugal in 1822, Dom Pedro I, now Emperor of Brazil, feared that elements of the Portuguese army still on Brazilian soil could prove disloyal. To bolster the ranks of the Brazilian army, Dom Pedro sent Major Georg Schäffer, a confidant of Empress Leopoldina, to Europe to recruit soldiers from the German states.\textsuperscript{46}

Schäffer was born in Munnerstadt in Franconia on 7 January, 1779. He studied pharmacology in Würzburg, becoming a doctor in 1808. That same year, he and his wife immigrated to Russia, where he served as a doctor in the army, as well as for the police in Moscow. During his time in Russia, Czar Alexander I awarded him with the title of baron,


\textsuperscript{45} Seyferth, “Os teuto-brasileiros e a integração cívica: observações sobre a problemática convivência do Deutschtum com o nacionalismo brasileiro,” 131.

and he later joined assorted Russian naturalist expeditions, including to Hawaii and
Alaska. In 1818, a ship carrying Schäffer docked in Rio de Janeiro. Establishing contacts
with local naturalists and scientists, Schäffer soon grew close to Empress Leopoldina,
who prompted him to join her court.47

Dom Pedro empowered Schäffer to offer potential emigrants free passage to
Brazil, as well as free land in Rio Grande do Sul.48 However, conflicting orders and poor
communication between Schäffer and Brazilian officials led to his recruiting both settlers
and mercenaries separately. On 7 January, 1824, the Argus arrived in Brazil from Europe,
carrying on it 150 men enlisted as soldiers, as well as 134 men, women, and children
meant for settlement. By the end of 1824, some 2,000 German-speakers emigrated from
Europe to Brazil, and another 4,000 followed by 1830. Of this 6,000 total, an estimated
4,000 were mercenaries.49

It should be noted that, in some cases, Schäffer failed to inform the unmarried
men whom he recruited that they would be conscripted upon arrival.50 Unfortunately, this
set a precedent for dealings with the Brazilian government and German settlers serving in
the army. After seeing action in the Cisplatine War, morale among the German
mercenaries was extremely low. Rations consisted of rotten meat, practically inedible

47 Juvencio Saldanha Lemos, Os mercenários do Imperador: a primeira corrente
anos/Deutsche Kultur seit 180 Jahre, ed. Jorge Luiz da Cunha, ed. bilíngüe (Porto
49 Lemos, Os mercenários do Imperador, 46; 63; Juvencio Saldanha Lemos, “Os
Batalhões mercenários Alemães no primeiro Império,” in Anais do VIII e IX Simpósios
de História da Imigração e Colonização Alemãs no Rio Grande do Sul, São Leopoldo,
setembro de 1988 e 1990, ed. Arthur Blásio Rambo (São Leopoldo, RS: Instituto
Histórico de São Leopoldo, 1998), 182.
50 Neill Macaulay, Dom Pedro: The Struggle for Liberty in Brazil and Portugal, 1798-
bread, and a paltry serving of rice and beans. Soldiers were paid very little, and salaries came late more often than not. Furthermore, conditions in military hospitals were deplorable. Lastly, corporal punishment was a mainstay of the Brazilian imperial army. All of these factors helped fuel a rebellion by German and Irish mercenaries in 1828 in Rio de Janeiro, although corporal punishment proved to be the spark that lit the powder keg. On 9 June, members of the Second Grenadier Battalion, nearly all of whom were German, attacked a Brazilian major after he ordered a German soldier receive 250 lashes for failing to salute. After airing their grievances to Dom Pedro I in the Boa Vista palace, the soldiers returned to their barracks at São Cristóvão, where they drove out the Brazilian officers and elected officers from their own ranks. By 11 June, violence spread into the streets of the capital, with Irish mercenaries from the Third Grenadiers attacking their officers and killing six Brazilian policemen. By the time Brazilian regulars restored order on 13 June, 150 German and Irish mercenaries were dead, as well as many Brazilians.

Beyond military and demographic needs, Brazilian officials also saw German settlers as a means to create a free-labor class of small-holding farmers and artisans. Decision N. 80 of 31 March, 1824, which set aside land for the settlement of Germans in what would become São Leopoldo, states that the Brazilian empire recognizes the

---

52 Macaulay, Dom Pedro: The Struggle, 207–210; Lemos, Os mercenários do Imperador, 328–77.
advantages of employing Germans, whom it calls “white, free, and industrious, both in the arts and in agriculture.”54 The Brazilian administration saw Germans as a unique combination of industrious, law-abiding, and unwilling to use slaves. The Visconde de Abrantes, a former Brazilian minister of finance and architect of Brazilian immigration policy, discusses the Germans specifically in his 1846 memoir. Abrantes cites the German capacity for agricultural work and their ability in the skilled trades as exceptional. Furthermore, he writes that Germans possess a “natural repugnance to slavery,” but this is tempered by their conservative nature, which abhors sudden change to the established order. Thus, they will neither use slaves nor support abolition. Abrantes argues that even when compared to other Europeans, the Germans’ are unique in their “love of work” and “respect for authority.”55 Of course, during this period, perceptions of race were interwoven with notions of industriousness, as the boundaries between phenotype and culture blurred, making Germans “white” both in terms of how they looked and how they (supposedly) acted.

Regarding perceptions of race in Brazil in this period, beginning in the nineteenth century, they underwent a complex evolution. The standard history of this remains Thomas E. Skidmore’s Black into White.56 As Skidmore discusses, the history of large-scale sexual mixing among Afro- and European-Brazilians and the tradition of manumission created a substantial free-black population in the country.57 The resulting

54 Luiza Horn Iotti, ed., Imigração e colonização : legislação de 1747 a 1915 (Caxias do Sul, RS: EDUCS, 2001), 79.
55 Miguel Calmon du Pin e Almeida Abrantes, Memoria sobre meios de promover a colonisação (Berlin: Typographia de Unger Irmãos, 1846), 1–2.
56 Skidmore, Black into White; Race and Nationality in Brazilian Thought.
57 Unlike in the American South, it was quite common in Brazil, and Latin America in general, to free one’s slaves for a host of reasons. See Stuart B. Schwartz, “The
approach towards race was not the binary black/white view more common in North America. Instead, the Brazilian approach was more nuanced, wherein phenotype was one of many factors, such as wealth and education, which dictated one’s status.

However, in the eyes of Brazilian thinkers, white remained superior to black. Scientific racism held sway in the country for much of the later nineteenth century, but due to the vast Afro-Brazilian population, Brazilian elites broke with the European notions that miscegenation produced degeneracy and that Africans were inherently and unalterably inferior. Instead, Brazilian thinkers argued that through mixing with whites, the negative racial character of Afro-Brazilians could be overcome. This notion was known as “branquemento,” or whitening.


59 This negative view of miscegenation is best illustrated by Arthur Gobineau, The Inequality of Human Races, trans. Adrian Collins (New York: H. Fertig, 1967).

Brazilian elites’ longing to whiten the population and the desire for European immigrants were closely linked.\textsuperscript{61} From the very beginning, the Brazilian government’s programs for European settlement were intimately related to race. For example, the Government Act (\textit{Aviso do Governo}) of 31 March 1824, which began the settlement process in Rio Grande do Sul, noted the importance of creating a German settlement in the area, citing the “superior advantage of hiring white, free, industrious people,”\textsuperscript{62} while in 1847, Manuel Antônio Galvão, the president of the province, stressed that it was for the greatest good of the empire that the expanses of the interior be settled by whites.\textsuperscript{63} In the eyes of the elite, European immigration became the means by which Brazil’s alleged racial impediment could be overcome.\textsuperscript{64}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Returning to the chronology of German settlement in Brazil, following the first
decade of immigration, foreign migration all but ceased between the early-1830s and
late-1840s. This was the regency period (1831-1840), beginning with Dom Pedro I’s
abdication and ending with Dom Pedro II’s taking the throne at age 16, and political and
financial instability mainly kept the interests of the government on internal affairs and
away from Europe. Additionally, the Farroupilha Revolution (1835-1845), wherein Rio
Grande do Sul attempted to break away from Brazil, meant a long and destructive war in
the south of the country, where most German immigrants had settled. In December 1830,
the Brazilian government cut all funding designed to stimulate foreign immigration.
Additionally, in August 1834, the imperial government transferred the responsibility of
creating settlements to the provinces, but without granting any additional funds to help
them do so. As a result of these legislative actions, immigration from the German states,
and Europe in general, essentially halted.65

However, Brazil’s political landscape began to stabilize with the ascension of
Dom Pedro II to the throne. Additionally, the end of Farroupilha Revolution opened the
south of Brazil to settlement again. In October 1848, General Law N. 514 reserved 36
square miles in every province specifically for settlement. In Rio Grande do Sul, the
provincial assembly passed a law three months later assigning additional land for
settlement, as well as supplying emigrants with seeds, tools, and covering the cost for

---

transport to the colony upon their arrival in Brazil. With the beginning of the Platine War against the forces of Argentine dictator, Juan Manuel de Rosas, in 1851, the Brazilian government engaged more than 50 agents in the German states to recruit mercenaries to staff a German Legion in the Brazilian army. The Germans recruits became known as the “Brummers,” named after the sound the copper coins with which they were paid made.\textsuperscript{66}

Several of these men would play a foundational role in the formation of the German-language press in Brazil, as well as in the political development of the German-Brazilian population. Before going further, a brief discussion of the Brummers is called for, since their importance in the development of the Rio­grandense German-language press is undeniable. Recruited to fight for the Brazilian army, some of the immigrants selected were recently demobilized from the Prussian army, having just fought in the First Schleswig-Holstein War with Denmark, while others, such as Karl von Koseritz, were participants in the failed revolutions of 1848. Undeniably, some were just adventurers or simply looking for a new life overseas. Regardless of their reasons, just over 1,800 men were enrolled in the German Legion, enough to form an infantry battalion, four artillery batteries, and two companied of pioneers. While initially contracted for four years, desertion rates within the Legion were very high, and only a small percentage of the men saw actual combat. With the end of the Rosas regime following the Battle of Monte Caseros in February 1852, the Brazilians dissolved the Legion and its members could immigrate back to Europe, be given a small piece of land

in the Teuto-Brazilian settlements, or accept 80 mil-reis as payment. The vast majority chose the money, and moved into urban areas throughout Rio Grande do Sul, although Porto Alegre received the largest number.67

Many Brummers went on to play important roles in Brazilian-German society, assuming positions in education, culture, and commerce. Some took on leadership roles, such as Wilhelm Ter Brüggen, who later became the German consul in Porto Alegre and served as a Conservative deputy in the Riograndense provincial assembly. Karl von Koseritz served as the first non-Catholic in the Riograndense assembly, as well as founding and editing several newspapers. One author called him “the most capable journalist that the Germans produced in Rio Grande do Sul”, and wrote that it is “difficult to understand” how Koseritz managed to write numerous articles and several books (in Portuguese and German) while editing his newspaper and maintaining both a successful political and busy legal career.68

Brazilians also sought Germans for purposes of labor. As British pressure on Brazil to end the transatlantic slave trade rose, the flow of German settlers to São Paulo also increased, as coffee plantations looked to establish a new labor supply.69 Senator Nicolau de Campos Vergueiro led the drive for increasing European immigration to the coffee-growing region, and private coffee growers created a series of settlements on

69 In 1845, the Aberdeen Act allowed British ships to search any Brazilian ship at sea. In 1850, when the British made clear that they would send warship into Brazilian ports to end the slave trade to the country, Brazil acquired, agreeing to act on the decades-old treaty banning the slave trade. See Margaret M. Bakos, “Abolicionismo no Rio Grande do Sul,” Caderno de História: Memorial do Rio Grande do Sul 29 (2007): 14.
fazendas (plantations) in São Paulo, such as Senador Queiroz (1852), Boa Vista (1852), Joaquim (1853), and São Jose (1855). However, local planters, who until now used primarily slave labor, often treated their newly-arrived, European laborers much as they treated their slaves, and tensions between owners and workers sometimes led to violence.\textsuperscript{70} In 1859, due largely to the abuse of settlers in the coffee-growing region of Brazil, Prussia issued the Heydt’sche Reskript, named for Prussian Minister of the Interior August von der Heydt, which officially discouraged Prussians from immigrating to Brazil.\textsuperscript{71}

Provincial governments in the southern Brazilian provinces of Rio Grande do Sul and Santa Catarina, where no plantation-based economy existed, still continued to seek Germans to populate and bring unoccupied land under production, although by the 1870s they also brought over other Europeans, such as Italians.\textsuperscript{72} In December 1851, the Riograndense assembly passed a law securing land for the purposes of colonization and establishing an administrative structure to oversee the distribution of plots to settlers. That same month, the provincial government secured contracts for up to 2,000 Germans


to settle the new colony of Santa Cruz do Sul.\textsuperscript{73} Post-1850, there was a marked increase of private settlement companies establishing colonies, although always in close cooperation with the provincial or even municipal governments. Between 1850 and 1889, there were seventy-one settlements created in Rio Grande do Sul using German colonists; of these, sixty were through private means and only eleven through direct provincial or municipal actions.\textsuperscript{74}

Thus, while the Prussian government attempted to impede the flow of Germans to Brazil by restricting advertising and the actions of agents, the country, and Southern Brazil especially, remained a destination for immigrants.

\textbf{Connection between Emigration and Colonialism}

In order to understand better the construction of Brazil as a colonial space by Germans in Europe and Brazil, something must be said about the rise of attention toward overseas spaces more generally in Germany. Colonial thought was where liberal desires for economic expansion, cultural purity, and national unity intersected.

Geoff Eley points out that referring to a single “German liberalism” is ahistorical, since what German historians define as “liberalism” was dynamic and underwent several evolutions during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.\textsuperscript{75} However, there were some threads of thought that existed within liberalism for most of the period following 1815, and, as recent work by Matthew Fitzpatrick and Jens-Uwe Guettel demonstrate,

\begin{itemize}
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\item \textsuperscript{74} Ernesto Pellanda, \textit{A colonização germanica no Rio Grande do Sul} (Porto Alegre: Livraria do Globo, 1925), 44–46.
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imperialism was one of these threads. Writing about liberalism in general (German and
otherwise), Guettel asserts that “[f]rom its beginnings in the seventeenth century,
liberalism was an imperial ideology. Imperialism was therefore a constitutive part of
liberalism and not merely the result of developments that undermined the ideology’s
‘true’ core, or, within the German context, resulted in liberalism’s eventual permeation
by ethnicist ideas.”

Fitzpatrick asserts that imperialism was the means pursued to
achieve unity among liberals and in the national sense: “Imperialism… operated
throughout the nineteenth century as a (not always successful) means of overcoming
differing liberal perspectives… Coupled with nationalism, imperialism was proffered as a
point of unity, firstly for German liberals and secondly for the nation that they were
attempting to forge.”

However, the centrality of imperialism to liberal ideology was not always so
clear. In the 1960s, Han Ulrich Wehler developed the notion of “social imperialism.”
Wehler focused on the rise of colonial agitation in the 1880s, arguing political elites
orchestrated the colonial movement to distract the working class and thereby maintain the
political status quo. In this calculus, colonialism came into being in the Bismarck era and
was a top-down phenomenon designed specifically with the domestic German setting in
mind. However, Wehler’s construction of German imperialism came to be challenged
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for a host of reasons. Wehler’s thesis that the working class was distracted by colonialism required that the working class had taken part in expansionist agitation groups. But, as Geoff Eley notes, workers were all but absent from these organizations. Additionally, Wehler’s notion assumed too much control from above. In fact, these imperialist agitation groups often came in conflict with the German imperial state regarding overseas expansion and policies. A further critique of Wehler’s top-down idea comes from the spread of colonialism throughout German science, literature, and culture, without an evidence of control from the groups upon which Wehler’s basic idea depends.

Recent work on German colonialism has also challenged the older notion that German imperialism developed in the Kaiserreich, as well as calling into question the idea that liberalism was averse to colonial expansion. Studies by Hans Fenske, Frank Lorenz Müller, and Bradley Naranch reveal how the issue of colonial expansion absorbed
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many German thinkers during the *Vormärz*; colonialism represented a means to create a politically and socially unified Germany that was economically prosperous through strong connections to German immigrant communities abroad. Additionally, these studies, as well as works by Matthew Fitzpatrick and Jens-Uwe Guettel, illustrate how far from being anathema to German liberalism, colonialism was central to liberal thought. Matthew Fitzpatrick argues that instead of serving as a means by politically weak liberals to distract the working class, as Wehler had argued, that liberals saw expansionism as an expression of German national greatness and as a means to help the disaffected in Germany.

Thus, colonialism was central to German liberalism. Concerns regarding emigration and the fate of emigrants were foundational to liberal opinions regarding the need for German expansion abroad. Beginning in the 1830s, interest and even concern about emigration became prominent within the German states. Emigration newspapers and associations proliferated, with some thirty immigration and colonization societies founded by 1850. This was in part due to emigration’s representing an issue in which many liberal economic, national, and cultural points of apprehension intersected. As Bradley Naranch writes, “[e]migration offered an ideal topic for bringing together the
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diverse strands of public discontent with state policy because it was an issue that seemed to be only soluble [sic] by the adoption of a uniform national strategy to the problem.”

Colonies appeared to be the bridge that could join emigrants and Germany, thereby solving a host of domestic and international issues.

Matthew Fitzpatrick finds five basic tropes in German imperialism from the 1840s through 1884, all of which related to emigration. Economically, colonies, populated by emigrants, would offer markets for German goods and supply raw materials to German industries. Friedrich List and Alexander von Bülow, both of whom are discussed below, were among the strongest advocates for colonies from this perspective. Demographically, colonies would allow German emigrants to retain not only their economic connection, but also their cultural attachment to Germany. As will be discussed, German liberals generally saw emigrants settling in the United States as essentially lost to Germany and to the Volk, due to the alleged capacity of the Anglo-Saxons to assimilate other cultures. Latin Americas, on the other hand, were seen as far less able to absorb Germans, allowing the settlers to maintain their cultural (and economic) connection to the Fatherland. A “new Germany,” free of the assorted divides that racked European-German society, could form overseas. Stefan von Senger und Etterlin called the drive to create such a place overseas, “a projection of unfulfilled
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dreams of national unity, freedom, and power.” Chapter II will address in detail how German liberals saw Southern Brazil especially as a zone of pure Deutschtum. Sociopolitically, settlements would allow disaffected German poor to find success overseas and not become radicalized in Germany. Colonies could also serve a moral purpose, whereby German settlers would spread civilization throughout the world. Lastly, colonies could help spur national unity and German greatness, especially through the creation of a unified German fleet, by which emigrants could be protected. As Matthew Fitzpatrick writes, “An imperial fleet had the role of convincing the German-speaking populace of central Europe… that they were ‘Germans,’ and that being German entailed being a trading, seafaring, colonizing nation not unlike England.” All of these tropes were interrelated, with authors often calling for colonies by referencing some or all rationales.
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Hence, emigration and imperialism were intimately linked in German liberal thought, and this study focuses on this connection. The proceeding chapters examine especially the second and forth tropes discussed by Fitzpatrick, that of concerns regarding cultural connection to Germany and of the alleged German civilizing mission. Regarding the civilizing mission, Chapter II discusses how Germanophone representations of Brazil and Portuguese-Brazilians portrayed the land as undeveloped and its residents as incapable to taming their surroundings, in large part due to Brazilians’ alleged dependence on slavery. Chapter II and IV reveal how these same sources presented the Germans as the primary fonts of civilization in the country, as demonstrated through their industriousness and supposed relationship(s) with slavery. These discourses made slavery integral to the construction of Brazil, Portuguese-, and German-Brazilians, as well as foundation to the alleged civilizing impact of Germans there.

The second trope discussed by Fitzpatrick, the issue of assimilation, both economic and cultural, is central to looking at Brazil and German colonialism, as liberal nationalists believed that German emigrants must go where they could “remain German,” buying German goods, selling to German companies, and retaining their cultural-linguistic connection to the Fatherland. Concerns regarding the emigrants maintaining their cultural Germanness became especially acute by the 1860s, as Auswanderer became Auslandsdeutsche in middle-class periodicals, indicating the growing sense that Germanness was now something timeless and unrelated to where settlers lived.96 This vision of the emigrant remaining German helped to resolve the two competing understandings of emigration in Germany post-1840: There were those who saw

96 Naranch, “Inventing the Auslandsdeutsche.”
emigration as a “loss of ‘national energy,’” although Friedrich List took the stance that sending that energy into colonies would thereby preserve it for the nation; the other camp, who represented the majority of opinion, saw emigration as a means to divert excess population, thereby preventing overextended food supplies and social unrest. “Keeping” emigrants German satisfied both sides: “Sceptics [sic] of emigration were appeased that emigrants were, in fact, not lost to the nation; and for its proponents it was the missing link between the Malthusian trap and German global politics.”

In both economic and cultural spheres, Brazil represented the ideal location for colonization to many German nationalists on both sides of the Atlantic. As will be discussed in later chapters, claims regarding the strength of the cultural and commercial relationship between settlers in Brazil and Germany were fundamental to the construction of Brazil as the consummate German colonial space. European- and Brazilian-German liberal nationalists lauded the purity of colonists’ Deutschtum, emphasizing that settlers in Brazil spoke and “acted” German for generations after arriving in their new country. Settlers’ alleged preference for European-German goods further reflected this sustained Germanness. While European-German visions during the Kaiserreich of Brazilian-Germans as paragons of unadulterated Deutschtum are well-established, German liberals in both Europe and Brazil held this opinion regarding the settlers in Southern Brazil well before German unification. Additionally, through stressing the Germanness of the settlers, Germanophone sources on both sides of the Atlantic emphasized the ethno-
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specific nature of the alleged achievements of the colonists, thereby using Brazil to illustrate the German capacity to colonize successfully. Furthermore, ethnicity defined Germanophone claims regarding the social and national impact of slavery on Brazilians (German- and non-German alike), and these allegations were foundational in creating the image of Brazil as a land in need of Germans’ capable and civilizing help.

Frequently, those supporting settlement in Southern Brazil emphasized its benefits by comparing the situation of Germans there with that in the United States. Many German thinkers in both Europe and Latin America argued that settlement in the U.S. did nothing for Germany and led to immigrants being lost to the Fatherland, both economically and culturally. The idea of Germans as “fertilizer” best exemplified the notion that mass emigration was economically and culturally strengthening other countries, especially the United States, while weakening Germany. The term “Kulturdünger” first appeared in 1845 and fears regarding the assimilation of Germans overseas to the detriment of the Fatherland and the benefit of other nations, especially Germany’s enemies, grew through the end of the Wilhelmine period.101 German liberal nationalists, on the whole, saw the U.S. especially as a zone wherein assimilation occurred quickly and all but universally, and so many openly opposed directing Germans there.
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For example, Friedrich List was among the first leading advocates for German colonies, but he was against attempting to create settlements in the U.S. Among the many roles List played in his life (politician, farmer, professor, diplomat, emigrant, American citizen), his contributions to German nationalism and imperialism are most important here. List bridged the gap between nationalism and economics by being among the first to call for greater economic unification of the German Confederation.\textsuperscript{102} In 1819, List formed the Union of German Merchants and Manufacturers, and he penned a letter for the Union to the German Diet urging the elimination of internal tariffs and the creation of a “national” tariff policy to combat foreign imports. While List’s recommendations went unheeded by lawmakers, Roman Szporluk stills called the Union “historical important” since it “propagated among the business classes a \textit{German} national identity and consciousness, and it contributed to the dissemination of the idea that the existing states… were really parts of a ‘Germany’ that needed to be united.”\textsuperscript{103} Matthew Fitzpatrick sees List as the “central figure in the consolidation” of the assorted strands within German colonialist discourse and as cites List as having “established the rhetorical terrain upon which the imperial debate would be argued for almost one hundred years.”\textsuperscript{104} List also influenced Alexander von Bülow (discussed below), who was a leading colonial advocate and activist.


\textsuperscript{104} Fitzpatrick, \textit{Liberal Imperialism}, 55.
List defined colonies via their economic relation with the mother country. In his most famous work, 1841’s *Das nationale System der politischen Oekonomie*, List discussed the commercial importance of colonies to the metropole; colonies would act as both a supplier of agricultural products and as a market for manufactured goods made in the mother country. List argued that through demand for products in the colonies, manufacturing in the metropole would grow, which would thereby spur demographic, agricultural, and naval (civilian and military) expansion there.\(^{105}\)

In discussing where Germany should consider establishing colonies, economic questions were the primary lenses of analysis for List. Unlike some later authors (discussed below), List was not overly troubled with German settlers losing their cultural connection to the Fatherland. In fact, he saw the notion of emigrants’ preserving their language and traditions as fanciful. Instead, he was most concerned with maintaining a commercial relationship with Germans overseas. Still, he believed that settlement in the United States would reap few rewards for Germany.

While List acknowledged that the U.S. held many advantages for German emigrants, he argued that the country was unsuited for establishing German colonies due to the lack of commercial connection between Germans there and German manufacturers in Europe:\(^{106}\) “What does it help the German nation if emigrants in North America become quite successful? Their identity is lost forever to German nationality, and furthermore, Germany can expect only negligible fruits from their material

\(^{105}\) Friedrich List, *Das nationale System der politischen Oekonomie*, vol. 1 (Stuttgart; Tübingen: J.G. Cotta, 1844), 377.

\(^{106}\) Friedrich List, *Die Ackerverfassung die Zwergwirthschaft und die Auswanderung* (Stuttgart: J.G. Cotta, 1842), 60.
production.” List believed that assimilation in any new country, but in the U.S. especially, was inevitable. Like the Huguenots in Germany and the French in Louisiana, the German emigrants in America “must and will fuse with the predominant population.” However, through assimilation and the omnipresence of American goods, German settlers’ economic connection to Germany ended: “those Germans who migrate to the west of North America offer no substantial assistance in developing the demand for German manufactured products”. Hence, List’s primary objection to settlement in the U.S. focused on the breaking of economic instead of cultural ties.

Alexander von Bülow, a colonial enthusiast who had both theoretical and practical experience with colonization, strongly agreed with List on most topics, even quoting from him at length. Bülow was a founding member of the Berlin Association for the Centralization of German Emigration and Colonization, created in 1849, which became the Berlin Central Association to German Emigration and Colonization Affairs in 1852. The Berlin Association (BA) had strong connections to the Prussian government, boasting several high-ranking officials as members and receiving direct reports from Prussian consuls in Europe and overseas. The BA supported colonization through government petitions and publishing pamphlets and booklets, including Karl Gaillard’s How and Where?, discussed in Chapter III. The BA became a leading voice for German settlement in Chile. Furthermore, the BA took more direct action to support
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German colonial expansion, securing contracts, in competition and then cooperation with the Hamburg Association for Colonization in Central America, for German emigrants to Costa Rica in 1851. Unfortunately, disease and hunger killed most the settlers soon after their arrival. In 1853, von Bülow established the settlement of Angostura and the first settlers, coming from Bremen, arrived that year. However, conditions in the colony proved too poor for the colonists, and by May 1854, many were migrating into the capital of San José. Within two years, Angostura was no more.\textsuperscript{113}

Concerning colonies, Bülow concurred with List’s calculus wherein they would provide agricultural materials to Germany while offering a market for German manufactured goods, in turn spurring industrial, demographic, and agricultural growth at home. He rejected the argument that Germany was overpopulated, instead asserting that a lack of development in German industries was to blame for mass emigration.\textsuperscript{114}

Colonization represented the means to address both the development and the emigration issues: “A proper emigration plan must solve the problem: guiding the movement of emigrants by a specific principle… to suitable lands. Colonization is the task and efforts must be applied properly. Colonization through work and intelligence is the solution.”\textsuperscript{115}

Furthermore, Bülow believed that directed emigration would help give the disaffected classes a sense of purpose, thereby incorporating them back into the nation through a “national” mission.\textsuperscript{116}
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In addressing where Germans might settle, Bülow warned against Brazil, Texas, and the American South, since the dominance of slave-labor there made the situation for free workers unfavorable. Bülow’s views regarding German settlement in the U.S. outside of the South revealed how, like List, he saw the question of maintaining cultural connection with emigrants as secondary to the commercial connection; cultural assimilation reflected economic assimilation and thus was to be avoided. Bülow acknowledged that in the U.S., Germans had trouble maintaining their language and customs. However, the larger issue was that German settlers, in part due to the ubiquity and low cost of American products, stopped buying European-German goods, and therefore did not spur growth of German industries. Thus, Bülow rejected the notion of large-scale colonization in the U.S. principally for economic reasons, although he cited the loss of the Germanness as well.

While List and Bülow were opposed to settlement in the U.S., some pro-colonial writers believed that the United States offered the best opportunity for German colonies, although such thinkers remained in the minority. Robert von Mohl, a Frankfurt parliamentarian and Minister of Justice, also supported German colonization, but broke with List and Bülow over settlement in the U.S. Mohl was especially concerned with the effects of modernization and industrialization in German society, and he advocated for German settlement specifically as a means to alleviate the growing alienation among
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With these criteria in mind, Mohl rejected Central and South America, citing disease, climate, and, in the case of Brazil, weak government and slavery. Unfavorable laws and potential instability, especially closer to the Turkish border, made Eastern Europe unsuitable. Mohl also did not recommend Australia, based on its geographic distance from Europe and the likelihood that large-scale German settlement would upset England. This left only the United States, which Mohl did not see as an ideal zone for settlement, but rather as one that offered more advantages than disadvantages.\footnote{Ibid., 328–30.}

Among the drawbacks of the U.S., Mohl especially stressed the dominance of English culture in the country and its ability to assimilate German settlers: “They are divorced in mind from the old Fatherland, just as they are separated physically from it.” Mohl asserted that some Germans even come to abhor their former homeland, speaking about Germany “with the hatred of the freed slave.”\footnote{Ibid., 332.} However, Mohl remained optimistic that the loss of Germanness among settlers in the U.S. could be prevented, if
Germany created a settlement policy and worked to guarantee the rights of Germans overseas. Should Germany establish German-only communities in the United States, wherein settlers conduct their daily lives in German, then institutions such as German schools, newspapers, and churches could flourish and assure the continued linguistic and cultural connection of the immigrants. Additionally, Mohl argued that both within the German states and in German colonies in the U.S., there must be an effort to educate the population in a way that fosters national pride. Lastly, Mohl asserted that the Zollverein must act to prevent abuses of emigrants in transit and in their new countries. Only through collective German action, instead of each state acting alone, could any effective policy develop.\(^\text{123}\) All of these efforts, Mohl reasoned, would help spur settlers to buy German goods instead of American, thereby helping Germany develop.\(^\text{124}\)

It should be noted that not every German author supporting settlement overseas believed that assimilation in the United States was necessarily negative. In 1857’s *Deutsches Staats-Wörterbuch*, Karl Brater, who edited the collection with Johann Caspar-Bluntschi and later founded the *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, took a different view from most thinkers, arguing that assimilation of Germans in the U.S. was positive for Germany. In the entry for “Politik der Auswanderung,” Brater praised the role of the Germans in helping settle and civilize the Earth, but lamented that they had always done so for other European countries, and for the English especially: “German emigrants, who so numerously succeeded in the course of German colonization in America, have no German rule there, founded no German colonies, but rather place themselves under the

\(^{123}\) Ibid., 333–34; 339–40.  
\(^{124}\) Ibid., 333; 343–44.
rule of the Anglo-Saxon colony.”  

He agreed with Friedrich List that settling the lower Danube region would be beneficial, but Brater thought that “non-German powers” (assumedly Russia and Turkey) would act to block any large-scale German colonization in the area. Only unified and concerted German action could bring such efforts to an end, and thus, “at present, as a plan, it [Danube settlement] is a chimera.”  

With this fact in mind, Brater argued that the United States remained the best site for directed German colonization. The tide of emigrants leaving for the United States was simply too considerable to hinder, Brater wrote, and the country offered good climate, available land, and an indisputable level of political liberty. The only objection one could raise to the U.S. was that of German assimilation, and Brater acknowledged the validity of such claims: “Several million Germans… who are already irrevocably alienated from their nationality, are already in the United States.” However, he asserted that if Germans were sent in large numbers to a specific area, than the new arrivals would maintain their Germanness, or at least slow the rate of Anglo-Saxonisation.  

But what of the millions of Germans already “lost” to the English? Brater argued that settlers’ integration into American society was, in fact, positive for Germany, especially in light of the rising power of the United States: “it is certain that the Union is growing into a world power… This means that the size of its sphere of influence is pronounced, and it must open itself to the German spirit, when that spirit achieves equal standing with the Anglo-American in the Union.” Integration of Germans into America would mean a strengthening of both economic and political ties, Brater reasoned, and  
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thus Germany’s strength would grow in proportion to that of the U.S.: “Germany can more emphatically pursue its economic interests in international trade if the nation [the U.S.] occupies a commanding role over two-thirds of the globe. Germany can also expect that the influence of its descendants will be beneficial in the formation of American trade policy.” If Germany created a settlement zone wherein German immigrants were concentrated and maintained their cultural connection to the Fatherland, then the influence of German-Americans would be even greater.\(^\text{128}\)

Thus, Brater reinterpreted List’s and others’ calculus of German assimilation in the U.S. While Brater still believed in the importance of the German government’s trying to keep immigrants culturally and linguistically connection to Germany, he argued that German assimilation was actually a means to grow German economic and national strength. Hence, he too linked German cultural, commercial, and national development with settlement, but did so in a way that coupled these issues with the development in the United States.

While most German thinkers opposed settling in the U.S. for economic and/or cultural reasons, many pro-colonial writers did call for settlement in Latin America. Friedrich List saw Latin America, along with Eastern Europe, as especially well-suited for German colonization. List saw Latin America as offering an excellent opportunity for German settlement, as there was minimal local manufacturing to compete with German goods. Therefore, settlers would retain a strong commercial connection to the Fatherland: “[e]migration to Central and South America… offers Germany, in terms of a national

\(^{128}\) Ibid., 597–98.
relationship, far greater advantage than emigration to North America.”

Furthermore, List believed that countries within the tropical regions would almost certainly always depend on those in temperate areas for manufactured goods. Areas such as Latin America and Texas “are, on the whole, tailored for producing colonial products. They cannot and will not ever come to advance far in manufacturing industry.”

List was especially interested in establishing strong commercial ties with Brazil. In a series of articles in the Zollvereinsblatt, List argued that Brazil and Germany could act together to counter English economic hegemony over both countries. He envisioned a commercial treaty that would create an economic colony-metropole dynamic, wherein Brazil would trade agricultural products for German manufactured goods. Trade with England, List alleged, was suppressing production in Brazil and Germany, leaving both countries unable to break English domination of commerce. At the time, Brazil was among the largest market for British industrial goods, but Britain maintained high duties on Brazilian agricultural products so as to favor development in British colonies.

However, if Brazil signed a commercial treaty with Germany, both countries would see their exports grow markedly, thereby helping spur production. In fact, List predicted that a trade treaty would triple German consumption of sugar. With this in mind, List
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called Brazil, second only to the United States, “the one overseas country with which Germany is able to complete the most advantageous commercial treaty.”  

Johann Jakob Sturz also decried settlement in the U.S. and advocated for Brazil. Sturz served as the Prussian consul to Brazil and later became one of the most vocal supports in the European-German public sphere for German colonization in Southern Brazil. Historian Fritz Sudhaus presented Sturz as the exemplar of pro-Brazilian colonial agitation, in contrast to Samuel Gottfried Kerst, a member of von Bülow’s Berlin Association and perhaps the leading agitator against German settlement in Brazil. Although the BA distanced itself from Kerst’s extreme stance that all of Brazil was unfit for colonization (including Southern Brazil), Kerst still used connections he made through the Association to help spur the Prussian ban on Brazilian emigration agents and advertising of 1859.

In Soll und Kann Deutschland eine Dampfflotte haben und Wie? , Sturz, writing under the penname “Germano-Brasilicus,” argued that German immigration was central to the success of the United States, but that Germany received nothing in exchange: “The immigration of Germans has contributed very significantly to the rapid flowering of the Union. Germans already number four million in the United States, and they are among the core of the population. But for the interest of the mother country [Germany], they are
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as good as lost.” While Germans played a fundamental role in American manufacturing expansion, they also stopped buying goods from Germany. In fact, Sturz argued, the flow of Germans to the U.S. was inversely proportional to the health of German manufacturing: “The more the German immigration becomes strengthened in North America, the more it will weaken the prosperity of German industry.”

Brazil, however, offered economic advantages to both settlers and Germany. Brazilian agricultural production was growing rapidly and the Brazilian government was interested in increasing commercial connections with Germany, including using German ships to bring Brazilian goods to Europe. For German settlers, Southern Brazil held many advantages; the Brazilian government was actively recruiting Germans, offering subsidized travel and other support to entice settlers. Furthermore, the climate was salubrious and productive land was immediately available. Lastly, “industrious Germans” would be more successful than Brazilians in exploiting the country’s natural abundance. Thus, Sturz believed that both Germany and settlers would gain through German settlement in Southern Brazil, unlike in the U.S., where whatever benefits the country offered immigrants were offset by the damage settlement there did to Germany.

Hermann Blumenau characterized those thinkers that, like List and Sturz, called for settlement in Latin America, but unlike them, he stressed the centrality of settling Germans where they could maintain their cultural-linguistic purity. Blumenau was a
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scientist turned colonial enthusiast who came to favor settlement in South America, and especially in Brazil. Blumenau befriended Sturz in 1844, while Sturz served as the Prussian consul in London. Through Sturz, Blumenau became interested in the issue of colonization. Sturz introduced Blumenau to Karl Friedrich Philipp von Martius, whose work on Brazil will be discussed in Chapter II. By 1849, Blumenau was, like Sturz, convinced that Brazil was the best destination to German colonists. Unlike Sturz, however, Blumenau moved beyond the realm of theory into practice when he and Ferdinand Hackradt purchased a large plot of land in the Itajaí-Açu valley in Santa Catarina, the province just north of Rio Grande do Sul. In 1850, the first settlers began arriving, and the result was the settlement of Blumenau.\footnote{140 André Fabiano Voigt, Cartas Reveladas: A troca de correspondências entre Hermann Blumenau e Johann Jacob Sturz (Blumenau, SC: Cultura em Movimento, 2004), 18–20.}

In Blumenau’s vision of German colonialism, it was essential that German emigrants end up in a purely German colony, which he believed was the best means to assure their safety, happiness, and cultural purity. It was the duty of the German government to guide emigrants all along “their thorny path,” protecting them from abuses and exploitation until they arrive in a German colony where “they soon achieve prosperity, domestic happiness, and finally, preserve unmixed their nationality, their German customs and language.”\footnote{141 Hermann Blumenau, Deutsche Auswanderung und Colonisation (Leipzig: Verlag der J.C. Hinrichs’schen Buchhandlung, 1846), 2.} Blumenau argued that the well-being of the settlers related directly to the capacity of Germans to keep their cultural connection to the Fatherland, and asserted that these issues were more important even than that of future trade with Germany when determining where emigrants should be settled. The
preservation of settlers’ language and customs, he reasoned, would naturally help fuel strong economic connections between the colony and Germany.\textsuperscript{142}

Based on these criteria, settlement in the United States was not the solution to the emigration question for Blumenau. He believed that once arriving in the U.S., or Texas for that matter, settlers lost their connection to Germany: “[T]he Germans will be lost to the Fatherland in Texas, just as in North America, and in the interest of Germany, one can only wish that future emigrants shall not turn either to Texas or the United States.”\textsuperscript{143} Blumenau rejected calls by some for Germany’s creating a colony in the U.S., asserting that the Germans already there were assimilated to the degree that, despite their massive numbers, they generated no political advantage for Germany. Germany must learn the lesson from German settlement in the U.S. by creating a colony where settlers could keep their language and customs, and thereby offer advantages for the Fatherland.\textsuperscript{144}

Concerning where Germany should form a colony, the need for the preservation of Germanness was central to Blumenau’s plan. He argued that the piece of land secured for settlement should be between 300 and 500 square miles, outside of any other European power’s sphere of influence, and sparsely populated so as to assure the totally German nature of the colony, as well as prevent armed conflict with another European country.\textsuperscript{145} Blumenau rejected the idea that tropical climates were inherently harmful to northern Europeans, although he did acknowledge that such regions did offer more environmental dangers, such as diseases and insects, than other climes.\textsuperscript{146} With that in

\textsuperscript{142} Ibid., 7–8.
\textsuperscript{143} Ibid., 4.
\textsuperscript{144} Ibid., 14.
\textsuperscript{145} Ibid., 16–17.
\textsuperscript{146} Ibid., 11.
mind he supported German settlement in the more temperate regions of the Americas, especially in Uruguay and Southern Brazil.\textsuperscript{147}

In referencing why these regions were better suited than much of the U.S., Blumenau focused on the potential for German settlers to remain unmixed with non-Germans, thereby maintaining their \textit{Deutschum}. He wrote that if the German government secured guarantees for the rights of settlers in Uruguay and create strong commercial ties with the country, large numbers of settlers could be sent there. If this was the case, then the German community there “would not fail, and in a few decades, Uruguay could be Germanized and, finally, the German element could secure a strong point overseas and in this place, all German emigrants could congregate.”\textsuperscript{148}

Concerning Southern Brazil, Blumenau cited the already several thousand Germans living in Rio Grande do Sul as a key reason for greater settlement in the area, along with the favorable climate and availability of land. Though, in 1846, Blumenau was still uneasy about Brazil’s restrictions on the rights of Protestants.\textsuperscript{149} However, following his immigration to the colony in Santa Catarina bearing his name, Blumenau expressed less concern regarding religious discrimination in the region, stressing instead settlers’ maintaining the German language and practices. In doing so, he emphasized this point by comparing the purity of colonists’ Germanness in Southern Brazil with that of the assimilated settlers in the U.S.: “German language, customs, and culture are also multiplying themselves in Southern Brazil, German action and perseverance are

\textsuperscript{147} Ibid., 54–59.
\textsuperscript{148} Ibid., 55–56.
\textsuperscript{149} Ibid., 56–58. The Brazilian Empire was an officially Catholic state, and Brazil did not fully recognize Protestant marriages until 1881. See Oliveira, “Colonização alemã e cidadania,” 90–1.
achieving their reward…and are able to bear witness to their usefulness, goodness, and
greatness.” Furthermore the settlers’ success demonstrated how German characteristics
were flourishing in the region, instead of in the U.S. where immigrants underwent the
“forcible education of Yankeedum.”

Thus, in the eyes of early German pro-colonial thinkers, Latin America, and
Brazil especially, represented a uniquely well-suited place for German settlement. In
terms of economics, there was little domestic manufacturing in the region, hence German
producers would find markets there. Additionally, Latin America could export
considerable agricultural products to Germany. Culturally speaking, Germans believed
that the predominant population in Latin America was less able to assimilate settlers than
the Anglo-Saxons of the United States. Furthermore, Latin America’s large tracts of
unpopulated land meant that German settlements could be isolated from the non-German
populace, thereby further assuring the preservation of colonists’ Germanness. As will be
discussed in later chapters, these two categories were central to later discussions of the
German community in Brazil, both among European- and Brazilian-German writers.

Besides the economic and cultural arguments for colonies, both of which made
Latin America seem the logical place for German settlement to many thinkers, there was
also a transformative aspect to early German pro-colonial thought, wherein Germans had
a role to play in bringing civilization to the uncultured parts of the world. As subsequent
chapters will illustrate, this “civilizing mission” later merged with discourses of
Brazilian-Germans’ allegedly pure Deutschtum, making settlers’ success in Brazil
reflective of their nature as Germans. Furthermore, the alleged incapacity of non-
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German-Brazilians to advance the country further emphasized the ethnically-specific nature of German accomplishment in the country. Work and its relationship to slavery formed the foundation of this discourse.

In addition to touting the economic advantages of Latin America, Friedrich List saw German colonization of tropical areas as having a civilizing element as well. He believed that the nature of the people and governments of tropical countries would help spur European settlement there; he saw the local populations as immoral and unsuited to raise their countries’ level of development, and at some point the political leaders would realize that they needed Europeans to overcome their own weaknesses: “These countries, without proper moral strength of their own to raise themselves to a higher position of culture, to introduce well-ordered government, and to impart stability, will increasingly come to the conclusion that they must have help from outside the country, specifically through immigration.”\textsuperscript{151} Hence, the idea of civilizing was part of List’s concept of colonialism, although he related the bringing of civilization to economic development and trade.

Robert von Mohl called on Germans to assume their rightful place among the civilizing European races. He wrote that Germans were called to spread their unique culture to the world, thereby further justifying his call for concentrated settlement overseas: “We as a people \textit{[Volk]} do not fulfill our mission if we do not involve ourselves in the blossoming expansion currently underway of European civilization and nationality, and transplanting our national manner to the other parts of the world.” The specific character of the Germans was just as suited as that of other European groups for

\textsuperscript{151} List, \textit{Das nationale System}, 1:582.
spreading across the globe, and Mohl referred to this as having “world-historical” implications.\(^{152}\) As already mentioned, Mohl did not believe that Latin America was the proper site for German colonization, but the presence of a German civilizing mission in his thinking in terms of colonies is undeniable.

This notion of Germans’ having a special role in civilizing the globe, one based in their nationally-specific character, took on a unique character in discourses of Brazil. The physical wildness of the country, with its jungles and lack of basic infrastructure, made Brazil the quintessential untamed space, thereby making German settlers’ success in the region one not only over hardship, but over uncivilized Nature itself. Additionally, presentations of Portuguese-Brazilians emphasized their incapacity to bring order, due in large part to the allegedly degenerate work ethic that dependence on slavery produced in them. This helped further foreground German-Brazilian efforts. Moreover, claims concerning Germans and slavery, both through denials of slave-holding and through stories regarding the effects of Germans on slaves, further underscored the role of Germans as civilizers. The upcoming chapters are an exploration of these civilizing claims. As will be discussed, German nationalist discussions of Southern Brazil on both sides of the Atlantic presented settlers as the singularly German solution to a country rendered so indolent and demoralized through slavery that it was unable to save itself without help from outside.

\(^{152}\) Mohl, “Ueber Auswanderung,” 325.
Chapter II
Paragons of Purity and Progress:
Images of Germans in Southern Brazil

This chapter examines how German nationalists in Europe and Brazil used positive presentations of German settlers to present the colonists as the vanguard of civilization and order in Brazil. As will be discussed in Chapter III, Germanophone authors presented the Portuguese-Brazilians as incompetent, lazy, and totally ill suited to develop their own country, in large part due to their dependence on slavery. The image of the German settlers was radically different. German nationalists on both sides of the Atlantic emphasized the singularly German character of the settlers. This image of a community of “purest” Germanness was foundational in constructing an ethnically specific civilizing mission for the settlers. This chapter focuses on that civilizing mission in Southern Brazil. How did perceptions of Germanness in the region define the alleged mission of settlers? How did representations of settlers construct it? What purpose did such claims serve in the European and Southern Brazilian context? These are the questions this chapter will address. This discussion of Germans as civilizers will further provide the context for the exploration of settlers and slavery addressed in Chapter IV.

This chapter opens with a discussion of discourses of assimilation and their relation to claims regarding the settler community’s Deutschum. An exploration of the German civilizing mission generally and in Southern Brazil specifically then demonstrates how the notion of work made the German “cultural-historical task” in the
region unique when compared with later views of the German colonial mission overseas. Discussions of settlers transforming both the land and the Portuguese-Brazilians themselves reveal how German-language authors locally and transnationally demonstrated the settlers’ civilizing effects, even relating settlers to the early abolition of slavery in Rio Grande do Sul. Lastly, this chapter looks at how these discourses of civilizing served distinct purposes on both sides of the Atlantic.

**The Question of Assimilation and Germanness**

Mass German emigration during the 1830s and beyond created intense anxiety among nationalist thinkers, who feared that emigrants would be lost to German People once they left the German states. Assimilation, both economic and cultural, allegedly led the millions heading overseas to forget their connection to their homeland, prompting them to buy non-German goods and accept non-German linguistic and cultural practices; while every nation receiving Germans benefitted, Germany only grew weaker in the exchange. The United States was especially reviled in this regard, as the alleged Anglo-Saxon capacity to assimilate proved too much for the millions of German immigrants there to overcome. Many European-Germans believed that Latins lacked such a capacity to absorb Germans culturally, and therefore Latin America appeared as a destination where German immigrants could maintain their ties to the Fatherland. Brazil became especially renown as a zone wherein Germans remained “German.”

With few exceptions, scholarship demonstrating this concern regarding assimilation focuses mainly on thought within Europe.\(^1\) While European-Germans were
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\(^1\) For an examination of Germanness and integration in the United States, see Alison Clark Efford, *German Immigrants, Race, and Citizenship in the Civil War Era*
clearly concerned, were German settlers anxious concerning their Germanness? If so, how did they express such concerns, and how did this relate to the local conditions in which they lived? This section addresses these questions for the Southern Brazilian context, demonstrating how Brazilian-German nationalists saw the preservation of *Deutschtum* as essential, regularly emphasizing the Germanness of the settler community. Additionally, Brazilian-Germans, like their European counterparts, made frequent reference to the loss of Germanness in the United States, but in this case to underscore how “German” settlers in Southern Brazil remained. This emphasis on colonists’ ethnicity helped construct an ethnically specific, superlatively German civilizing mission. Furthermore, as will be discussed later, these claims related to local conditions, constituting a foundational part of settlers’ demands for full political and social integration in their new homeland. In this way, settlers’ “Germanness” became a means by which to demand recognition of their “Brazilianess”.

That an immigrant group integrating into Brazilian society should retain identification from its region of origin is unsurprising. As Jeff Lesser writes in his study of Japanese immigration to Brazil, “[a]ssimilation (in which a person’s premigratory culture disappears entirely) was a rare phenomenon while acculturation (the modification of one culture as the result of contact with another) was common… hyphenated Brazilians incorporated many elements of majority culture even when they endured as distinct.”² Examining immigration worldwide, Thomas Faist, Margit Fauser, and Eveline
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Reisenauer refer to immigrants as “translated people,” constantly interpreting and adapting “languages, cultures, norms and social and symbolic ties,” defined by and defining both their origin and their destination.\textsuperscript{3} In looking especially at German immigration, Dirk Hoerder refers this condition as “transculturalism,” emphasizing the break with older scholarly visions of immigration that focused on single nationalities, seeing immigrants’ identification as solely defined by the country of destination: “Rather than losing one national identity,” writes Hoerder, “most migrants gain transcultural competence.”\textsuperscript{4} Through their concern and claims regarding the community’s Germanness, German-Brazilian nationalists in Southern Brazil exhibited just such transculturalism.

Turning to the scholarship regarding European-German concerns regarding assimilation, as mentioned in Chapter I, Matthew Fitzpatrick cites five pro-colonial tropes in German liberal imperialist discourse: Economic, wherein colonies would help deal with German overproduction and capture markets; demographic, as colonies could allow the maintenance of emigrants’ economic and cultural ties to Germany; sociopolitical, by which colonies could help maintain order by draining off the growing number of radicalized workers and disenfranchised; moral, allowing for Germans to
spread civilization; and nationalist, by which Germany could build a strong fleet, achieving unity in Europe and power internationally.\(^5\)

Fitzpatrick’s second trope, “demographic,” expresses the European-German concern regarding emigrants’ assimilation, although Friedrich List’s pro-colonial stance, discussed in Chapter I, consolidated all of these tropes.\(^6\) In looking at the Germanness of communities overseas, European-German nationalists found conditions in the United States to be most disheartening; no longer speaking German, buying American and British goods, and adopting crass American materialism, Germans in the U.S. appeared totally lost both to Germany and the *Deutsche Volk*.\(^7\) The U.S., referred to as a “mass grave of Germanness,” was so allegedly adept at assimilating that some Wilhelmine nationalists feared that American ways would seep even into Europe and beyond.\(^8\)

For example, In his 1846 book, *German Emigration and Colonization*, Hermann Blumenau, who would later found a colony bearing his name in Brazil, addressed how Germany could best deal with mass emigration through a policy of driving emigrants to places wherein their future labor would help grow German industries and increase German influence. Blumenau argues the first and foremost concern should be immigrant safety, but after that, maintaining settlers’ cultural-linguistic and economic connections to Germany should be second. Blumenau relates preserving these links to increasing
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Germany’s trade and international power, since settlers who remained “German” would also remain loyal in their preferences to their former country, and could thereby influence the political and economic direction of their new country toward a course that benefits Germany.  

In discussing how best to create a future settlement policy in Germany, Blumenau cites the U.S. as an example not to be emulated: “The sad fact of current conditions in North America, that the German population, despite its large number, not only acquired no political standing and is lost to the motherland, but is also in danger of losing language and customs, should not be repeated in another country.”

In discussing Germans in the United States, Robert von Mohl believed that they were not only lost to Germany, but even came to despise their former fatherland. Mohl writes that despite making up close to 1/8th of the free population in the U.S. and their representing the majority of some regions’ populations, Germans in America do not retain or spread German culture, and even those areas where the German language is retained, “these have but little effect on the whole intellectual physiognomy of the country.” Instead, English customs and language remain dominant in law, literature, and in common practice. Furthermore, Mohl accuses the Germans in the U.S. of abandoning their cultural-linguistic heritage as quickly as possible. “The Germans rush to reshape themselves,” he writes, and many immigrants see losing their German language and customs as “a point of pride.” In fact, he believes that many immigrants come to hate Germany just as “freed slaves” hate their former masters.
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Thus, it is clear that European-Germans were concerned with the capacity of immigrants abroad, and especially in the U.S., to maintain their connections with Germany. This concern existed both prior to unification and throughout the Wilhelmine Empire; Bradley Naranch demonstrates how in the 1850s, middle-class periodicals began referring to emigrants as “Germans overseas” (Auslandsdeutsche) instead of “emigrants” (Auswanderer), and Sebastian Conrad notes that during the German Empire, calls grew to settle Germans where they would not assimilate, such as Latin America and the Eastern Mediterranean.¹²

However, previous studies regarding settlers in Southern Brazil and Deutschtum either address the topic from a single geographic perspective (Germany or Brazil) or from a temporal perspective defined by the rise of Germany as a formal colonial power (post-1885), thereby leaving decades of German settlement in Brazil unaddressed. Sebastian Conrad devotes a chapter of his study, Globalisation and the Nation in Imperial Germany, to Brazil and its development as a space of alleged German national regeneration¹³; settlers in the wilderness spoke German, created German clubs and societies, and reconnected with their nature as farmers. European-Germans, he writes, saw the community in South America, and Brazil especially, as “capable not merely of preventing Germanness ‘being assimilated by’ (aufgehen in) the majority society, but even of recreating Germanness itself.”¹⁴ However, while going into great detail regarding Brazil and European-German nationalists, Conrad’s book does not discuss how settlers

¹³ Conrad, Globalisation and the Nation, 275–333.
¹⁴ Ibid., 324.
saw Germanness. His work, while revealing the connection between Europe and Brazil, looks at Brazil only from a European perspective.

Giralda Seyferth examines the formation of German-Brazilian ethnicity and its relationship to settlers’ integration. She argues that in the early decades of German settlement, colonies’ isolation and lack of services from the Brazilian government helped spur ethnic-based social, religious, and educational organizations; without interaction from outside the community, the settlers turned inward to meet local needs. However, it was not until the 1860s, when a bilingual, literate, and urban class of intellectuals and journalists began asserting the community’s status as simultaneously German and Brazilian. As Germany’s foreign policy grew increasingly expansionist in the early twentieth century, Portuguese-Brazilians began to doubt German-Brazilians’ political loyalty, and politicians called for greater efforts to assimilate the German-Brazilian community. While Seyferth’s exploration of the connection between integration and Germanness is revealing, her study does not acknowledge the transatlantic nature of alleged German national characteristics; its focus is solely local.

---

15 The same can be said for his other works, such as Conrad, “Globalization Effects”; Conrad, “Wilhelmine Nationalism.”
Stefan Manz’s important contribution regarding German settlement throughout the world during the Kaiserreich moves past the geographic-based limits that mark Conrad’s and Seyferth’s studies, creating a consciously transnational view of Germanness overseas. Manz looks at how assorted immigrant communities, including those in Southern Brazil, interacted with Germany. He uses naval agitation, Protestantism, and German-language schools overseas to demonstrate how the “German diaspora” was heterogeneous in terms of its relations with the Fatherland and in the ways in which immigrants negotiated their national identification. Manz’s contribution is significant, as it bridges the Europe-overseas divide, but his temporal focus in discussing Southern Brazil is mainly during the Old Republic (post-1889), and thus does not address how colonists during the first six decades of German settlement negotiated their ethnic identification.

Between the 1860s and the end of the Brazilian Empire in 1889, Brazilian-German sources emphasized the purity of settlers’ Germanness and called for maintaining the community’s linguistic and cultural connection to Germany. Brazilian-German nationalists often underscored Southern Brazil’s status as a zone of Germanness through comparisons with the U.S., which they, like their European counterparts, claimed assimilated German immigrants. In a two-part Deutsche Zeitung article in 1864, “Regarding the German Emigration Question,” the author contrasts the Germanness of settlers in Southern Brazil with that in the United States. According to the piece, Germans in the U.S. assimilate quickly, even in regions wherein the German population is sizeable: “in North America, even in Ohio, Wisconsin, Minnesota, wherein it amounts to 33% or
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greater of the total population, it rapidly Americanizes and has mixed with the Anglo-Saxon race.” As will be discussed, the article arrives at a very different conclusion regarding Germanness in Southern Brazil.

Brazilian-German nationalists also proselytized the gospel of Southern Brazil’s Germanness, demonstrated through comparison with that of settlers in the United States, in Germany. In an 1871 petition to the Reichstag from a group of German-Brazilians in Rio Grande do Sul, the signatories make use of claims regarding the speed at which Germans in the United States assimilate so as to call for an end to Prussian laws acting to limit the influence of Brazilian agents in Germany. According to the petition, it was in the best interests of Germany to increase ties with regions where Germans maintained their cultural, linguistic, and economic connection to the fatherland. The United States was the opposite of such a region, since there (and Australia), “the immigrant element quickly merges with the kindred Anglo-Saxon race, is estranged from the fatherland, consumes foreign industry, and naturally joins foreign interests.” In a lecture given to the Central Society for Economic Geography in Berlin, A.W. Sellin praised the Germanness of settlers in Rio Grande do Sul. Furthermore, he assured the attendees that, unlike in the U.S. and Australia, where the majority was “ethnically and linguistically similar” to the Germans and thereby absorbed them quickly, this would never happen in Brazil, wherein the Portuguese-Brazilians hold the German language in high regard.

Thus, on both sides of the Atlantic, German nationalists presented the United States as hazardous for immigrants’ Deutschum, leading to their alienation from the
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German Nation. As will be seen in greater detail below, Brazilian-Germans utilized this presentation to foreground the purity of settlers’ Germanness.

**Southern Brazil and Germanness**

In explaining why Germans in Brazil could maintain their *Deutschtum* while those living among Anglo-Saxons could not, German thinkers asserted that Latin groups did not possess the same power to assimilate. Hans Fenske notes that within Germany, many believed “that the supposedly ‘softer’ Hispano-Americans did not have the same strong power of assimilation as the Anglo-Saxons, so that here [Latin America] the preservation of Germanness was easier than in the north.”

Such thinking translated into action, with individuals and organizations acting to promote German settlement in Latin America. Hermann Blumenau’s establishing a colony in Santa Catarina, Brazil, has already been discussed. Within Germany, a combination of trade interests and colonial activists, led by Alexander von Bülow, formed the Berlin Association for the Centralization of German Emigration and Colonization (*Berliner Verein zur Zentralisation deutscher Auswanderung und Kolonisation*) in 1849. In 1852, the *Verein* changed its name to the Berlin Central Association for German Emigration- and Colonization Affairs (*Berliner Centralverein für die deutsche Auswanderungs- und Colonisationsangelegenheit*). However, its founding principles remained the same: that Germans should settle where they could maintain their economic and cultural connections to the Fatherland. In the eyes of the Association, Latin America, and Central America especially, with its weaker states, was
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the best region in this regard. The Association proved quite powerful for several years, with close relations with the Prussian state, thanks to connection with officials such as the Minister of the Interior, Otto von Manteuffel, and Minister of Trade, August von der Heydt. Prussian consuls in Europe and overseas even had to provide statistical reports to the Central Association. Throughout its existence, the Association was an educational organization, funding presentations and pamphlets on the importance of creating German colonies overseas, but it also took part in the actual establishment of colonies. In 1853, 100 German families arrived in Costa Rica at the settlement of Angostura, created by Alexander von Bülow. The experiment proved short-lived, but reflected the general tenor of the Central Association’s view of settlement in Latin America: that Germans in the region would not assimilate to the local culture and thereby keep their connection to Germany.23

While German nationalists asserted various locations within Latin America as ideal for German settlement, Southern Brazil, and the Germans setters there, came to represent something unique in the German nationalist imaginary. However, previous studies of how Brazil “assumed a metonymic presence and implicitly evoked the promises of authenticity, simplicity, and national reawakening,” and how settlers became renowned for their maintenance of German language and customs, focused on the period of rising radical nationalism in Germany, post-1880.24 Looking at the transatlantic
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German-language public sphere, it is clear that such presentations existed on both sides of the Atlantic and began well before the founding of the Kaiserreich, much less the rise of colonial agitation of the 1880s. Through emphasis on the Germanness of the community in Southern Brazil, European- and Brazilian-German nationalists constructed a discursive context whereby later claims regarding settlers’ success and civilizing efforts became ethnically specific: Success and development by settlers became reflections of their Germanness.

Assertions concerning settlers’ Germanness began as early as the 1850s. Following the creation of the colony of Blumenau in 1850, Hermann Blumenau became a vocal supporter of increasing immigration to the region. In 1855, he published German Colony Blumenau in the German states, in which promoted the settlement as a destination for emigrants. Blumenau writes that settlers in his colony enjoy a prosperous and happy existence. A large part of this related to the social conditions in the colony, which Blumenau stressed allowed Germans to keep their Deutschtum: “German language, customs, and education are maintained in southern Brazil,” he writes, and the German settlers in the region are illustrating the nature as a people through their “German activity and diligence.” Blumenau contrasts this with the situation of the Germans in North America, whom he laments face the “forced education of Yankeedum,” as opposed to the settlers of Southern Brazil, who flourish without falling prey to American assimilation.”

In his discussion of the settlers of São Leopoldo, Johann Jakob von Tschudi is struck by how well they retain their cultural and linguistic connection to Germany. “Without having to idealize,” Tschudi writes, “one can say that the Germans in São

25 Blumenau, Deutsche Kolonie Blumenau, 17.
Leopoldo are generally a strong, beautiful race.” However, “they are far more than this,” Tschudi believes, because they are brilliant reflections of Germanness of the best aspects of Germanness. “They have preserved their German customs and traditions, but for the most part stripped of the servility” which Tschudi sees marking Germans in Europe. Furthermore, Tschudi observes, the residents of São Leopoldo continue to speak German through several generations. In fact, while many settlers, both young and old, speak Portuguese, but only when dealing with their non-German neighbors: “among themselves, they always communicate in German.” Tschudi even believes that, based on “the large expansion of the settlement and the steady spread of the eccentric German element” throughout neighboring areas, the German settlers will retain their language despite their status as a linguistic minority contra the non-German population of the province.26

In his sizeable introduction to the geography, economy, society, and history of Brazil, Brazil: Land and People, Oskar Canstatt also remarked regarding the purity of Brazilian-Germans’ Deutschtum. In visiting São Leopoldo, Canstatt is surprised by how well the settlers in the town have held onto to their language and customs. “Although many [Portuguese] Brazilians live in this small town, they [Brazilians] completely disappear compared to the Germans, and they cannot escape the influence of the [German] majority.” Canstatt expresses his pleasure at how, “contrary to the experience of other countries and parts of the world, the Germans here hold stubbornly onto the customs and language of their homeland.”27 Assessing the region’s German community

27 Canstatt, Brasilen, 416.
on the whole, Canstatt is effusive in his praise. Recognizing that some discussions of settlements in Southern Brazil erroneously present the lives of colonists as easy, Canstatt still asserts that “it can not be denied that a sizeable new Germany has been built with German customs and language, inspiring awe on the Southern American continent, which anyone who comes to know must wish the greatest success.”

Regarding the German community in Southern Brazil, Hugo Zöller believed that its Germanness was exceptional when compared to any other zone of large-scale German settlement. He recognizes that all is not perfect in Brazil, but still asserts that “it is better there than elsewhere, better than I found anywhere else overseas.” Zöller writes that his reader might wonder why he has devoted so many pages to what might appear as little more than a small spot on the map of South America. The nature of the German settlement in Southern Brazil is the reason:

“The fact that on a foreign continent, in the most unfamiliar of conditions and in the midst of a foreign population, a vigorous branch of German industriousness and German culture has developed there from the poorest elements of German emigration, and is not simply vegetating, but its lush shoots are spreading. This fact is so unique, so unheard of elsewhere in the world, that it is worthy of our special attention.”

With the development the German-language press in Southern Brazil in the 1860s, German-Brazilian voices joined the chorus praising the strength and quality of settler’s Deutschtum. In 1864, the Deutsche Zeitung published a three-part article; The German Population in the Province, wherein it asserted that Southern Brazilian Germanness was more robust than anywhere outside of Europe. The author writes that

28 Ibid., 435.
the region is unique when compared to other zones of German settlement, since unlike elsewhere, the Germans are the primary immigrant population to the region. “Here,” the author claims, “the German element is the one that absolutely prevails in immigration.” As opposed to in the United States and the former Spanish possessions, such as Argentina, this has helped the Germans of Southern Brazil retain their German spirit and culture: “The only part of the world where Germanness has emerged free and unfettered, where it is not absorbed, and even does not feature any foreign, disruptive element- is Southern Brazil.”

In “Regarding the German Emigration Question,” also published in 1864 and already discussed above in terms of the article’s portrayal of German assimilation in the U.S., the author claims that while immigrants there rapidly Americanize, settlers in Brazil retain the Germanness: “the German nationality in our province has remained unmixed for 39 years.” Furthermore, when coexisting with the Brazilian-Portuguese national character, the German community will become more prosperous and powerful. For these reasons, the author asserts that Rio Grande do Sul must be the focal point of all German settlement in Brazil.

In an 1878 article discussing the status of German settlers in Rio Grande do Sul, the Deutsche Zeitung again emphasized the purity of colonists’ Germanness. In “The German Element,” the author writes that in the province, “a young Germany is emerging,” with settlers expanding their influence into the interior of the province from the central points of São Leopoldo and Santa Cruz. The author stresses that not only are
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the newest immigrants retaining their Germanness, but also those settlers who were born in Brazil: “First and foremost, we must begin by saying that not only is the immigrant part of the German element, but also not just in the first, but in the second, third, and forth generation.” Regarding the character of this resiliently “German” element, the author makes his point clear: “The principal point is that the decedents of the Germans in the second and third generation have preserved the language and customs of their fathers.”

Thus, both European- and Brazilian-German nationalists portrayed the settler community in Southern Brazil as speaking and “acting” German in an exceptional way, especially when compared to Germans in the U.S. By stressing the Germanness of the settlers, while simultaneously emphasizing the indolence and incompetence of Portuguese-Brazilians as will be discussed in Chapter III, Germanophone authors placed discussions of colonists’ accomplishments in a specifically ethnic context: Civilizing Brazil came to be one of the leading examples of the colonists “acting German.” As will be discussed later, these assertions of Germanness and its civilizing capacity served different purposes in the European and Brazilian local context, but nevertheless, discussions of settlers’ Deutschtum began earlier than the Kaiserreich and should be seen as transatlantic phenomena, forming the foundation of a specifically German mission to civilize Brazil.

**The German Civilizing Mission in General**

In discussing the role of Germans in the world at large, many European-German nationalists believed German immigrants held a unique destiny to reshape the world for
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the better. Such thinkers often related mass German emigration to the civilizing potential of the German People, while others saw the alleged impact of Germans in Europe as evidence of their civilizing capacity.

Robert von Mohl associated the spreading of Germans over the planet through immigration with a larger, more grandiose task of the German people, that of helping civilize the earth: “We do not fulfill our task as a people if we do not also then bring ourselves into the currently ongoing conceived expansion of European civilization and nationality over the other parts of the world to transplant our national type.” The Germans should, Mohl writes, join the other “civilized nations,” such as the Anglo-Saxons, French, Celts, and Iberian nations in bringing their culture and expanding their control. Mohl also argues a prosaic point, that “even for those who have no sense of such world-historical considerations,” German settlements overseas would drive industrial expansion in Germany through trade.34

Johann Jakob Sturz also believed that the German people were specially suited to disseminate culture and civilization. Sturz argues that one need look no further than Europe itself for the evidence, asserting that “Northern Europe owes [its development] mainly to the German spirit, by which it [the region] possesses skillful diligence, and through it stands mightily on the Earth.” German military leaders and statesmen have made Northern Europe powerful, while German manufacturers made the region wealthy. The same was true of North America, where Germans represent the core of the American industrial and productive sectors. Unfortunately, Sturz writes, Germany gained nothing through the exceptional influence of the Germans in both Europe and the U.S. Germans

made other nations powerful, but never their own: “It seems that the German is intended to spread Germanic culture widely across the Earth, but without remuneration for the homeland, without gratitude, even to its detriment.” For this reason, Germans should settle where they would maintain their connection to the Fatherland, such as Southern Brazil.\footnote{Sturz, \textit{Soll und Kann Deutschland}, 20–1.}

Karl Arndt echoed such sentiments. Arndt was a German nationalist and leading free-trade economist, having observed the Frankfurt Parliament as a guest of John Prince-Smith, one of the foremost voices for free trade in the German states. In addressing German colonies and their connection to a German cultural mission, Arnd related them to the larger movement among European nations to spread civilization. He writes that we must “[c]onsider the superiority which the Christian peoples of Europe by virtue of their higher culture, enjoy over all the other peoples of the world.” Arnd praises the positive impact of European expansion, but decries the fact that, despite Germans’ central role in the establishment and expansion of European culture, Germany has little to show for it. “For the most part, it was German science and German ingenuity on which modern European civilization is built. It was in large part the work undertaken of German expeditions that made foreign countries known to the Christian world. It was in large part German productive activity and German trade that carried such success. Finally, it was mainly German emigrants who cultivated and populated many uninhabited regions of foreign parts of the world.” However, despite all of this, Germany remained weak internationally and divided domestically.\footnote{Karl Arnd, \textit{Gedanken über die Fortbildung des Deutschen Bundes} (Frankfurt am Main: H.L. Brönner, 1860), 40–1.}
Arnd called on the Germans to end their work for other nations and instead turn their energies toward helping their country and meeting what he calls Germans’ “world historical calling.” In this capacity, Germans were “apostles of civilization and cultured behavior,” acting to bring morality, rationality, and development to the unsettled parts of the world, and “populate them with industrious inhabitants, and thereby transform them to joyous places of many generations of rational living.” Arnd links this to political unification, asserting that only through a strong navy and embassies representing a single German state could this be possible.37

Hence, German nationalists saw the Deutsche Volk as well suited to settle and civilize the world. However, the United States, the largest recipient of Germans, allegedly gained the advantages of German settlement while robbing immigrants of their Deutschtum. Southern Brazil, on the other hand, represented the best of both Germanness and the civilizing effects that Germanness produced.

**German Civilizing Mission: Comparison with Britain and France**

When discussing the civilizing mission, it is necessary to inquire in what ways did the German civilizing mission in Southern Brazil differ from British and French impressions of their colonial role in the world, as well as later German views developed in the formal colonial empire began in the mid-1880s?

The fundamental difference between the alleged German “cultural-historical task” in Southern Brazil and that of the two largest European colonial powers relates to the nature of the target of the respective mission: While the French and British controlled vast non-European populations, the German civilizing mission targeted primarily the
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Portuguese-Brazilians, who, while allegedly incompetent and lazy, were never seen as non-European. Hence, as increasingly racialized visions of inherent difference spread throughout European colonial empires in the latter half of the nineteenth century, Germans on both sides of the Atlantic remained convinced of settlers’ capacity to transform Portuguese-Brazilians.  

This confidence sprung from a strongly ethno-national sense of German superiority. So focused on the Germandness of the settlers, the mission in Southern Brazil more resembled the French vision of the nation’s role in the world than the British, as the British generally believed in spreading European culture and institutions, while France emphasized the specifically French nature of its colonial task.

Concerning the nature of the British civilizing mission, Michael Mann notes that in expressing its task in India, Britain spoke first of “improvement” and later of “moral and material progress,” while the French overseas spoke of the “civilizing mission.” On the whole, British thinkers and politicians were, through the 1850s, skeptical of the idea of “civilizing.” The Scottish Enlightenment notion of a universal progression of cultures from savagery to civilization, moving from hunting/gathering to farming to trade, etc., helped crystallize the notion that while some nations were more advanced, those characteristics that made them so were universal, not national; while Britain was among the most advanced nations, industrialization and trade were not unique to the

38 The relationship between the German mission and Afro-Brazilians will be discussed in Chapter IV.
British, and would spread to others over time. The British preferred more general notions of improvement than the more nationally specific ideas of the French. For example, British Evangelicals argued that Christianity and good governance, the latter supported by secular reformers as well, would act to overcome the Indian tendency toward “Oriental despotism.” The first attorney general of New South Wales in Australia and proponent of aboriginal rights, Saxe Bannister, also advocated the rule of law as the best means to bring Aborigines into the fold of European civilization. Good governance was not seen as singularly British.

This is not to say that the British did not believe in “universal” principles they could apply in the colonies, merely that such principles were perceived less as British than as European. For example, British social theorist and sociologist Harriet Martineau believed that political economy and private property were central means to civilize the non-European world, but she did not see these as specifically British concepts, but rather understood them as universal principles developed in the larger European context. During debates in the late 1850s regarding intervention in China, Lord Palmerston argued that the British should help spread civilization there, by which he meant enforcing free
trade, not a specifically “British” idea.\textsuperscript{44} Karuna Mantena writes that following uprisings in India, New Zealand, Ireland, and Jamaica in the 1850s and 1860s, the British began to question efforts if to introduce Western principles and institutions to non-Europeans would succeed. Instead, British policy moved to “indirect rule,” stressing the maintenance of local institutions and integration of locals into the dynamics of imperial power, but only as a means by which to support British control. This marked a shift in emphasis to the inherent difference of non-Europeans and transformed resistance by natives as rooted in that difference, instead of as justifiable reaction to British rule.\textsuperscript{45}

Unlike the British, however, the French were quite deliberate connecting “civilization” and French culture. While the term “civilizing mission” (mission civilisatrice) first came into usage in the 1840s to express the French intention for Algeria, but unlike the British discussion of “improvement,” which had more a universalist than specifically British connotation, the “civilizing mission” was seen as both universalist and wholly French.\textsuperscript{46} Alice J. Conklin writes that the French mission overseas not only assumed the superiority of French government and technology, but “unparalleled supremacy in the moral, cultural, and social spheres as well.” Conklin writes how the very word “civilization,” developed by French philosophes in the late eighteenth century, were trying not only to express the victory of reason over irrationality not only in government, but in ““the moral, religious, and intellectual spheres as well- a word that would capture the essence of French achievements compared to the uncivilized

\textsuperscript{45} Mantena, Alibis of Empire, 1–21.
world of savages, slaves, and barbarians.” By the beginning of the nineteenth century, French intellectuals believed in a single “civilization” that encompassed most of Europe, but they saw the foundations of this civilization as French. With the French Revolution, French thinkers and politicians saw the spreading of French civilization as a necessity, as higher calling for France, both within Europe and beyond.47

Unlike in British colonial policy wherein assimilation of non-Europeans was not a central tenant, assimilation played a key role in the French notion of spreading civilization through empire, although the scope of such plans contracted over time. William Cohen writes that in Senegal through the mid-nineteenth century, assimilation guided French policy. Intermarriage among white French and locals was common, while Senegalese students learned French and took up positions in administration. In 1830, the Civil Code extended to all free men, while the Senegalese both voted for and served in the local representative body. In 1848, Senegal was even awarded a seat in the National Assembly in Paris.48 Within Algeria, the French government pursued a policy of assimilation, convinced that exposure to French language and law was sufficient means to extend French citizenship to many in the country. However, race religion remained powerful determinants in this regard, with non-French-Europeans and Jews becoming naturalized, but many Algerian Muslims retaining French nationality without citizenship. Furthermore, Algerian Muslims lived under a different code of law, overseen by Muslim

judges.\textsuperscript{49} Nevertheless, in the French assumption regarding civilization, there was an underlying emphasis on the universality of a specifically French type of civilization.\textsuperscript{50}

The German civilizing mission in Southern Brazil demonstrated a strong ethno-national component, wherein the success of the settlers and their calling in the country were related directly to their allegedly unadulterated Germanness. In this way, it was closer to the French concept. However, there were similarities between all three; as British and French colonial thinkers asserted regarding their national colonies elsewhere, German nationalists on both sides of the Atlantic emphasized the German capacity to develop Southern Brazil’s infrastructure and make the untamed wilderness productive. However, while British colonizers emphasized “improvement” and the French “civilization,” the German “cultural-historical task” in Southern Brazil specifically focused on changing the notion of work from dishonorable to praiseworthy; through doing this, settlers allegedly transformed the Portuguese-Brazilians’ national ethos, to the degree that European- and Brazilian-German nationalists argued that settlers were central to the abolition of slavery in Rio Grande do Sul, occurring four years earlier (1884) than in most of the country (1888). Thus, while there similarities between the civilizing mission of other European countries and Germany, the centrality of work in transforming


Brazilian society and Portuguese-Brazilians was exceptional in the Southern Brazilian case.

While the idea of teaching non-Germans to work was present in German Africa, the notion of coercion inherent in the policy of “education to work” (*Erziehung zur Arbeit*) in the African colonies did not exist in the German mission to civilize Portuguese-Brazilians. Instead, German-Brazilians allegedly elevated the Portuguese through their superb example.

Andrew Zimmerman writes that “educating the Negro to work” was central to German colonial administrators’ view of their mission in Africa.\(^{51}\) However, this “education” was often marked by forced labor instead of formal training.\(^{52}\) (Markmiller, “Die Erziehung des Negers”) This was especially the case in German East Africa, although colonial policy varied depending on the period.\(^{53}\) Dominik J. Schaller writes that due to the policy of forced labor, whole regions of the colony became depopulated. Schaller cites an estimate by a missionary in 1913 that in his district, the African population fell by half over a short period of time following the imposition of labor by
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the colonial administration. In German Southwest Africa, missionaries provided instruction to natives on religion and German, among other topics, but hard labor remained a key part of the education program.

While the notion of teaching non-German “natives” (Portuguese-Brazilians) to work was fundamental to the German civilizing mission in Southern-Brazil, settlers would achieve this task with neither violence nor formal mechanisms of education, such as schools. Instead, observing the Germans’ success, efficiency, and morality would transform the Portuguese-Brazilians from indolent and inept dependents on slavery to exemplars of industriousness, skill, and modernity. Hence, the civilizing mission in Southern Brazil differed in important ways not only from the French and British missions to civilize, but also from the German colonial vision for Africa: In Southern Brazil, the power of Deutschtum itself would remake the region and its people.

Civilizing Brazil: Taming the Wilderness

In presentations of Brazilian-Germans as civilizers, colonists transformed the land, taming the wilderness and bringing development in the form of infrastructure, but they also transformed the people, prompting Brazilians to see work as noble and thereby changing their national character. In both cases, intervention by the Germans was a necessity and such changes could not occurred with the settlers.

In discussions of German settlement in Brazil, the image of the German colonist expanding the borders of civilization through conquering the jungle was a common trope.

In his trip through Southern Brazil, Robert Avé-Lallemant frequently stressed how German-Brazilians are entrusted with taking the untamed wilderness of Southern Brazil and making it productive. Referencing the earliest settlement in São Leopoldo, he writes that the first Germans in the area had to clear the forest and battle Amerindians, but through their diligence, the settlers triumphed: “With difficulty they began, but they conquered the soil themselves, and those that were servants in Germany have become, through the right of their own labor, masters.” Later discussing his visit to Novo Hamburgo, to the north of São Leopoldo, Lallemant compares the prospering town with the wilderness he observes from a nearby mountain. Avé-Lallemant marvels at the work the Germans have accomplished: “Where there was silent jungle for miles, or only parrots cried and monkeys howled, there is a now, after difficult struggles, a gleaming, decisive victory, and the brave warriors for themselves and their children and grandchildren won fertile soil and prosperous estates.” Avé-Lallemant later visits several other German settlements further into the interior of the province, and he is astounded at the capacity of the colonists to turn wilderness not only into productive land, but communities that bear the unmistakable mark of Germanness: “And so these pioneers of German breeding, customs, and industriousness work deeper and deeper into the forests, from one hill to another, from one valley to another, from mountain range to mountain range, from stream to stream!”

Friedrich Epp was born near Heidelberg and earned his medical degree there before serving as a doctor in the Dutch West Indies between 1835 and 1848. Epp became
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a prolific author, writing books and articles on assorted topics, including the East Indies, the natural world, and even spiritualism. In 1864, Epp toured the German colonies in Southern Brazil, penning *Rio Grande do Sul, or New Germany*, based on his experiences there.58

As the title indicates, Epp was impressed with what he saw among the German population in the region, specifically in Rio Grande do Sul. Epp presents that settlers in the interior in terms that not only stress their role as civilizers and conquerors of the jungles, but also connect the Germans in Brazil with those in the ancient world: “Like those Germans of old, whose massive blows collapsed the Roman Empire, so they [settlers in the province] too have fought battles and won victory- not with the sword, but with the axe. Before their heavy axe-blows have the giants of the forest fallen.” Here Epp’s presentation of colonists emphasizes their Germanness in two ways, first by associating them with an unbroken chain of Deutschtum stretching from the ancient world into the modern, but secondly by juxtaposing the Germans with the Romans, from whom the Portuguese-Brazilians owe their cultural heritage. In this way, the settlers are paragons of Deutschtum and offer a stark contrast to the their Latin neighbors.

However, Epp emphasizes that the Germans do more than just clear the forest; they transform the wilderness into a place of productivity and civilization. Describing the scene as piles of trees burn, Epp reminds the reader that the destruction is only temporary, as “from their [the burned trees] ashes, sprout the seeds of culture. Where once only the jaguar roared and the sinister Indian fired his deadly projectile in ambush of errant wanderers, there the rooster crows and red-cheeked, blonde children now cavort

in carefree games.” Thus, in Rio Grande do Sul, civilization, culture, and farming is spread through the work of the Germans, one acre at a time. Epp calls on Germans throughout the world to recognize the sacrifice and work of the settlers of Southern Brazil: “Hail, Germania, that thou hast such sons! Even those German offshoots in the far south are your children! Worthy sons of the great, common Fatherland.”

The role of German settlers in making the wilderness productive, in contrast to the Portuguese-Brazilians, was a recurring theme within the German-Brazilian press, as well. In this way, the Brazilian-Germans also emphasized the country’s need for German settlers if it were to advance into a civilized state.

Established in 1867 and publishing until 1877, Der Bote: Amtliches Blatt für St. Leopoldo und die Colonien (referred to from here out as the Bote) became the first voice specifically of the Lutheran community in the Riograndense public sphere. Julius Curtius Filho founded and edited the paper until 1875, and under his leadership, Der Bote came into frequent conflict with the anti-clerical Deutsche Zeitung. However, while questions of religion were a frequent point of contention between the two newspapers, both agreed on issues of German nationality, such as the need to protect Germanness, and on the uniquely constructive role of German settlers in Brazil.

In August 1875, the Bote published an article discussing European-German concerns regarding settlement in Brazil. The piece acknowledges the abuses that immigrants faced on the coffee plantations of São Paulo, as well as many cases of
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unfulfilled promises on the part of the Brazilian government regarding assistance to settlers upon their arrival. However, the article argues that cases of exploitation were far less common than the European-German press and governments believed. Furthermore, the history of German settlement in Brazil was marked by broken promises, but the Germans of Southern Brazil were able to overcome such obstacles and thrive, despite the “best” efforts of the Brazilian administration: “It is only thanks to the tenacity and perseverance of our countrymen [Germans] that now, despite all of the hindrances that were created by the administration of the state, that joyful fields and human homes have risen in the place of wilderness, where once only wild animals resided.”62 The Bote article thereby calls for increased immigration to Southern Brazil, and does so by stressing that without the Germans, the Brazilian wilderness would have remained unproductive and untamed, and that the settlers overcame not only the forest and its wild inhabitants, but the Portuguese-Brazilian government as well.

In February 1882, Koseritz Deutsche Zeitung published an article comparing the part German-Brazilians play in settling the wilderness with that played by the Portuguese-Brazilians. Koseritz’ Deutsche Zeitung was the brainchild of Karl von Koseritz, former editor of the Deutsche Zeitung. In 1882, following a disagreement between Wilhelm Ter Brüggen, the leading financier of the Deutsche Zeitung, Koseritz formed his own newspaper, making it the second secular, liberal Germanophone journal in Porto Alegre.63

62 “Nach Brasilien,” Der Bote, August 21, 1875.
In the February 1882 piece, entitled “Bloodsuckers,” the author asserts that the Germans alone build new municipalities in the Brazilian wilderness: “The German farmer penetrates into the forest with axe and handsaw, where it was previously only accessible by foot by the volatile Indian or deserter or escaped slaves. He [the German farmer] reclaims the land through colossal effort, working with his wife and children, as hard as possible- indeed, it must be done this way so as to move forward at all.” In this first stage of settlement, writes the author, there is not even time to build a school, since the children are too busy clearing the land with their parents. Through this “German industry and German sweat,” the town rises from the ashes of the forest.64

However, once the Germans clear the wilderness and the government hears of the progress, “an army of clerks, municipal officers, crooked lawyers, [and] procurators” descend on the area, exploiting the settlers through state corruption and breeding strife among colonists, “starting the profitable business of the blood sucker.” The author decries this unfortunate reality, since it was the German settler alone who “has wrested the municipality from the virgin wilderness, has made it productive and rewarding. So, he is the true master there.”65

Thus, the image of the German settler as the vanguard of civilization in the Brazilian wilderness was a trope in both European- and Brazilian-German sources. In such discussions, colonists overcame the natural challenges of the Brazilian jungle, taming and ordering the land, as well as making what had, under the Portuguese-Brazilians, been idle land, into productive farms and towns that reflected the civilizing
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nature of the Germans: the Germans alone expanded the boundaries of civilization in Brazil.

**Civilizing Brazil: Building Infrastructure**

When discussing the role of German settlers in developing Brazil’s infrastructure, European- and Brazilian-German authors presented colonists as the single driving force behind such development. As Chapter III will demonstrate, this was in sharp contrast to the image of Portuguese-Brazilians, in which they were totally incapable of building the roads and bridges the country desperately needed.

Wilhelm Stricker was a medical doctor and member of the Geographical Society of Frankfurt am Main with a passion for history and German culture. He published the short-lived “Germania, Archiv zur Kenntniß des deutschen Elements in allen Ländern der Erde,” as well as a history of medicine in Frankfurt. In 1845, he published *The Distribution of the German People Across the Earth*, in which he discussed German communities in Europe and throughout the world, including Brazil. Stefan Manz cites this work as an important early contribution to the movement “to view Germans living abroad as integral parts of the nation.”

In *The Distribution*, Stricker praises the Germans for their moral and cultural strength, through which they advance any country in which they settle. Wherever they settle, Stricker writes, Germans are known by their non-German neighbors for “their honesty, their diligence, their law and order,” and where there are German colonists, it is
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clear that Germans “stand as the true bearers of civilization.”\textsuperscript{68} Stricker’s discussion of the Germans in Brazil reflects this view.

Regarding whether Germans should immigrate to the country, Stricker advises against it. He writes that the tropical climate in most of the country precluded settlement there. This was especially the case in the sugar-growing region, wherein climate and the abuses of colonists in the sharecropping system combined to make the area downright dangerous for Germans.\textsuperscript{69} Stricker believes that at the very highest levels of the Brazilian imperial government, there really is a desire to make the country a welcoming place for Germans. However, these good intentions are “all ruined by a caste of corrupt officials,” the incapacity of the state to monitor local conditions in the vast emptiness of the Brazilian wilderness, and the overall distrust of foreigners that Stricker alleges marks most Brazilians.\textsuperscript{70}

However, in contrast to the corrupt, ineffective, and xenophobic Portuguese-Brazilians, the Germans in Brazil were the leading force helping develop the country, according to Stricker: “By contrast, the Germans are nearly always at the forefront of material improvements.” Stricker cites several provinces wherein Germans head the civil engineering divisions, including in Minas Gerais, wherein Germans recently oversaw the construction of 35 miles of road. At the border between Brazil and the British colony of Guyana, Stricker writes that Germans oversaw the setting of boundaries on both sides of the Amazon: Major von Sewelop, from Hannover, represented the Brazilian Empire,
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while Robert Schomburgk, from Saxony, represented Britain.\textsuperscript{71} Hence, in Stricker’s account, Germans play the central role in bringing order and modern development to the untamed Brazilian wilderness, even in the ultimate act of ordering the jungle, the creation of national borders. The Portuguese-Brazilians, however, not only do little to help, but actually act as an impediment to increasing the settlement of civilizing Germans.

In 1884, the \textit{Gartenlaube} published an article by German engineer Franz Keller-Leuzinger regarding Leuzinger’s experience building a road in Minas Gerais. The piece emphasizes Brazil’s need for Germans, as it presents them as the driving force of progress and development in the country. Leuzinger’s presentation of the Germans as the fonts of civilization in an undeveloped Brazil was a study in competencies: the supremely competent Germans, the utterly incompetent Portuguese-Brazilians, and improvisationally competent Afro-Brazilians.

While Chapter III goes into greater detail regarding Leuzinger’s presentation of Portuguese-Brazilians, it will suffice to say here that he sees them as utterly unable to bring order to the wilderness in their own country. For example, the Portuguese-Brazilians, Leuzinger writes, were extremely proud of a road they built, the quality of which leaves Leuzinger singularly unimpressed.\textsuperscript{72} Furthermore, the Portuguese-Brazilians must bring in European engineers.\textsuperscript{73}

In his discussion of the Afro-Brazilian workers, who carry the equipment and clear the forest, Leuzinger is more impressed. On their way into the interior to reach the
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road the Germans are to oversee building, the party comes across a rockslide that created a wide gap in the road. Since the road was narrow and high above a river, the gap had to bridged in order for the party to proceed. Leuzinger is at a loss at what to do, but then a group of Afro-Brazilian porters build a makeshift bridge out of cowhides. The group successfully crosses the breach, and just in time, as a downpour breaks that would have washed the bridge away. Leuzinger is quite impressed, writing that “[n]o professor of physics could have done the job… to create a viable passage, to solve [the problem] any better, than these brown boys did.”

However, while the Afro-Brazilians impressed Leuzinger with their improvisational skills, it remained clear that the Germans and the Germans alone were the group bringing order to the wilderness. Leuzinger emphasizes the painstaking effort necessary to design roads in the Brazilian jungles, since “somehow, comprehensive topographical maps are entirely absent.” So, the Germans have to make their own topographical maps by painstakingly considering landmarks, making drawings, estimating heights of hills, etc. before deciding which direction the small portion of road will take. “Only after that, when he is as sure as possible, without fear of creating wasted effort, can the actual measuring with the theodolite (altimeter) and leveling instrument proceed.” Leuzinger grants that all of this work is rewarding, but stresses that “the physical and mental effort is not at all small.”

Here the Germans are moving beyond what Mary Louise Pratt called the “rhetoric of presence,” wherein viewing and description by European travellers simultaneously expressed the importance of discovering the new territory while also expressing the need for European intervention

there. Instead, the Germans are, through their singular technical skill, intervening directly in the literally uncharted terrain, thereby taming and civilizing the Brazilian wilderness.

To emphasize the dissimilarity between the work of the Germans and that of the Afro-Brazilians, Leuzinger stresses the supervisory role the Germans play in directing the clearing of the forest: “According to our instructions, a working crew of 20-30 men, Negros and Mestizos, accompanied us with axes and machetes to clear the forest and allow a better view in the desired direction.” Hence, the forest is cleared by Afro-Brazilian hands, but according to the orders of the Germans. In this way, Germans are making not only the land productive (a road would spur trade, etc.), but also making the Afro-Brazilians and their axes, which would have been mismanaged or left unused by the incompetent Portuguese-Brazilians, active parts, though not partners, in the civilizing process.

Leuzinger’s note regarding the dangerous working conditions underscores the subservient role of the Afro-Brazilians in that process: “With difficulty we climb along the steep slope, fearing at every stop [that] the brown fellow (braune Bursche) who carries our instruments will lose his balance and fall headlong into the abyss.” It is unclear whether Leuzinger’s concern is for the equipment, Afro-Brazilian, or both, but by placing the “brown fellow” in the context of a carrier of equipment, Leuzinger emphasizes to the reader that whatever intelligence and creativity the Afro-Brazilians had, theirs was not the capacity of the Germans, since the Germans alone used the
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instruments that brought order to the wilderness. Hence, the Portuguese- and Afro-Brazilians could civilize their country, but there Germans most certainly could.

German-Brazilian sources also emphasized the singular role that settlers played in building a modern and developed Brazil. In 1869, the Deutsche Zeitung published “The Success of the Germans,” an article wherein the author asserted that the Germans were the sole reason for the advancing state of development within Rio Grande do Sul. The author opens by quoting Goethe, that “[o]nly nobodies are modest,” so as to call on the Germans of Brazil to take greater pride in their accomplishments. This, the author writes, is especially the case wherein Germans overseas are living under the rule of Latins, whose inability to work makes German modesty “inexcusable.” After all, the author asks, “what would Southern Brazil, and especially Rio Grande do Sul, be without the work of the Germans?”

In addressing German accomplishments in the region, the author makes clear that the Germans alone are responsible for the region’s progress: “It was they who penetrated into the jungle, took hundreds of square miles out of the hands of the Indians and wild animals, developed agriculture and through their work as farmers made the province the granary of the entire enormous empire.” Beyond this, the Germans also took it upon themselves to create the infrastructure necessary to bring the fruits of their labor to the country’s markets: “It was they who opened the mountain roads and carried trade into the [interior] plains, into which the German colonies already extended. It was they who opened a way through the wilderness, built bridges over its flowing rivers, brought into the full measure of exploitation the great natural resources of the province.” The

Brazilian state, according to the article, recognizes the civilizing capacity of Germans, employing German surveyors to map the country, German engineers to build public works, and German teachers to improve the school system. The arts and sciences are flourishing in Rio Grande do Sul because, the author argues, “we find performers and scholars with German names.” Thus, according to this piece and others, Germans alone achieved essentially all infrastructural, cultural, and intellectual development in the province; they were the sole fonts of development and civilization in the region.

**German Work and the Civilizing Mission**

While German-language sources emphasized how settlers brought productivity to the wilderness and development to the country, these were manifestations of something singularly German allegedly within the settlers: a love of work. The notion of work was central to nationalists’ assertions that Germans had a unique role to play in civilizing the world, just as the alleged incapacity to work was fundamental to Germanophone vision of Portuguese-Brazilians. Beginning in the eighteenth century, work as a concept became an important topic of discussion in Europe. As Werner Conze discusses, by the mid-eighteenth century, “work” was increasingly disassociated with toil and associated more with happiness. In “The Song of the Bell,” German poet Friedrich von Schiller praised work as “where our honor lies,” while philosopher Christian Garve called activity “the main purpose of man, and source of his happiness.” Pedagogues such as Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi and Immanuel Kant (in discussing education) stressed the need for children to learn the value of working.  

---

80 Ibid.
81 Werner Conze, “Arbeit,” in *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*, ed. Otto Brunner, Werner Conze, and
With the rise of “political economy” in the late-eighteenth century, the concept of work further transformed, becoming focused specifically on economically productive pursuits. Anne-Robert-Jacques Turgot and later Adam Smith saw work as the central source of national strength and a means to create an ordered society. Furthermore, work’s relation to happiness became one of commodities: work provided capital with which to purchase sought after things, thereby fueling consumption, and thus growing the economy. In this way, “work” became a national issue, with Christian Jacob Kraus’ coining the term “national work” in 1808 a reflection of this.82

The growth of manufacturing and the radical transformation of long-standing labor relations, such as the guild system, produced concern about the growing number of landless and under- or unemployed in Germany. This “social question,” prompted thinkers to consider the relation of work to social structures. Two basic camps arose: the liberals, who stressed the need for lifting restrictions in the labor market, which would gradually increase prosperity across society, and those that challenged the liberals, the romantic conservatives and the socialists/communists. The latter two groups were in opposition to each other, as well to the liberals; romantic conservatives favored a return to an idealized past, while the socialists/communists believed in varying degrees in state intervention to limit the destructive effects of recent economic and social transformations.83
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Romantic conservatives, such as Adam Müller and Hermann Wagener returned a spiritual sense to work, which had been essentially replaced by the economic meaning of labor. Writing in the early-nineteenth century, Müller idealized medieval society, calling for a reemphasizing of the value of manual labor (farming and crafts), as well as the value of commerce, which he saw as now dominating. Müller spoke of “the inner bond of the people with the soil on which it lives,” praising the farmer as holding “an exalted position at the threshold of nature and civil society.” Müller believed that the market-driven economy was against God’s plan for social relations, leading to both individual and national (in the *Volk* sense and political sense) ruin. In the mid-nineteenth century, Hermann Wagener took a more specifically Christian tack, calling for organizing society and labor according to the principles of Christian love. This would assure the protection of the workers while also offering a counterpoint to the anti-religious message of the socialists/communists.

The notion of “national work” continued to strengthen throughout the nineteenth century, no doubt related to the rising tide of European nationalism. The phenomenon of the national exhibition, the first world exhibition occurring in London in 1851, reflected the cementing of “national work” in the popular and academic imagination. Writing in the context of “national work” and the rise of socialism, Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl combined the spiritual nature of the romantic conservatives and nationalism to create a German-specific vision of work.

---

Riehl was a journalist and pioneering scholar of German folklore, and in 1861 he published *German Work*, in which he proposed work as a means to combat the growing fracturing of German society. Riehl called for a society of estates, in which the members of each would perform work that progresses both the individual and the nation. In asserting that the individual and the nation could both draw something from work, he was in part countering the arguments of socialists such as Karl Marx. Additionally, Riehl was reintroducing the idea of joy to work, as well as moving work out of the sphere of economics and into that of a quasi-spiritual realm, whereby it was now an expression of national culture. According to Riehl, Germans approached work from a more moral perspective, drawing something from it greater than simply profit: “A more rigorous spirit travels through the customs and legends enshrined in the work ethic of the German people… Neither profit nor earnings decide, but solely the moral achievement in work. This noble principle is rooted since primeval times deeply and firmly in the German mind”.

This idea of a specifically German diligence was widespread in discussions of Germans overseas. In his book, *Liberal Imperialism in Germany: Expansionism and*

---

88 Charles Fourier was among the first to emphasize a connection between pleasure and work. See Conze, “Arbeit,” 211; Gerd Spittler, *Founders of the Anthropology of Work: German Social Scientists of the 19th and Early 20th Centuries and the First Ethnographers* (Münster; Berlin; Piscataway, NJ: Lit Verlag ; Distributed in North America by Transaction Publishers, 2008), 33.
Nationalism, 1848-1884, Matthew Fitzpatrick notes that within German liberal imperialist discourse post-1848, the notion of “bringing of the ‘saving virtues’ of work and discipline to the ‘indolent natives’ of the extra-European world” was one of the key tropes in this literature. Studies specifically examining journals beginning in the 1840s also note how the image of the German settler as hardworking was common in these sectors of the Germanophone public sphere as well. Sebastian Conrad writes that overseas, and in Brazil especially, European-German presentations of “German work” were a means by which immigrants could be distinguished from others in the country. Additionally, these reports stressed how settlers’ work was unlike that of other national groups, such as the British or French, in that the Germans were working to develop South America, while the other nations were only exploiting the region. Thus, there was a specifically German discourse of work that related directly to Germans overseas and their perceived capacity to civilize the lands they settled.

**Portuguese-Brazilian Notions of German Work**

The idea that Germans were especially industrious was also common among the Portuguese-Brazilian elite, although it developed in the context of a sense of the superiority of European to Brazilian workers more generally. In his 1821 book, *Memoir*

---

93 Outside of the southernmost provinces (discussed in Chapter I), the first major push for European immigrants came from coffee planters in São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro, beginning in the late-1840s and lasting through the 1860s, at which point sharecropper immigration slowed until the mid-1870s. With the de-facto end of the

which Europe is, so many ruined families, so many unfortunate individuals, so many skillful people without employment and disgruntled; it would not be difficult to swell our white population with emigrants from there.” Brazil needed Europeans for their skills and industry, but also to help grow a healthy and vigorous society, once which was willing to develop the country and help Brazil realize its potential. “Brazil’s population is very poorly composed,” da Costa writes, making reference to the large and politically isolated enslaved populace who feel no connection to their country. Brazil needed to bring over Europeans to counterbalance the enslaved, to recruit “diligent men for industry or for agriculture,” and these diligent Europeans would act as models for slaves to emulate. Immigrants from Europe, da Cunha asserted, were the key to expanding farming, manufacturing, and helping ease slaves into Brazilian society.  

However, while most Brazilian thinkers saw Europeans as superior workers, many saw Germans as especially industrious, even when compared to other Europeans. From the very outset of German colonization in Southern Brazil, official plans reflected the image of Germans as superior workers. Resolution 80, passed on 31 March, 1824, set aside land for what would later become São Leopoldo in Rio Grande do Sul. The resolution’s text emphasizes the positive expectations of the Brazilian government regarding the impact of German settlers: “This [imperial] Court is hoping for a colony of Germans, which cannot help but be recognized for its utility for this Empire due to the superior advantage of employing white people, free and industrious, in both the arts as in agriculture.”

---
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This vision of the Germans as especially hard working continued throughout the Brazilian Empire. In his 1846 book, *Account Regarding Ways to Promote Colonization*, Miguel Calmon du Pin e Almeida Abrantes asserted that Germans were unique in their diligent approach to work. Abrantes studied at the University of Coimbra and served in a number of offices in his career in the Brazilian government, including Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Foreign Affairs, deputy in the General Assembly, and diplomatic posts in Europe. For his efforts, the emperor made him a viscount in 1841 and a marquis in 1854. Abrantes moreover led one of the most influential salons in Rio de Janeiro. He also personally directed efforts to secure a commercial treaty with the German Customs Union (*Zollverein*) in the mid-1840s.

A wealthy and influential man, Abrantes was also an advocate specifically for German settlement. He opens *Account* by emphasizing how wide-spread German colonization is around the world: “There are German colonies in southern Russia, from Bessarabia to the Caucasus… In Canada, Mexico, Venezuela, and New Granada, in the River Plate region, in Brazil as well, in Java and Sumatra, and as far as Australia, there are German colonies.” Abrantes further cites that nearly a third of the U.S. population

---


was of German descent. In explaining why the Germans were so popular for use in colonization, Abrantes asserts that their national nature is uniquely suited to settlement and development. He writes that the “aptitudes of these colonists for work in agriculture, as well as in the crafts and trades, and their peaceful and conservative spirit are confirmed by the most genuine testimonies,” citing how American presidents have often praised the German usefulness in colonization. Discussing his experience within colonization in Brazil specifically, Abrantes proclaims that even compared to other Europeans, the Germans remain the best group for use in colonization: “Love of work and family, sobriety, patience, respect for authority, are the qualities that distinguish German colonists, generally, from colonists of other origins.”99 Thus, the Germans were uniquely suited in Abrantes’ eyes for use in settlement.

**Transnational Discourse of German Work**

This image of the German settler as the civilizing, industrious, and competent foil to the backward, indolent, and ineffectual Portuguese-Brazil defined Germanophone discussions of Southern Brazil. However, while Germans in both Europe and Brazil asserted that the settler community in Southern Brazil was both uniquely civilizing (as Germans are) and uniquely German (as the settlers allegedly are), there were also cases wherein the nationalists from both locations interacted in transnational social spaces. Thomas Faist defines transnational spaces as “relatively stable, lasting and dense set of ties reaching beyond and across the borders of sovereign states.”100 In the case of Germanophone claims regarding settlers in Southern Brazil, such ties represented the written word, as well as the physical movement of thinkers between Brazil and Europe.

100 Faist, *The Volume and Dynamics*, 197.
In such cases of transnational contact, the participants celebrated the alleged purity of Southern Brazilian *Deutschtum*, the singularly civilizing capacity of the settlers, and Brazil’s need for more German immigrants so as to advance the country. Hence, the diffusionist discourse of Germans saving Brazil existed transnationally.

Concerning the written word, in 1871, some 2,300 Brazilian-Germans from Rio Grande do Sul sent a petition to the Reichstag calling for increased German immigration to the country. The document contained three primary demands: First, that all restrictions on emigration agents be lifted (referring specifically to the Prussian ban of 1859); second, that Germany and Brazil sign a treaty specifying and affirming the rights of Brazilian-Germans; and lastly, that Germany and Brazil establish a postal treaty to facilitate business and private postal traffic. In support of their calls for the elimination of obstacles to German immigration to Brazil, the signatories emphasized both the transformative effect of the settlers on the country and the purity of the colonists’ *Deutschtum*. In this way, the signatories connected colonists’ capacity to civilize and develop their new homeland with their nature as Germans, thereby making the former a reflection of the latter.

Regarding the Germans’ positive impact on Brazil, the signatories stressed that the settlers were at the forefront on making Brazil productive, claiming that “they have in the majority German settlements, the whole of trade in their hands, theirs is the greater part of the export and import business… they occupy the highest place in farming, in industry and in the trades, and also in terms of land, where productivity and management of the soil is concerned.” In explaining why the Germans have been so successful, the

---

authors mention the temperate climate of Southern Brazil, as well as the abundance of natural resources. However, while these characteristics helped the Germans succeed, the soil and climate were available to all Brazilians. Brazil’s many advantages were realized only through “German diligence,” whereby these advantages could be exploited. 102

In looking at the advancements that the Germans have brought to Brazil, the signatories assert that Southern Brazil is a testament to the German capacity to civilize, claiming “perhaps nowhere has the culture-bearing influence of the German element operated as brilliantly as in this remote area of South America.” The author further emphasizes the Germanness of the settlers by claiming that “[f]aithful adherence by the local Germans to the customs and traditions of the fatherland, preserving its language, has truly made absorption into the dominant Latin race impossible.” With this in mind, the petition argues that the increased settlement by Germans will spur even greater economic development and trade with Germany, as well as control of the economy by German-Brazilians. Hence, Germany could gain a devoted and “German” trading partner without having to resort to war, thus making the relationship with Southern Brazil a potentially “brilliant achievement in the field of modern colonial policy.” 103

While the Reichstag petition commission chose not to eliminate Prussian restrictions regarding Brazilian emigration agents and advertising, the commission did agree with the assertions of the petition regarding the character of Germanness in Rio Grande do Sul: the commission said that no new obstacles should be created for immigration to the province, in that, unlike in North America and Australia, “the German [in Southern Brazil]… in his customs, in school and church, in maintenance of all

102 “Petition an den Deutschen Reichstag.”
103 Ibid.
spiritual and material relations, remains a German.” Additionally, the commission agreed that, paraphrasing the petition, the Germans dominate trade, agriculture, industry, and the crafts. Thus, German officials at the highest political level acknowledged the validity of Brazilian-German claims concerning the colonizing power of settlers, the specifically German quality of which was emphasized through assertions regarding the community’s Deutschtum.

Beyond engagement in the European-German political sphere, Brazilian-German nationalists also engaged directly with colonial agitation groups in Germany. In 1879, Alfred W. Sellin gave a lecture to the Central Society for Economic Geography in Berlin (reprinted in Porto Alegre’s Deutsche Zeitung) in which he presented the Germans of Southern Brazil as agents of transformation and paragons of Germanness. Sellin was the former director of the German colony of Nova Petrópolis in Rio Grande do Sul, and lived in Brazil thirteen years before returning to Germany. Sellin published several books on Brazil and the Germans in the south of the country, and was a vocal supporter of settlement in the southernmost region of the country.

In his lecture to the Central Society, Sellin asserts that the Germans are among the best colonizers in the world, and this makes the emigration question that more pressing, since “the colonizing talent of the Germans is eminent,” as illustrated by the employing of Germans by other nations in their colonizing efforts. However, the superior work of settling done by the Germans does nothing for Germany, and instead only strengthens other Powers. “Yes, gentlemen,” Sellin writes, “it is a kind of compulsory labor we provide to foreign countries with the sending of so many German subjects” to
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their colonies. So, it is central that Germans be sent where they can benefit Germany through maintaining their cultural and economic ties to the Fatherland. The solution, Sellin argues, is Southern Brazil, which is free of the abuses that Germans associate with the sharecropping system.\textsuperscript{105}

Sellin portrays German colonists as civilizing not only the land, but also the people of the region, all while emphasizing the singularly pure Germanness of the settlers. Germans in Southern Brazil, Sellin writes, are not like those immigrants in the U.S. and elsewhere, in that German-Brazilians still speak and act German. They have Germanophone newspapers, shooting and gymnastics societies, and aid associations. “[I]n short, the German in southern Brazil has remained essentially German, and will remain so for all time.” Furthermore, unlike in the U.S., where there is plenty of competition against European-German goods and German-American industries, German (European- and Brazilian-) trade and industry dominate. Sellin asserts that the Portuguese-Brazilians are “little qualified for industrial enterprise,” while the diligence of the local Germans assures that trade remains firmly in German hands.\textsuperscript{106} Here, Sellin is contrasting the industrious and civilizing Germans with the listless Portuguese-Brazilians, whereby the Germans have come to dominate economic development in the region.

However, besides the economic impact of the settlers, Sellin relates the German presence in Southern Brazil to a greater civilizing mission, wherein the Germans will remake both the land and people of the region into productive elements. Sellin argues that Brazil represents a special case for Germans as civilizers, whereby settlers bear the


\textsuperscript{106} Sellin, “Süd-Brasilien,” May 9, 1879.
mission of spreading their culture of work to the Portuguese-Brazilians, whose
dependence on slavery has morally crippled them: “to show those [Brazilians] in contrast
the value of free labor, is that not a beautiful, cultural-historical task?”
Furthermore, Sellin believes that German settlement in Brazil could be the kernel from which the entire
region, and local population, could be transformed. If Germany sent more immigrants,
Germans could spread into Argentina and Uruguay, to create a zone “in which the
German element extends their culture-bearing influence far beyond the borders of
Southern Brazil, in an unbroken chain, i.e. until it ran down into the beautiful La Plata
region, extending and creating productive farms, where still the lasso-swinging Gaucho
hunts through the Pampas.” Hence, the Germans would make both the land and the
people productive through the sharing of their specifically German culture.

Sellin closes by stressing the importance of the region for Germany, the past and
future effect of settlers, and their singularly pure Germanness: “Those brave pioneers of
German culture, who have transformed the local wilderness into productive farms, were
previously seen as lost. You [Europeans] hardly thought of them, you refused to deal with
them. Nevertheless, they remained loyal to their beloved Germany, to which they have
remained connected by the bonds of custom, language, and trade.” The Germans of
Southern Brazil were models of what Germans abroad could accomplish, and it was time
for Germany to recognize and share in the brilliant success of the region’s settlers.

In a speech delivered to the Congress for the Promotion of Overseas Interests in
Berlin, Karl von Koseritz presented the Germans of Southern Brazil as having settled the
region through their efforts alone. In describing the first generation of arrivals, Koseritz

says that their lives were full of suffering, since the Brazilian government entrusted them to bring order to the wilderness: “They were led into the jungle and had to stand their ground, on alert everyday against wild men and wild beasts!” A lesser people would have failed, but Koseritz asserts that the Germans were well suited to the task because of their national character: “German strength and German conscientiousness overcome all obstacles, even those that nature itself brings.” Thanks to the effort of those first Germans and their offspring, Koseritz claims, the southern provinces are now developed and productive: “they have been the standard-bearers of German culture in Southern Brazil, and we have to thank them for successes of today.”  

Hence, the vision of Brazilian-German settlers as remaining remarkably German and representing the sole civilizing factor in Brazil represented a transnational phenomenon, wherein Germanophone nationalists moved between borders and continents, propounding that vision. It should be noted that while I find examples of European-German newspapers quoting Brazilian-German sources regarding the settler community, I do not find instances of the reverse. Thus, perhaps unsurprisingly, European-German nationalists turned often to Brazilian-Germans for information about the settlers, while nationalists in Southern Brazil did not reference European opinion in this regard. Through formal and informal contact, through print sources and Brazilian-German nationalists proselytizing the diffusionist calculus of the capable German and (as

---
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Chapter III will discuss) incapable Portuguese-Brazilian, this calculus grew stronger in Europe.

**German Work as Transforming the Portuguese-Brazilian Character**

Celebrations of settlers’ alleged civilizing efforts in Brazil went beyond discussions of making land productive and building roads. European- and Brazilian-German sources asserted that settlers were transforming the notion of work within Brazil, making it honorable again in the eyes of Portuguese-Brazilians.\(^{111}\) In this way, settlers were remaking not only the Brazilian economy, but the Brazilian national character as well. As will be discussed later, this transformation had serious alleged social repercussions, as German-language authors asserted that teaching Portuguese-Brazilians to work helped compel the early abolition of slavery in the southernmost province of Rio Grande do Sul.

In 1866, the *Deutsche Zeitung* published “Porto Alegre,” which was not only a discussion of the Riograndense provincial capital, but also a commentary on the German population throughout Southern Brazil. The author alleges that the Germans have a transformative effect on their Portuguese-Brazilian neighbors. The German community “exerts a significant cultural-historical influence on the native-born people, and gives that population a sounder and realistic direction that gradually displaces the hollow Lush- and Hispano-American formalism.” The influence of German culture on the Latin population will exercise a growing “invigorating and ennobling influence… not only in a material but also in a moral sense.”\(^{112}\)

\(^{111}\) As will be discussed in Chapter IV, the German vision of settlers’ task to civilize Afro-Brazilians was quite different.

\(^{112}\) “Porto Alegre,” *Deutsche Zeitung*, October 20, 1866.
In discussing specifically how the Germans are transforming the Portuguese-Brazilians materially and morally, the author argues that the growing interest in farming among non-Germans demonstrates both. German influence “draws the traditionally mainly cattle-raising population into farming.” This shift, driven by effect of the Germans, will totally transform Brazilian society, “opening to them [Portuguese-Brazilians] the path to the highest cultural development, whose base is always farming, but whose crown is the firm blossoming of industry, commerce, science, and the arts.” According to the author, the growth of farming, beginning with the German colonies and now spreading into non-settlement areas, is the primary factor driving Porto Alegre’s rapid growth.113 In this piece, the Germans were remaking the national character of the Portuguese-Brazilians through converting their approach toward work, i.e. moving from cattle-raising to farming. The result was moral and economic transformation that would have been impossible without the German presence.

In his 1879 lecture before the Central Society for Economic Geography in Berlin, Alfred Sellin argued that the Germans were transforming Brazil’s economy. But, he also stressed the transformative effect of the settlers on the Portuguese-Brazilians. Sellin refers to Brazil’s economic history as one of “non-development,” due to the use of slavery. However, the Germans would not just provide free (non-slave) labor, thereby helping end the country’s dependence on slavery, but they would reshape the very concept of work itself among Portuguese-Brazilians: “to show those [Brazilians]… the value of free labor, is that not a beautiful, cultural-historical task?”114 Beyond the value of work, the settlers were spreading German culture through popularizing the German
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language. According to Sellin, “learning of the German language has been mandatory for some time in all the finer Brazilian schools in the province [of Rio Grande do Sul], from which the high importance of the German element is evident.”

An 1885 Frankfurter Zeitung article, “Slavery and Brazilian Free Work,” asserted that the Germans were affecting a strong moralizing influence on the Portuguese-Brazilians, changing character their non-German neighbors. The piece opens by praising Brazilian imperial and provincial officials for their actions against slavery over the past fifteen years. The author also congratulates the Brazilians for increasing European immigration to the country as a means to expand the labor pool, thereby making easing the transition from slave to free labor. The piece recognizes that German readers might have trouble believing that Brazil could break its economic dependence on slave labor, since Brazilians are renowned for their laziness, and thus the country would require an impossibly large influx of Europeans to replace both the enslaved and free native labor force. The author dispels such claims, writing that “[t]his view is exaggerated,” since “the native free workers already represented a more valuable productive element than the African.”

While the shrinking slave population was central to this fact in terms of Brazil on the whole, the article asserted that in Rio Grande do Sul, the German presence, and the resulting effect on the non-German population, was responsible for the changing relationship between Brazilians and free labor, specifically farming, there: “The more German farming spread throughout the former wilderness region through the expansion of colonization, the more Brazilians came there [the colonial zone], and they settled next
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to immigrants. Through interaction, the moral influence of immigrants on the native-born people is inescapable.” However, the article stresses that while the Germans affect the Brazilians, the reverse is not the case: “Both elements work together peacefully, while maintaining their national character.” 117 The Germans were remaking the Portuguese-Brazilians into morally upstanding farmers, while preserving their Germanness.

In his discussion of German settlement in Southern Brazil, Wilhelm Breitenbach presents the colonists as transforming both Rio Grande do Sul’s economy and the province’s non-German population. Regarding the economic impact of the Germans, Breitenbach writes that Germans have a natural propensity towards farming and colonization. “Prior to the establishment of German colonies, one could hardly speak of farming, but now there is already a significant part of the Brazilian wilderness under cultivation, specifically through German industriousness. Out of a cattle-raising country will come an agricultural one, a higher cultural stage will take place of the lower.”118

According to Breitenbach, that “higher cultural stage” will move beyond the realm of production and into that of national character: Through their diligence, the Germans were remaking the Brazilians as well as Brazil. “And with the German immigration that arrived in this land, the consequences of this have only now begun to show themselves clearly: respect for the work of free men, which, consistently performed, is incompatible with slavery.” This, according to Breitenbach is changing the approach of all Brazilians in the province toward work, and thus, changing the very foundation of Brazilian society.119
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German Work and the Riograndense Abolition Narrative

According to European- and Brazilian-German nationalists, the transformation of the Portuguese-Brazilian character brought about by the settlers’ example had momentous effects in Southern Brazil, specifically helping fuel the decision to end slavery earlier in Rio Grande do Sul (1884, versus 1888 for the country as a whole).  

Following the abolition in Ceará and Amazonas in 1884, calls for abolition grew in Brazil’s southernmost province. Between 1870 and 1880, the slave population in the province fell by nearly 40%, but in 1884, Rio Grande do Sul still held the sixth largest number of slaves among Brazilian provinces.

In terms of political parties within Rio Grande do Sul, the Conservatives were split into two groups along lines defined by their approach to abolition: the “wolves” (lobos), who opposed any movement toward abolition, and the “lambs” (cordeiros), who supported gradual abolition. The Liberals, who were less radical in Rio Grande do Sul than elsewhere in the country, supported gradual abolition as well. However, by 1883, they rejected the notion of paying masters to free slaves. Instead, they came to support “conditional liberty” (claúsulas de serviço), which required “freed” slaves to work for their former master for a period. Lastly, the Republicans, a formal party in the province as of 1882 and made up mainly of small ranchers, called for full abolition. The Riograndense Republican Party (PRR) initially focused its efforts on abolition on the provincial level, but later became more vocal in its support of ending slavery throughout

---

Brazil. The Republicans also were the only party calling for an end to the imperial system of government as a whole, although like the other parties, they too favored a strict maintenance of social order.¹²²

Outside of political parties, abolition within the province was, as in the rest of the country, also partly a result of the actions of the slaves themselves.¹²³ For example, slave
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flights, the first such registered in Rio Grande do Sul in 1738, took their toll on the sustainability of slavery in the province. The region held a unique attraction in terms of slave flights, with its proximity to Uruguay, which abolished slavery in part of the country in 1842 and the remainder in 1846. While some escaped slaves left Brazil, some remained in the province and formed quilombos (escaped slave communities). The first record of quilombos in the region dates from the eighteenth century, but they became more common throughout the nineteenth century. Slave insurrections, or plans to rise up, were also common in Rio Grande do Sul (1838 and 1868 planned rebellion in Porto Alegre and 1848 in Pelotas, while actual rebellions erupted in 1859, 1863, 1864, and


1865). Even following the “end” of slavery through partial emancipation, there was a major uprising in Pelotas in 1887.  

Due to deep division among the province’s political parties, any movement on slavery would have required compromise. The notion of conditional liberty made this possible. Slavery would technically be ended, but emancipation would come with required periods of labor wherein the “freed” would have to work for their former masters. These periods could be up to seven years. Any former slaves violating these terms could be put to work for the province, or else jailed. Additionally, former masters could sell the time remaining on the required work period, although not technically selling the person affected. Lastly, because they were now free, those bound by these labor contracts lost the right of slaves enshrined in the Rio Branco Law to purchase their own freedom. Hence, conditional liberty would maintain the social order and even expand some powers of employers over former slaves, all while allowing the elites to revel in their allegedly progressive policies.

In late summer 1884, Porto Alegre took the lead in the province in the movement to end slavery through conditional emancipation. Abolitionist clubs met and formed committees to help organize attempts to buy slaves’ freedom. A final date of 7 September was set for the total elimination of the institution in the city, and huge celebrations marked that evening, wherein the Municipal Council and emancipations leaders declared

---


Porto Alegre free of slaves. From the provincial capital, abolition spread throughout the province. By the end of September, almost a dozen cities passed ordinances freeing their slaves through partial emancipation. Even the salted beef-producing city of Pelotas, where some 5,000 slaves lived at the beginning of 1884, declared slavery over there on 17 October. Between the 1884 and national abolition in 1888, the slave population in Rio Grande do Sul fell from close to 60,000 to less than 8,500, although in some cities where partial emancipation was the law, such as Porto Alegre and Pelotas, there were reports of small numbers of enslaved up until 1888.

Studies regarding the relationship of German immigrants to slavery in Southern Brazil focus on the question of settlers’ role in abolition through creating a free work force and developing economic sectors based on free instead of slave labor. However, neither scholars of abolition in the south generally nor of the German community specifically cite evidence of German participation in the abolition movement directly,
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such as through leadership positions in abolition societies.\textsuperscript{131} An exception regarding the lack of connection between abolitionist groups and Brazilian-Germans was at the celebration commemorating the coming end of slavery in Porto Alegre, wherein several leading Germans and their wives were present.\textsuperscript{132} However, many of these German men were political leaders and prominent in Portoalegrense business circles, so their presence at this major political and social event does not necessarily indicate a deep-rooted engagement with the abolition movement.

While the majority of Germanophone writers’ connecting German settlement with the end of slavery occurred in the 1880s, there were cases occurring long before abolition in Rio Grande do Sul. In 1866, the Deutsche Zeitung asserted that the German presence was driving slavery out of the province: “the work of an industrious population, made up of small landowners, as occurs among the immigrants here, raises the production and wealth of the country, and drives slave labor gradually northward [out of the province].”\textsuperscript{133} In 1870, the Globus published a report on the slave population and the spread of disease among slaves, “Number of Slaves and Mortality in Brazil,” in which the author connects the presence of Germans with the lower number of slaves in Southern Brazil. He writes that while much of Brazil would have serious trouble replacing slaves’ labor, and hence should abolish the institution in the most gradual and thoughtful way, this is not the case in the German-settled areas: “It [slavery] is only worthwhile in the tropical regions and in the plantation system, which is virtually absent in the southern

\textsuperscript{131} For general studies, see Footnote 138 above. For a specific study, see Magda Roswita Gans, \textit{Presença teuta em Porto Alegre no século XIX, 1850-1889} (Porto Alegre: UFRGS Editora, 2004).
\textsuperscript{132} Weimer, \textit{O trabalho escravo}, 97–98.
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provinces. There you have a comparatively small number of slaves, and the German colonists have, from the outset, kept themselves away from slavery.”  

In both of these articles, the authors associated the economy of the province with the presence of Germans, either directly stating or implying that German settlement was related to the relatively low number of slaves in the southernmost provinces.

Concerning slave-holding among German-Brazilians, there is no evidence to suggest that any settlers owned large numbers of slaves. In her study of German masters in Rio Grande do Sul, Maria Angelica Zubaran finds an average of only two slaves in slave-holding households, with the largest holding by a settler being eleven. Regarding how widespread owning slaves was among German-Brazilians, Roland Spiesgart, looking at the largely German colony of Nova Friburgo in Rio de Janeiro province, writes that the settlement was 21% slave, which mirrored that of the rest of the province, suggesting that in areas where slavery was permitted, the presence of German-Brazilians did not decrease the prevalence of the institution. Studies such as Zubaran’s and Marcos Antônio Witt’s have shown that German masters used slaves for a host of tasks, including domestic and agricultural labor, working in transportation, and even aboard ships. See Maria Angélica Zubaran, “Os teutos-rio-grandenses, a escravidão e as alforrias,” in Os Alemães no sul do Brasil: cultura, etnicidade, história, ed. Cláudia Mauch and Naira Vasconcellos (Canoas, RS: Editora da ULBRA, 1994), 65–74; Maria Angelica Zubaran, “Slaves and Contratados: The Politics of Freedom in Rio Grande Do Sul, Brazil, 1865-1888” (Ph.D. Dissertation, State University of New York at Stony Brook, 1998); Marcos Antônio Witt, “Os escravos do Pastor Voges na Colônia de Três Forquilhas,” in 500 anos de Brasil e Igreja na América meridional, ed. Martin Norberto. Dreher (Edições EST, 2002); Roland Spiesgart, “Verbrasilianerung” und Akkulturation: deutsche Protestanten im brasilianischen Kaiserreich am Beispiel der Gemeinden in Rio de Janeiro und Minas Gerais (1822-1889) (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006), 351. The small number of slaves among settlers in Rio Grande do Sul reflected the nature of slavery more generally in the province. The only sector of the Riograndense economy that featured large numbers of the slaves was the charque (salted beef) industry, which featured no major settler presence. See Joseph LeRoy Love, Rio Grande Do Sul and Brazilian Regionalism, 1882-1930 (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1971), 20; Conrad, Destruction of Brazilian Slavery, 24; Herbert S. Klein, The Atlantic Slave Trade (Cambridge, U.K.; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 37; Ana Lucia Araujo, Shadows of the Slave Past: Memory, Heritage, and Slavery, 2014, 132–4. For general histories of slavery in the charque industry, see Alvarino da Fontoura Marques, Evolução das charqueadas rio-grandenses (Porto Alegre, RS: Martins Livreiro Editor, 1990); Ester Gutierrez, Negros, charqueadas & olarias: um estudo sobre o espaço pelotense (Pelotas, RS: Editora e Gráfica
As abolition approached in Porto Alegre, Germanophone sources took the occasion to emphasize the settlers’ role in ending slavery in the region. In an 1884 *Globus* article, “The Current State of the Slavery Question in Brazil,” Wilhelm Breitenbach discussed rising popular support in Rio Grande do Sul for ending slavery, but did so by relating that support to the presence and alleged impact of the German-Brazilian community there. 

Breitenbach quotes an article from *Koseritz’ Deutsche Zeitung* regarding festivities in Porto Alegre for the coming end of slavery in the city, in which the author wrote that the “will of the people celebrates a great triumph” as what little resistance to ending slavery was swept aside in the tide. In examining how much of Rio Grande do Sul managed to end slavery, Breitenbach emphasizes that the province holds some 120,000 German settlers, and it is largely because of this community that the region arrives at abolition so early: “Here in southern Brazil, the rapid liberation from slavery has few injurious consequences, for here has, especially through German immigration, the labor of the free man acquired respect long ago”. According to Breitenbach, this transformation of work from dishonorable to esteemed has far-reaching consequences. Because of the Germans, the Portuguese-Brazilian association of certain work with slavery, still prominent in much of the country, does not exist in Rio Grande do Sul. Hence, unlike in the northern provinces where slave-labor dominates some economic sectors, abolition will not produce a dire lack of manpower in the South. Thus, according
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to Breitenbach, the swell of abolitionism in Rio Grande do Sul was inextricable from the presence of Germans in the province: German-Brazilians paved the way for the end of slavery though their transforming the non-Germans of the province, making many of them respectful of work and thus able to end their previous dependency on slavery.

On 23 August, 1884, *Koseritz' Deutsche Zeitung* published an article discussing the approval to ban slavery in Porto Alegre city on 7 September and in the whole municipality on 28 September. The author praises the decision because of slavery’s negative effects on family life and general social morality. However, he focuses especially on how slavery represents an affront to work and that its abolition will mean the victory of the German notion of work over that of the non-German-Brazilian.

The author writes that while slavery existed, “[m]anual labor is deemed unworthy of a free man” and that abolition would therefore be “a rehabilitation or ennoblement of work.” The piece predicts that with the end of slavery, “work will be widely regarded as an honor,” and this will lead to greater economic prosperity throughout the province. But, there are many places in the province wherein the residents respect labor, and these are German settlements. In the German colonies, the article asserts, “only laziness is a disgrace, but work is an honor,” and it cites the residents of São Leopoldo and how they “are proud of their callused hands, and have the right to be.”

The article argues that while the areas settled by Germans were limited, the effect of the settlers is far-reaching. The author quotes a piece in the Portuguese-language newspaper, *Reforma*, that referred to Rio Grande do Sul as a place “where work, thanks to the German immigration, ceased to be a disgrace long ago,” to demonstrate that the
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Portuguese-Brazilians recognize the German work ethic. However, the Brazilian-German author notes that for decades, the settlers’ appreciation for work made them targets of disdain: “The time is not too distant when the word “allemão” was a kind of insult, and why? It remained so only because the German performed work which, in earlier periods, only slaves performed, and therefore was demeaning (not to mention dishonorable).”

However, the article asserts, the prosperity brought about by the Germans is undeniable, and their example has done much to change the perception of settlers’ neighbors. Agriculture and the crafts are now largely accepted as legitimate and even honorable pursuits throughout all members of communities where Brazilian-Germans live, including “in other parts of the province where the colonist was [previously] doing work deemed unworthy of a free man”. Thanks in large part to this influence of the Germans, the author argues, Rio Grande do Sul is far better prepared for the end of slavery than much of the country: “we are, thanks to the colonization, in a much better position than all the provinces of the Center and North [of Brazil].”

Thus, Germanophone authors argued that German settlers were central to the early abolition of slavery in Rio Grande do Sul, either through their role as laborers or through their approach to labor itself, which allegedly helped prepare the province culturally for the move to free labor. As discussed, the idea of Germans’ view of work as honorable had been a mainstay of Germanophone discussions of Brazil since the 1820s. However, this notion of Germanness’ capacity to transform the Portuguese-Brazilian work ethic intensified in this period after the Free Womb in 1871, wherein the impact of

139 Note that the Portuguese word “allemão” is used in the text, to clarify further that it was the Portuguese-Brazilians insulting the Germans.

140 “Die thatsächliche Abschaffung der Sklaverei.”
German settlers, especially as related to the decline of slavery, became increasingly central. In this way, German-Brazilians took center stage in the decline of the immoral and socially deleterious institution of slavery in the province, thereby further demonstrating their role as the driving force behind moral and economic progress in the country.

Thus, European- and Brazilian-German sources presented settlers in Southern Brazil as the sole driving force behind the transformation of Brazil and its people: they made the land productive, they built roads and bridges, and changed the national ethos of Portuguese-Brazilians to the degree that slavery could end in the region years before it ended nationally; while settlers colonized the land with the axe and the Brazilian character with their example, it was their Germanness that made both possible.

**Different functions for claims regarding Germanness in Southern Brazil**

While allegations regarding the civilizing power and purity of settlers’ Germanness existed among nationalists in both Europe and Brazil, the functions that these discourses served depended on the local contexts in which they were utilized.

In representing the community in Southern Brazil as unified, pure, and transformative, European-German liberal nationalists used the colonies there to contrast with the alleged political (until 1871), religious, and social divisions plaguing the German states. Susanne Zantop wrote that “[t]he ‘colony’… became the blank space for a new beginning, for the creation of an imaginary national self freed from history and convention.”\(^{141}\) While she was referring here specifically to German colonial fantasies generated through literary sources, Zantop’s point remains valid in the context of German

\(^{141}\) Zantop, *Colonial Fantasies: Conquest, Family, and Nation in Precolonial Germany, 1770-1870*, 7.
settlement overseas; Sebastian Conrad writes that “the idea of ‘Germans abroad’ served as a kind of ersatz national community outside of its territorial borders, through which the Germans could ‘invent’ themselves as a nation.”¹⁴²

In the German colonial imaginary, colonies represented a means by which the politically and socially fragmented reality of German society could be overcome. As discussed in Chapter I, the pre-1848 period saw the rise of thinkers such as Friedrich List, who stressed the economic and demographic power of colonies; overseas settlement, they argued, could grow German industry through providing raw materials and secured markets, as well as stabilize German society by decreasing Germany’s alleged “excess” population.¹⁴³ Following the failed revolution of 1848, German liberal nationalists projected their unfulfilled desires for a powerful and unified Germany onto overseas settlements.¹⁴⁴ Bradley Naranch writes that many nationalists believed that “[i]n foreign lands, free of the strains of regional strife and petty aristocratic prerogatives, the German national body as a united whole could come to full fruition.”¹⁴⁵ The European-German press played a central role in the construction of this image. In its discussions of Germans overseas, the Gartenlaube presented such communities as “free from the particularism that seemed to plague the Germans within Europe,” as well as zones wherein Germans could enjoy the political freedom that remained elusive in Germany.¹⁴⁶ Furthermore, the Gartenlaube presented German settlers as cultural models to be emulated in Europe.

¹⁴² Conrad, Globalisation and the Nation, 278–9.
¹⁴³ Fitzpatrick, Liberal Imperialism, 53; Conrad, Globalisation and the Nation, 276; Naranch, “Beyond the Fatherland,” Chapter II.
¹⁴⁴ Senger und Etterlin, Neu-Deutschland in Nordamerika : Massenauswanderung, nationale Gruppenansiedlungen und liberale Kolonialbewegung, 1815-1860, 2–3; Conrad, German Colonialism, 17–9.
¹⁴⁵ Naranch, “Beyond the Fatherland,” 61.
¹⁴⁶ Fitzpatrick, Liberal Imperialism, 180–2.
These presentations, as Fitzpatrick notes, were “perfectly situated to enact a forgetting of internal differences… central to the successful narration of a totalizing national identity.”

This remained the case following German political unification in 1871, due to dissatisfaction among many nationalists with the borders (many German-speakers excluded), demographics (many ethnically non-Germans included), and politics of the new German Empire.

Discussing a presentation of Blumenau in Santa Catarina from the Handbook for Germandom Abroad from the early twentieth century, Stefan Manz notes how Germans overseas, and in Southern Brazil especially in this case, allowed a solution to social divisions plaguing Germany through idealization: “The diaspora situation has the potential to heal societal wounds associated with the metropolis. Different social classes exist, but without strife… Catholic and Protestant institutions are situated in close vicinity.” Through such idealized presentations, Manz writes, Germans overseas could not only create a “New Germany,” but “a better Germany” in the wilderness.

Sebastian Conrad cites how German settlements in the region represented a “fountain of youth” in European-German nationalist eyes, wherein Germanness could thrive without the deteriorating effects of modernization and industrialization. The German-Brazilians “appeared as manifestations of the true Germany,” wherein settlers remained tied to the soil and lived in a society free of the fractures marking Germany.
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While European-German liberal nationalists used claims regarding an idealized colonial society in Southern Brazil to contrast with the reality of division within society in Germany, Brazilian-Germans nationalists’ discussions of their alleged role as the sole sources of development in the region were part of a more directly political project: Facing a host of limits on their political and religious rights, Brazilian-German liberal nationalists used the discourse of civilizing Germanness to make claims to full inclusion in their new homeland. A discussion of local conditions in Southern Brazil, as well as an exploration of settlers’ legal rights, is necessary for context.

**Germanness and German-Brazilian Political Rights: Restrictions**

Concerning limits on Brazilian-Germans’ rights, many immigrants faced two levels of inequality: First, settlers’ (German or otherwise) rights remained restricted even after their naturalization as Brazilian citizens, and secondly, non-Catholics, regardless of their origin and citizenship status, faced a host of both civil and religious restrictions. Many Brazilian-Germans belonged to both of these categories, and thus the issue of citizenship was a pressing one to many in the community. However, Brazilian legal doctrine regarding citizenship was far from uniform, and there were many cases wherein laws and guarantees conflicted.

The Brazilian imperial constitution of 1824 reflected the contradictory nature of Brazil’s citizenship laws. Article 5 affirmed that Catholicism was the official faith of the empire, but that other faiths would be tolerated. However, Catholicism’s position produced discrimination against non-Catholics that affected a host of their political
Article 95 stated that non-Catholics could be neither deputies nor senators, and they could not hold government jobs. It should be noted that this article withheld these rights from naturalized citizens of Brazil as well, regardless of their confessional affiliation. Marriage recognized by the state remained outside the realm of possibility for non-Catholics living in Brazil, due to the Church’s role as record keeper of births, marriages, and deaths. This would not change until the 1860s, when Decree 1144 (1861) and Decree 3069 (1863) finally recognized non-Catholic marriages. However, a civil registry, and thus full equality before the law regardless of religion, was not in place until 1889. Furthermore, while decrees 1144 and 3069 recognized Protestant marriages, they required that Protestants meet administrative registration requirements that were not clearly defined. When finally clarified, many of the requirements proved difficult for Brazilian-Germans to meet. Protestant settlers found many ways to circumvent these faith-based restrictions. For example, in São Leopoldo, Protestants commonly registered their marriage with a notary, thus making the marriage “official” in the eyes of their fellow settlers, although this practice produced no rights in terms of the state. Some settlers took more drastic action, such as in the settlement of Novo Friburgo in Rio de Janeiro province, where a group of Swiss Protestants converted to Catholicism on their arrival to the country.152

Even the legal process by which German settlers could become naturalized citizens was muddled and inconsistent. When the first German immigrants to Rio Grande do Sul arrived in 1824, their contracts guaranteed them full citizenship and religious freedom, even though these provisions violated Article 5 constitution. A naturalization law did not pass until 1832, requiring 4 years residence in Brazil, as well as an oath of loyalty to the constitution and nation. However, there was considerable cost involved in filing the appropriate documents, and few German settlers took advantage of the law.¹⁵³

In 1846, Brazil passed Imperial Law 397, which granted settlers in São Leopoldo and São Pedro de Alcântara das Torres the chance to become naturalized citizens, assuming they went before their municipal council and applied. Still, a clarification in 1850 made clear that all immigrants settling in those regions after Imperial Law 397’s promulgation were not eligible. If applicants did not have the documents the municipal councils required, settlers had to apply to Rio de Janeiro for copies, a costly and time-consuming process. Imperial Law 601 of September 1850, and Decree 808-A of June 1855 lowered the four-year residence requirement to two, but only for those who lived on land they owned. Furthermore, 808-A made the model created through Imperial Law 397 applicable nation-wide, as well as offering naturalization for minors born outside of Brazil.¹⁵⁴

However, these laws offered the status only of “naturalized citizen”, which did not remove the limits placed on such citizens by the imperial constitution discussed above. Additionally, in terms of suffrage, the laws had little impact, since voting
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remained restricted to those who spoke Portuguese, and this represented a small percentage of the German settler population. Furthermore, the control of Portuguese-Brazilian elites over the election process proved difficult to challenge on all levels, from the imperial down to the local; while São Leopoldo was elevated to the status of município in 1846, and thus able to elect locally a municipal council (conselho municipal), no German-Brazilian served on the council until 1864.155

In January 1881, with the passage of the Saraiva Law (Decree 3029), electoral and constitutional limitations on naturalized and non-Catholics citizens were finally removed. These groups could now vote, as well as hold office. Hence, it was not until 1881, some 57 years after the arrival of the first Germans in Rio Grande do Sul, that German-Brazilians who had become naturalized citizens, as well as any Protestant born in Brazil, could serve in the legislature. The effect of this law was immediate in terms of German representation in the Riograndense Assembly, with two Brazilians of German descent elected in 1881 (Frederico Guilherme Bartholomay and Frederick Hänsel), and another in 1883 (Karl von Koseritz).156 However, it should be noted that while the Saraiva Law opened public office to German settlers, it severely restricted the number of Brazilians who could vote, partly through raising the income requirement to 200 milréis, but mainly by requiring a literacy test. At the time, only 20% of the male Brazilian population could read, and the Saraiva Law actually shrank the total electorate by some

156 Oliveira, “Colonização alemã e cidadania,” 89–90.
90%. While the law granted naturalized and non-Catholic Brazilians the vote, it stripped the ballot from the hands of many more.157

**Germanness and German-Brazilian Rights: Demands for Inclusion**

Brazilian-German demands for political and social inclusion were often made in the contexts of claims regarding the community’s allegedly civilizing Germanness and its superiority over Portuguese-Brazilian indolence and corruption: Settlers deserved full integration because they were the sole driving force of progress in a country led by an incompetent and lazy people. Linking Brazilian-Germans’ emphasis on their Deutschtum and socio-political restrictions settlers faced connects scholarship regarding the earlier organization of settler society along ethnic lines and studies concerning Germanness in the later period. Marcos Justo Tramontini argues that in the first three decades of German settlement in Southern Brazil, the lack of support from and contact with the government helped induce settlers to emphasize their ethnicity and difference from the political elite. He reminds us that “organization of a social group with an ethnic base is a political phenomenon, that is to say, the mobilization of this group’s ‘symbolic capital’ is related to its political struggle, as a strategy to find in the ‘community’ social recognition, a combining of the strength to resist, and directing and lobbying for solutions.” Devoid of a place in the official political system, Tramontini argues, settlers organized internally to create change outside of the community.158 However, his study focuses on the period before the rise of a Brazilian-German elite that engaged with the Brazilian political establishment directly, calling for greater rights for settlers. Marcos Antônio Witt and
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Giralda Seyferth examine the place of Germanness beyond the 1850s, noting how it informed both everyday and larger discursive interactions. However, these studies do not examine the alleged civilizing aspect of Germanness, which was central in the local context, constructed transnationally, and often related directly to limits on settlers’ political rights.

In 1869, the Deutsche Zeitung published “The Naturalization Question,” wherein the newspaper decried limits on settlers’ rights and abuses at the hands of parasitic Portuguese-Brazilian administrators, while emphasizing the productive and morally upstanding nature of German-Brazilians.

The author begins by stressing that he once believed that becoming a Brazilian citizen was a good idea, but after twelve years of living in the country, he can no longer advise settlers to become naturalized. Abuses and mistreatment are the issues: “The German, even if naturalized ten times, will always remain, in the eyes of the majority [of Portuguese-Brazilians], Alem [sic].” German-Brazilian citizens are expected to serve Brazil and its political elites, the author argues, but only if they do so quietly and ask to no real power: “Fine if he wants to satisfy all of the duties of the citizen, that he serve in the National Guard, that he serve on a jury, that he be the instrument of a party in elections, but if he also, in a fit of naivety, claims the rights of the citizen… he is again
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160 Portuguese for “German.” I leave it untranslated to stress the author’s intent to demonstrate the negative view of assertive settlers in the Portuguese-Brazilian elite’s eyes.
Aleman, and can count himself lucky if he does not receive [the title] ‘renegade’ in the process.”

The author cites several examples from São Leopoldo to make his case that the Portuguese-Brazilian elite treats Germans, regardless of their citizenship, as commodities. For example, the local Portuguese-Brazilian politicians responded with outrage when native-born German-Brazilians tried to form a municipal council that lacked any non-Germans-Brazilians. The author puts this example directly into the context of German work and Portuguese indolence: “they [Portuguese-Brazilians] say it without thinking that the work force of the municipality is almost exclusively confined to the German element, and that the funds to be managed are nearly without exception derived from the sweat the German population.” With the exception of those living in two districts of the municipality, “the Portuguese element… consists almost entirely of speculators who want to live by the sweat of the colonists.” Hence, despite citizenship, Germans remain the providers of work to the exploitive Portuguese-Brazilians, who would rather exploit the settlers than work themselves.

However, the author writes that while he does not suggest that individual German-Brazilians accept citizenship, he would support a mass naturalization, since settlers could take real part in the national and political life of the country, leading to the de facto equality of German-Brazilians that has avoided individual citizens for so long. Furthermore, this engagement would spur greater cultural integration among settlers, since learning Portuguese would be sensible if Germans were integrated into political
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parties. However, until German-Brazilians, including Protestants, could be treated as equals instead of “Aleman burros” meant to be exploited and kept quiet by the Portuguese-Brazilians, then the author and the Deutsche Zeitung could not recommend becoming a Brazilian citizen.\footnote{163 “German donkeys.” Ibid.}

In 1881, the Deutsche Zeitung published a letter written by Emil Schlabitz, a farmer from a German settlement in Rio Grande do Sul’s interior. The letter focuses on the lack of German-Brazilian political rights and continued discrimination against Protestants.\footnote{164 This article was published only two months after the passage of the Saraiva Law, so its effect of opening political offices to Brazilian-Germans were not yet felt.} In discussing the situation of German settlers, Schlabitz stresses the role of Germans as the sole productive force in the province, while emphasizing the incompetence and incapacity to properly develop the country of Portuguese-Brazilian officials.

Schlabitz begins by underscoring the loyalty of German-Brazilians, writing that they “came to this country to work, to live, and probably even to die here. We raise children, the sons of this country, and they should be proud to be children of this land.” However, despite the desire “to take part in the joys and sorrow of our new fatherland,” settlers remain outsiders in Brazilian politics due to legal restrictions on their ability to hold office.\footnote{165 “Eine Stimme aus dem Urwald,” Deutsche Zeitung, March 19, 1881.}

Schlabitz calls for German-Brazilian inclusion first because the Germans, he argues, are the backbone of production in the province, while their non-German neighbors remain less helpful to national development: “We are the primary farming sector of the population, with the majority of the Brazilians in this province living from
raising livestock, and from them we can expect neither understanding nor farming.” If Brazil is to advance, Schlabitz asserts, it must make its land productive, and Germans, already established as the agricultural element in provincial society, were the means to do this: “In a country like Brazil, the main ambition of the people should be to conquer nature and make it subservient to the nation’s goals. The best way to accomplish this is farming.” Since the German-Brazilians were clearing the land and making it productive, Schlabitz writes, “our voice must be heard.”

Beyond granting Germans rights in recognition of settlers’ role in national development, Schlabitz also believed that Portuguese-Brazilian officials’ incompetence needed to be offset through German engagement in government. “Famine, pestilence, and other evils have not brought as much calamity as bad policies, especially in this country.” Schlabitz notes how the government has failed to connect properly the farming centers (colonies) in the interior to cities, arguing that if agriculture were to spread, trade routes over land and water had to be created. The only way to accomplish this was to bring the German settlers into government: “Our interests and our circumstances imperatively demand an improvement in conditions, and this can happen only if we ourselves work, if we help ourselves.” Schlabitz even argues that discrimination against colonists reflected Brazil’s status as an uncivilized country, writing how the question of settlers’ rights “should, in a civilized country, already actually be settled,” but that Brazil’s policy-making apparatus is too “burdened with dead weight” to accomplish this.

__________________________
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German-Brazilians were the solution: “it is necessary to act, to free ourselves from it [the current situation], so that the legislature can turn to more practical matters.”

Thus, the Brazilian-German press connected demands for rights with claims regarding Germanness, civilization, and non-German ineffectiveness and corruption. In this way, the transnational vision of the German as the exemplar of settlement and progress served a very specific local purpose in Southern Brazil: to make claims to political and social inclusion in the community’s new homeland. Furthermore, through investigating both the European- and Brazilian-German contexts of discussions concerning settlers’ role as civilizers of Southern Brazil, it is clear that the discourse of the German civilizing mission was both transnational and local, constructed on both sides of the Atlantic, but serving distinct purposes for each group.

Conclusion

In discussions of Southern Brazil, European- and Brazilian German nationalists constructed the image of settlers not only as gifted civilizers, but as paragons of *Deutschtum*. Settlers’ Germanness was allegedly exceptionally pure, thereby making their role of tamer of the wilderness, builder of roads, and catalyst for the transformation of the Portuguese-Brazilian character a reflection of their ethnicity; colonists civilized not only through their Germanness, but because they were German. The German notion of work was foundational to this specifically German civilizing mission. Proselytizing the benefits of work through their example, settlers even purportedly laid the moral groundwork for ending slavery in the Southern Brazil. The Germanness and achievements of German-Brazilians were touted on both sides of the Atlantic and in the
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transnational space of the Atlantic world, but the image of the German civilizer served distinct purposes in Europe and Southern Brazil.

Having now established how Germans on both sides of the Atlantic presented German-Brazilians and Southern Brazil more generally, Chapter III will focus on the presentation of Portuguese-Brazilians, whom German-language authors presented as the antithesis of settlers; while colonists were allegedly industrious, competent, and advancing the country, Portuguese-Brazilians were purportedly lazy, inept, and standing in the way of settlers’ efforts to develop Brazil. European- and Brazilian-German nationalists saw slavery as the primary means to explain the Portuguese-Brazilians’ condition. According to these sources, slavery perverted the Brazilian work ethic, leading to the sad state of affairs within the country at the time.
Chapter III
A Backward Land, an Indolent People: German-Language Discourses of Portuguese-Brazilian Ineptitude and Indolence

This chapter explores the German-language presentations of Portuguese-Brazilians with regard to their capacity to develop Brazil properly and how they saw work more generally. As discussed in the Introduction, the theoretical model of Eurocentric diffusionism, articulated as a colonial ideology by J.M. Blaut, is central to my argument. This idea asserts that European colonial powers believed in a European core from which innovation and development radiates into the non-European periphery, which is marked by stagnation and lack of capacity to innovate. In the case of Germany and Brazil, the central quality in question was industriousness, which the Germans allegedly had and the Brazilians supposedly lacked; backward and indolent, Brazilians needed Germans to civilize their country. Slavery was fundamental in this industriousness/civilization calculus, wherein slavery rendered Portuguese-Brazilians lazy, but, as will be discussed in Chapter IV, acted to define the Germans as industrious, either through their alleged rejection of slavery or their acting to civilize even when owning slaves.

This chapter opens by exploring the European- and Brazilian-German presentation of Brazil as undeveloped, and of the Brazilians as too incompetent and lazy to rectify the situation. German-language sources emphasized these issues by stressing that the lack of proper roads and bridges threatened the well being of German settlers,
thereby restricting the capacity of German-Brazilians to improve the country. In examining why the Brazilians were incapable and indolent, Germanophone authors in part credited the negative effect of the tropical climate, but mainly they related the demoralized state of the Brazilians to the institution of slavery’s harmful effect on the Brazilian vision of work. While the idea that slavery created indolence among masters was unique neither to the German nor Brazilian context, the idea of Brazilian laziness and its connection to slavery was foundational to the German construction of Brazil as a colonial space requiring German intervention. Additionally, the concept of German industriousness and non-German incompetence as justification for colonialism was not unique to Brazil, but rather was central to German colonization in Poland, as well. Hence, the German presentation of non-Germans (Brazilians in this case) as incompetent and uncivilized was a trope common to German colonialism, but was also unique due to the centrality of slavery.

**Brazil as Undeveloped**

Throughout nineteenth-century German-language discussions of Brazil, the country’s poorly developed infrastructure was a common theme. References to poor roads and bridges occurred quite often. A common trope in this regard concerned the effect of poor development on settlers’ lives: due to a lack of proper roads, German colonists could not get their products to market. Hence, the failure of Brazilians to develop their country properly was preventing settlers from realizing their efforts to advance the country.

1 Chapters II and IV explore this in greater detail.
From the earliest years of German settlement in Brazil, Germanophone authors marveled at the lack of proper infrastructural development. For example, G. H. von Langsdorf cited both the terrible conditions of Brazil’s infrastructure and its negative effects on the lives of settlers. George Heinrich von Langsdorf was a doctor and naturalist who served on an 1803 Russian expedition around the world, after which he spent a year in Santa Catarina, Brazil. In 1813, Langsdorf returned to Brazil as the Russian consul. During his service, he established a coffee-plantation where he played host to several visiting European naturalists, including Johann Baptist von Spix and Karl Friedrich von Martius, whose work is discussed below.² In 1821, Langsdorf published *Observations Regarding Brazil*, which he intended as a guide to the country for potential German emigrants.

On the whole, Langsdorf is quite positive about Brazil as a destination for German settlement. He praises the weather as mild, climate as healthy, and soil as productive.³ However, he is quite pointed in his criticism of Brazil’s infrastructure. Langsdorf writes that outside of the capital, the roads are infamously dangerous and undeveloped. He claims “there is still not a single proper thoroughfare in the whole country”. This slows trade, but also threatens the lives of those entrusted with carrying goods from the interior to the coast; “the caravans that bring the cotton from Minas Novas [Minas Gerais] to the capital on the backs of mules (more than 200 hours away from Rio Janeiro [sic]) … have to cross swamps, marshes, and rivers with risk of death, and often the goods, mules, and drivers perish within sight of the imperial city.” In terms

³ Langsdorf, *Bemerkungen über Brasilien*, 11; 21–2; 15.
of the impact on settlers, Langsdorf decries what he sees as the inertia of the Brazilian government to fix the issue of infrastructure, especially in terms of developing farming in the colonies: “Therefore, as long as the government does not take action in this regard, as long as the farmer cannot bring his goods conveniently to market, the merchants of colonial products can ship colonial products only at risk to his life.”

J. Friedrich von Weech was also struck by the poor quality of Brazilian roads. Weech, from a noble family in Munich, was an agronomist who immigrated to Brazil in 1823 with the intention of starting a farm. When his first attempt failed, he went to Buenos Aires in 1825, returning to Rio de Janeiro a year later. Upon arrival in the capital, he purchased land on the island of Viana in the bay of Rio de Janeiro, as well as 10 slaves, intent on beginning a dairy. This venture failed as well, and he returned to Europe in 1827. On the trip back, he penned 

Brazil’s Current Conditions and Colonial System,

which was a general review of his experiences in Brazil and opinions of the settlement system there.

During his time in Brazil, Weech contrasted the opulence of some parts of the imperial capital with the backward quality of the city’s roads. He writes that foreign visitors to Rio de Janeiro would be amazed at the lavish parties held at the imperial palace, especially by the men’s extravagantly decorated uniforms and the women’s elegant dresses. The imperial garden, so large that it could be explored on horseback, often provided the setting for the extraordinary pageantry of court parties. The whole scene would, Weech muses, “remind the visitor of the glory of the greatest courts of
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Europe.” However, when the foreigner leaves the gates of the palace following the party and tries to exit the city, he will experience the reality of development outside of the sumptuousness of the court; the visitor’s horse will no doubt get stuck in the muddy city streets, and while he tries in vain to free the animal, “this poor traveler has full leisure to reflect on the truth of the adage, ‘All that glitters is not gold.’”

Weech also cited the poor quality of roads in the countryside. In discussing a trip into the interior of Rio de Janeiro province, Weech wrote that the roads were often overgrown, offering great opportunities for robbers to prey on travelers. Moreover, thoroughfares were little more than small paths cut into the wilderness, so a change in weather could render them impassable. In fact, Weech had to delay his journey due only to a few days rain, which left the roads either flooded or inaccessible. During longer periods of precipitation, Weech warns, rural rivers often cover thoroughfares, making travel totally impossible.

In discussing the state of infrastructure in Brazil, Weech, like many other Germanophone authors, related it to the question of German settlement and the impact it had on the efforts of settlers to improve the country. Discussing the Germanophone (Swiss and German) interior settlement of Novo Friburgo, northeast of the capital, Weech writes that the first colonists had to overcome tremendous obstacles, such as adapting to the climate and establishing farms. However, the settlers’ strenuous (and successful) efforts to grow food proved inadequate to increase the colony’s prosperity, since they could not trade with communities outside of the colony: “there was no travelable road, and the road to nearest the port was so bad and dangerous that it could be traversed by

---

7 Ibid., 57.
only mules in the driest weather”. However, without selling their crops, there was no way for the settlers to secure funds to buy mules. So, the settlers “had to suffer need in the midst of abundance,” forced to survive on their own crops, and thus unable to buy basic essentials such as clothing.\(^8\)

While a supporter of German settlement in Brazil, Weech still warned those considering immigrating to the country that the government’s failure to connect colonies with nearby cities through roads or ports along rivers was a substantial obstacle to colonists’ success: “The industrious among the emigrants build up their land with worthy success, but the lack of roads and connection with populated cities does not allow the sale of settlers’ of their harvests’ surplus.” This threatened the specifically German nature of the settlers, Weech argues: “Their home, their kitchen is replete with all kinds of needs, but income is so insignificant that they are forced to dress like the natives, to live like them.”\(^9\) However, Weech remains optimistic that the issue of connecting colonies to markets could be solved, but only through the actions of the settlers themselves. Citing the precedent of German success in Pennsylvania, Weech asserts that “[e]nterprising and insightful farmers will unite and create roads, streets, and mills, without help from the outside.”\(^10\) Hence, the failures of the Brazilian government would be overcome through the strenuous efforts of the Germans.

Emil Lehmann warned those considering immigrating to Brazil that the country’s lack of roads represented a serious threat to colonists’ well-being. Lehmann was an attorney, librarian, and linguist, responsible for translating Dickens’ *The Mystery of* 

\(^8\) Ibid., 222–23.  
\(^9\) Ibid., 236.  
\(^10\) Ibid., 230–31.
Edwin Drood into German. In 1858, he published a series of articles in Berlin’s newly established Preußische Jahrbücher about German emigration generally. These articles, published over three months, were the basis for his book, *German Emigration*. Lehmann wanted his work to serve potential emigrants, for whom migration was a very personal matter, as well as colonial theorists, for whom the *Auswanderung* was a national, economic, and intellectual issue. Lehmann writes that while the number of works regarding emigration multiplied in the 1850s, they often reflected too narrow an interest or viewpoint to appeal to a wider audience.\(^{11}\) Lehmann attempted to buck this trend by casting his net wide; beginning his book with a history of German emigration since the 17\(^{\text{th}}\) century, Lehmann discusses regions of modern German settlement throughout the world, including Eastern Europe, North America, Australia, and Latin America.

However, Lehmann was quite critical of Brazil generally as a destination for Germans. Even Southern Brazil, which Lehmann recognizes as free of the slavery-like conditions that dominate settlement in the sharecropping regions and writes that Germans can sustain “a tolerable existence,” is not recommended, due to the continued restrictions on Protestant marriage and political rights of naturalized citizens.\(^{12}\) However, in addition to such legal issues, the lack of infrastructure is another reason why Germans should avoid Brazil: “A country, whose local population is sunk in the deepest inertia, where road construction is still of the lowest level, and therefore colonists, only with enormous financial sacrifices and efforts can achieve even the smallest mental and physical


\(^{12}\) Ibid., 56.
communication with civilized life from these isolated points [colonies], cannot draw European emigration in any sustainable way.”

The isolation of colonies, due to the lack of roads, hurts the German settlers directly and helps those outside the colony profit off their hard work: “At last, the settler has achieved one or more good harvests. Yes indeed, the rich virgin soil was worth his trouble: He stands in the midst of his bounty, and must, do to the lack of good roads which would allow him to bring his goods to market in the usual German way by wagon, stand there helpless.” Instead, “they sell it [their harvest] for a song to the owner of pack animal herds, who make all the purchases and have all the prices in their hands.”

The European-German press also discussed the poor quality of infrastructure in Brazil. In 1884, the Gartenlaube published a two-part article by Franz Keller-Leuzinger regarding development around the city of Petrópolis in Rio de Janeiro province, where the Brazilian emperor often summered and where a large number of German settlers, principally from the Rhineland, lived. Keller-Leuzinger was an engineer and cartographer who travelled to Brazil with his brother, painter Ferdinand Keller, and their father, who was commissioned to build roads and bridges throughout the country, in 1856. Franz would make a second trip to Brazil in 1873, but the article in the Gartenlaube described his experiences during his first time in the country.

“Road Building and Site of a German Colony in Brazil” opens with Keller-Leuzinger’s trip from Rio de Janeiro to Petrópolis. After a train ride out of the capital, a

13 Ibid.
14 Ibid., 56–7.
15 The Gartenlaube was an extremely popular, with a circulation of nearly 400,000 copies by the mid-1870s, making it the best-selling magazine of its kind in the world. Alves, Das Brasilienbild, 115.
16 Ibid., 122–23.
group of mule-drawn wagons meets the party at the end of the rail-line. Keller-Leuzinger notes how the muddy and steep road proved almost too much for the animals, “who seemed barely to cope with the significant slope and heavy load.” Regarding the road, the author is not impressed with the quality, although the Brazilians seem quite proud of it. “The road,” Keller-Leuzinger writes, “was only recently finished and admired by the Brazilians as a marvel of architecture, despite its significant shortcomings.” Once arriving in Petrópolis, the scene changes markedly, with the clean houses and tree-lined streets prompting the Germans in the party to “believe that we are on the Rhine or the Moseley” and compare the orderly city to “a small German spa town.”17 Here Brazil appears essentially as two different countries: a poorly organized, wild Portuguese land, and a well-ordered, clean German one.

However, once outside the colony, the party is reminded again how undeveloped Brazil is. “Just outside the town begins the grizzly mule track… [that] in the rainy season literally nearly every step forward happens with the greatest effort, sometimes even at the risk of death.” The issue was a combination of challenging terrain and poor design, with the road “here wide, there narrow, for no reason steeply rising and falling again as the path leads alongside the Piabanha [River], [which] in the dry season, [is] a babbling brook, [in] the rainy season, a raging, wild river.” Keller-Leuzinger describes the road as “a sea of reddish brown earth,” nearly impassable, even for the mules. The party later has to get over a group of dead horses, which had become stuck in the mud and died there,
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and boulders blocking the road, before finally arriving at the Public Road for the Province of Minas Gerais.¹⁸

Concerning the Public Road, Keller-Leuzinger describes its condition prior to the arrival of German engineers (after the failure of French engineers to complete the project) as a testament to poor design and execution: “Even after the prolonged drought in the months of June and September…. there still remained on the primary thoroughfare (Hauptstraße) of the empire technical shortcomings from steep slopes and rises (with heights of 1,000 feet and quite often had to be climbed by foot in entirely unnecessary ways), to poor river crossings and bad bridges, insufficient protection for people, animals, and cargo, that the problems, in truth, seemed unbearable.”¹⁹

Keller-Leuzinger’s discussion of the arduous (and successful) German efforts to create a proper road already occurred in Chapter II, but the point is clear: The Brazilian efforts to develop their country’s infrastructure were a failure, and only through the intervention of an outside European party, specifically the Germans, can Brazil move into the ranks of advanced countries.

The notion that Brazil’s lack of infrastructure threatened German settlers in the country did not just relate to getting goods from the settlers to market, but also getting the settlers to the colonies in the first place. In an 1863 article in the Gartenlaube, entitled “A New Warning for Emigrants,” Friedrich Gerstäcker addressed how poor roads played a role in driving German settlers into sharecropping debt.²⁰ Gerstäcker was a prolific writer
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²⁰ More will be discussed regarding the sharecropping, or parceria, system in Chapter IV, but briefly, coffee planters loaned money to German settlers to pay for
and world traveler who published several books on the US, including a three-volume work on his travels down the Mississippi River (*Mississippi-Bilder*) and a three-volume book discussing his journeys throughout much of the Western Hemisphere (*Neue Reisen in Nordamerika, Mexiko, Ecuador, Westindien und Venezuela*). Gerstäcker was also a harsh critic of the sharecropping system.

In “A New Warning,” Gerstäcker notes how the uncertainty of transportation costs once settlers arrive in Brazil can drive the immigrants deep into debt before even leaving Rio de Janeiro. Acknowledging that the cost of transatlantic travel is easy to calculate, Gerstäcker writes that upon arriving in port, it is uncertain, “even very unlikely,” that the mules required for carrying the Germans and their baggage into the interior will be available. Hence, the newly arrived settlers have to accrue debt to survive. Additionally, if colonists arrive shortly after the rainy season, the roads are virtually impassable anyway. “Emigrants of this kind are then often in an unhealthy harbor for weeks, even months, before they can be transported, and living at their own expense,” by which “their debt burden is charged and multiplied by the day.”

---


Hence, German-language sources presented Brazil as a country that lacked anything more than the most rudimentary of infrastructure. Many sources also presented Brazil’s insufficient development as an impediment to German-Brazilian attempts to survive and prosper. As shown in Chapter II, the image of the German settler improving Brazil was fundamental to German-language discussions of the country, and hence thereby acted to contrast the Germans with the allegedly inept Portuguese-Brazilians.

**Portuguese-Brazilians as Indolent**

While presenting Brazil as undeveloped, German-language sources portrayed Portuguese-Brazilians as lazy, suggesting that the course toward Brazilian progress required more than just time, but instead intervention from outside the country. This vision of Portuguese-Brazilians as indolent was widespread on both sides of the German-speaking Atlantic, as evidenced by its appearing in a wide variety of sources, from the popular press, to travelogues, to works by colonial enthusiasts supporting settlement in Southern Brazil. Within the German-Brazilian press, journalists related the alleged Portuguese-Brazilian distaste for work to the claimed settlers’ capacity for work, creating a trope of Portuguese-Brazilian as parasite, living off the labor of the colonists without contributing to the country’s development.

For example, in the European-German popular press, in April 1844, the *Illustrirte Zeitung*, published in Leipzig by Johann Jacob Weber, featured an article entitled “Brazil and Its Relationship to Germany.” This piece was, in part, an introduction to Brazil and, in part, a call for German settlement there. The article praises Brazilian Emperor Dom Pedro II, stressing his education, intelligence, and foresight. The piece argues that the emperor is central to keeping such a vast and sparsely populated country peaceful and
functioning. Beyond Dom Pedro, the article also focuses on the nature of the Brazilians as a people, calling them “a highly heterogeneous mixture.” With regard to that heterogeneous mixture, the article asserts while the emperor had the best intentions and many good plans to speed Brazil’s development, one thing remains absent “to a great degree” in the country: “a capable, hardworking, and industrious population, which understands how to use the resources provided by the wonderful climate and richness of the soil, and has the will and energetic activity to achieve this end above all for the benefit of the country.” Germans, the piece argues, are the solution to this issue. Hence, non-German Brazilians were, according to the article, not up to the task of helping Brazil advance due to their lack of skill and energy.

Reports among European-Germans travellers and scientists also reflected the prevalence of the image of Portuguese-Brazilians as slothful. Johann Jakob von Tschudi was a Swiss naturalist and civil servant. He explored large portions of South America, including Brazil, and later served as the Swiss consul to the country. His most famous book was the five-volume *Trip Through South America*, in which he devoted parts of several volumes to Brazil.
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In this work, Tschudi argues that Brazilians’ laziness and desire to appear powerful help drive them into the civil service, where a Brazilian “can finally satisfy his vanity and his inclination for sweet idleness.” A public position provides the sense of power and respect that Tschudi thinks suits the Portuguese-Brazilian nature. He notes that even when the position is limited in power, the Portuguese-Brazilian uses it to enrich and reward his friends. This generates an even greater sense of respect and further satisfies the Brazilian’s sense of self-importance. Tschudi remarks, however, that one should not expect a Brazilian official to work very hard, as that is contrary to the reason he sought the office in the first place.\(^\text{27}\) In addition to civil service, Tschudi writes that Portuguese-Brazilians aspire to work as traders or merchants. He relates this to the general indolence and distaste for physical labor that marked many Brazilians: “Retail trade requires little mental and just as little physical exertion, and that is a major reason why it is a favorite activity of the Brazilians.”\(^\text{28}\) According to Tschudi, Brazilians choose their careers based on ease above all else.

Pro-Brazilian colonial enthusiasts utilized the image of the indolent Portuguese-Brazilian in attempts to make settlement in the country more attractive.\(^\text{29}\) Hermann Blumenau, introduced in Chapter I, argued that Brazil offered many advantages, such as readily available land and low taxes. However, one advantage in particular should make Brazil attractive to German settlers: the incapacity of indolent Brazilians to compete with industrious Germans. Blumenau writes that while Brazilians were generally courteous

\(^{27}\) Tschudi, *Reisen durch Südamerika*, 1866, 1:240.

\(^{28}\) Ibid., 1:239–240.

\(^{29}\) Besides Blumenau, see Epp, *Rio Grande do Sul oder Neudeutschland*.  
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and even friendly to settlers, the German emigrant soon learns that there are differences between him and his Brazilian neighbors that cannot be overcome:

that in some respects a mutual, intimate understanding and joining-in is difficult or almost impossible, and that at times their (Brazilians’) lethargy and carelessness could exhaust the patience of a saint when dealing with them. At the same time, however, he finds that it is precisely these traits that assure him an advantage he would otherwise not have among a more industrious and energetic people, and that precisely for this reason all the more unexploited avenues of help are at his disposal.  

Hence, according to Blumenau, the Brazilians were so lazy as to be unable to compete in the least with German settlers, whose capacity to work would make them the leading element in Brazilian society.

Claims regarding the inability (or refusal) of Portuguese-Brazilians to work were central to Brazilian-German discussions in the German-language press in Southern Brazil. As discussed in Chapter II, allegations concerning Germans work and settlers’ role in development were central to German-Brazilians’ project to assert their rights to full political and social integration into their new homeland. Allegations concerning Portuguese-Brazilians constructed them as the lazy and incompetent converse to settlers. With this in mind, the trope of the non-German-Brazilian as parasitic was common in the German-Brazilian press. This calculus emphasized how denying settlers rights was an injustice, especially in light of the established injustice of exploitation at the hand of Portuguese-Brazilians.

In September 1863, the *Deutsche Zeitung* published a piece considering the disparity between Brazil’s vast natural resources and its lack of adequate development. The *Deutsche Zeitung* was the leading German-language newspaper in Rio Grande do Sul
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30 Blumenau, *Deutsche Kolonie Blumenau*, 16.
at the time, and the only such newspaper in the provincial capital of Porto Alegre between 1861 and 1871.\footnote{Rambo, “A História da Impresna,” 64–5; Rambo, Cem anos, 292–4.}

In “The Natural Wealth of Brazil,” the author argues that central to this gap between the country’s near limitless potential and disappointing reality was the attitude of the Brazilians towards exploiting their land’s natural wealth. He writes “one marvels when considering all the many types of products that rot unused in the Brazilian lap, since the people need only extend their hand to gain the greatest treasures.”\footnote{Note that unless otherwise noted, German-Brazilian newspaper articles were published without reference to a specific author. “Der natürliche Reichthum Brasiliens,” Deutsche Zeitung, September 19, 1863. “} Brazilians, however, are unwilling to take advantage of their country’s abundance, promoting the author to muse wistfully that “perhaps one [the Brazilian] wanted to remain more pious than Adam and Eve and not fall into sin,” and thus refused to pick the fruits of their own Eden.\footnote{Ibid.}

The author argues that natural wealth, without the proper intelligence to realize how to exploit it and the industriousness to turn this desire into action, is wasted, citing the example of Spain, where wide-spread poverty remains despite the country’s vast natural potential. The problem, according to the piece, is one of the Portuguese-Brazilian people, as well as the Brazilian leadership: Despite the natural riches in the country, and even the financial wealth created by the export economy, “the [Brazilian] people \textit{Volk} are still poor; poor in the genuine pleasures of life, as much in the spiritual as in the material.”\footnote{Ibid.} Hence, the author believes a failure of spirit among Portuguese-Brazilians renders them unable to improve the country. As discussed in Chapter II, this article also
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asserts that the Germans, with their industrious spirit, are the solution to this problem. In this way, the piece stresses Portuguese-Brazilian laziness while also emphasizing German diligence.

In examining the evolution of Brazilians’ attitude towards labor, Brazilian-German liberal journalists often looked disapprovingly at the country’s colonial heritage. An 1861 article in the Deutsche Zeitung, entitled simply “Brazil,” begins by asserting that Latins in general are poor colonizers, while the Germans are supremely qualified as settlers: “today it is certain that the Roman race [Romanische Race] (French, Italians, Spanish, Portuguese) is not suitable for colonization, and for this purpose only the Germanic race can be used.” In discussing Brazil specifically, the author traces the country’s distorted work ethic and lack of development to the influence of the Portuguese.

The author contends that for centuries, Portuguese settlers arrived with little knowledge of agriculture and were unwilling to learn in that most arrived in the colony either as bureaucrats or as military adventurers. Both groups sought to enrich themselves as quickly as possible, and were willing to achieve this end my any means necessary. This attitude towards farming and government service remains the rule in Brazil, even after independence: “We still see the Brazilians themselves, with few exceptions, following the same system that was used previously on the part of the mother country.” The result is a massive and utterly corrupt system of rule, designed for self-enrichment instead of the public good.

35 “Brasilien,” Deutsche Zeitung, August 17, 1861.
36 Ibid.
However, the author asserts, this created something much more insidious than just an ineffective and bloated government: The very notion of work itself became perverted, wherein Portuguese-Brazilians came to see physical labor, or even working in the crafts, as something beneath them: “among us [Germans] stands in honor the class of the craftsman as well as that of the artisan, here we see [them] only in the hands of foreigners, or Negros and half-breeds; the vast majority of Brazilians, however, only turn either to trade, or the military or the state service.”

The author argues that this left the German settlers responsible for improving the country, in that their Portuguese-Brazilian neighbors and Brazilian government officials are unsuited to the task: “You [the German settler] are a son of God, so help yourself. Expect nothing from the government and everything from yourself, and, in this way, you will soon be helped.”

The Brazilian-German press related the question of Portuguese-Brazilians’ distaste for work with the settler situation by portraying the relationship between the former with the latter as parasitic. This was often in the context of discussions of colonists’ political rights. In September 1869, the Deutsche Zeitung complained that the Portuguese-Brazilians are more than willing to use German colonists for service in the National Guard or on juries, but when a settler demands political equality, Brazilian politicians label him a “renegade.” Citing the make-up of the São Leopoldo city government, the author cites that Portuguese-Brazilian leaders object to any committees that are German-Brazilian only, despite that the local tax base is essentially German
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alone, and that those few Portuguese-Brazilians living in the town were speculators “want to live by the sweat of the colonists” instead of working for themselves.\(^{39}\)

A *Deutsche Zeitung* article a few months later, also on the poor legal standing of German-Brazilians, referred to the non-German colonial administrator as the “Brazilian village tyrant” who sees Germans as little more than slaves; according to the piece, willing to let the German colonists do all the work of clearing the land and creating farms, these administrators often force the settlers off their land once the work is done.\(^{40}\) Another *Deutsche Zeitung* article, this one from November 1877, warns that full political and religious equality for naturalized citizens is necessary, but so too is a shift in Portuguese-Brazilian culture that sees all foreigners, naturalized or otherwise, with suspicion. This suspicion is, according to the article, based in part on the Portuguese-Brazilian distaste for work: “Every Brazilian believes he is born in Arcadia and thinks he is necessarily better than the foreigner who comes to his country,” since the immigrant works hard to establish a new life. Preferring “sweet idleness” to labor, the Portuguese-Brazilian looks down on foreigners, while depending on immigrants and slaves to keep the economy running.\(^{41}\)

In an 1882 *Koseritz’ Deutsche Zeitung* article, rather undiplomatically called “Bloodsuckers,” the author decries a culture of parasitism among Portuguese-Brazilians, and especially among colonial administrators, wherein they depend only on the work of others and avoid any themselves. The author claims that Brazilian officials treated the German colonists with disdain for no more reason than that Germans work in the fields,

\(^{39}\) “Die Naturalisationsfrage.”
\(^{40}\) “Die hiesigen Rechtsverhältnisse und die Deutschen,” *Deutsche Zeitung*, December 8, 1869.
\(^{41}\) “Die große Naturalisation,” *Deutsche Zeitung*, November 3, 1877.
which the Portuguese-Brazilians sees as dishonorable: “Such work these people would never do, as if they are princes born in Arcadia and therefore princes by blood. Manual labor debases a man in their eyes.” German settlers, the author claims, are left to fend for themselves in the opening years of a colony. However, after the Germans clear the forests and build roads, “an army of [non-German-Brazilian] clerks” descends on the settlement, taking as much from the colonists as possible while giving nothing back in return.42

**Explaining Portuguese-Brazilian Indolence- The Moral Meaning of Climate**

Hence, the image of the Portuguese-Brazilian as incompetent and indolent was present in both Germanophone Europe and Brazil. However, what was it according to these sources that made non-German-Brazilians so lazy? In addressing why Brazilians were languid, and thereby unsuited to develop the country, the issue of climate was sometimes raised. However, the notion that dependence on slavery was to blame for Portuguese-Brazilian sloth, not the effects of humidity or heat, was the dominant discourse in German sources on both sides of the Atlantic.

The idea that tropical environments produced indolence and degeneration has a long history. Scholars of European thought regarding the connection between climate and behavior refer to the European paradigm of understanding the tropics as “tropicality.” David Arnold defines tropicality as “a belief in the intrinsic ‘inferiority’ of tropical as opposed to temperate environments and hence in the primitivism of the social and cultural systems to which the tropics gave rise.”43 Beginning in the ancient world and
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continuing well into the modern age, Europeans have seen the tropics as a zone of “otherness.” Additionally, Europeans have long asserted that the environment impacted (to varying extents) human behavior, including not only physical development, but mental and moral as well.

Two basic tropes existed, often simultaneously, in the European vision of the tropics in relation to its impact on work ethic. The first was that of the tropics as a paradise of abundance, in fact, overabundance that rendered residents lazy. The other was that of the tropics as an oppressively hot and humid region, the effects of both also led to indolence.

Regarding the image of the tropics as abundant to a demoralizing point, this discourse existed since the discovery of the New World, but Philip Curtain writes that by the eighteenth century, the “full-fledged myth of tropical exuberance” was common in Europe. The basic premise of this notion was that since the tropical environment produced food so easily, residents did not have work to survive and this rendered them indolent.
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For example, John Crawfurd was surgeon, Fellow of the Royal Society, and leading member of the Ethnological Society of London. He lived in Southeast Asia for a time, and in 1820, he published his three volume *History of the Indian Archipelago*. In it, he asserts that peoples living in the tropics are marked by weakness and despotism. “The cause of this phenomenon is in good measure… the softness and fruitfulness of the climate, and the consequent facility of living with little exertion.” Able to survive without working, tropical peoples lack “habits of hardihood, enterprise, and independence” that is necessary for true freedom and civilization.\(^48\) Alfred Russel Wallace was a British naturalist and biologist who spent time in both Brazil and the Malay Archipelago. In discussing the eastern region of that archipelago, Wallace concluded that the fecundity of the area had an adverse effect on the local peoples: “This excessive cheapness of food is… a curse rather than a blessing. It leads to great laziness… The habit of industry not being acquired by stern necessity, all labour is distasteful.” Wallace theorizes that if the whole planet was as verdant as the tropics, “the human race might have remained for a longer period in the low state of civilization” that he finds among natives in the eastern archipelago.\(^49\)

In the case of German discussions of alleged Portuguese-Brazilian laziness, authors generally did not assert a connection between abundance and laziness. For example, G.H. von Langsdorf calls the assumption that the natural abundance of Brazil


meant that no one worked “very hasty in the least.”\textsuperscript{50} In fact, many Germanophone authors stressed how hard settlers had to work to succeed there.\textsuperscript{51}

The second trope concerning the tropics and laziness related to climate, wherein heat and humidity deleteriously impacted people, and Europeans especially. The relation between temperature and moral/physical development has a long history in European thought. Sixteenth-century thinker Jean Bodin argued that heat produced drunkenness and lust in Europeans, although hotter regions tended to yield better philosophers, since the heat cultivated a stronger sense for inward thinking. According to Bodin, colder climates help spur people to external forms of work, such as the crafts and the arts.\textsuperscript{52} In the seventeenth century, French poet Guillaume de Salluste du Bartas described the Garden of Eden as a temperate place, while in the eighteenth century, Bernard Le Bovier de Fontenelle argued that extremes of heat and cold were not conducive to scientific thinking. Many Europeans thinkers saw heat as detrimental to mental and moral development. Trader and traveller Sir John Chardin asserted that hot climates slowed people’s thinking, and Scottish physician John Arbuthnot argued that constant heat produced laziness due to a lack of expansion and contraction of “Fibres” (sic) that greater variations in temperature produced.\textsuperscript{53}

In 1748, Scottish philosopher David Hume wrote that those living in the extreme cold and heat were “inferior to the rest of the species, and are incapable of all the higher

\textsuperscript{50} Langsdorf, \textit{Bemerkungen über Brasilien}, 23–4.
attainments of the human mind.” However, while he believed that people in the coldest climates were crippled by “poverty and misery” brought on by their struggles surviving in the harsh environment, indolence was the weakness of those from warmer climates. Hume argued that while there were many examples of early intellectual contributions from the warmer regions of Southern Europe, it was Northern European countries where recent advances occurred, while thinkers in the south grew less productive.\footnote{David Hume, “Of National Characters,” in The Philosophical Works of David Hume, vol. 3 (Boston; Edinburgh: Little, Brown and Co.; A. and C. Black, 1854), 228–230–1.}

In 1748’s The Spirit of the Laws, Baron de Montesquieu asserted that due in part to the positive effects of cold on blood flow, cold climates produced more energetic people, while heat robbed residents of warmer regions of their initiative and rendered them lazy. He also argued that people from colder regions were braver and less prone to cunning. He related those from warmer areas to old men, calling them “timorous” and lacking the courage that marked northerners. Furthermore, warmer regions breed a strong love of pleasure that is lacking in the coldest areas and well-balanced in temperate zones. This imbalance fueled a passion that dominated southerners, producing an immorality that did not plague those in the north: “If we travel towards the North, we meet with people who have few vices… If we draw near the South, we fancy ourselves entirely removed from the verge of morality.”\footnote{Charles Louis de Secondat de Montesquieu, “Of Laws in Relation to the Nature of Climate,” in The Spirit of the Laws, trans. Thomas Nugent (New York, NY: Hafner, 1949), 221–4.}

German thinkers, too, saw climate as shaping humanity’s development. Eberhardt August Wilhelm von Zimmermann, a zoologist and geographer best known for his three volume Geographical History of Man and General Diffused Quadrupeds, asserted that
climate was central to the development of the races, although he saw environmental
influence as malleable and temporary. In the first volume of the Geographical History,
compared the racial character of Europeans and Africans, including those of African
descent living in the United States. He called White Europeans “actually comparatively
wiser and more active” than Blacks, but this was “a consequence of climate” and not
permanent. In fact, he argued that if a group of Senegalese Africans were relocated to a
cold climate, such as Denmark, and allowed to live on their own without mixing with the
native Europeans, the Africans would, after some time, become “Nordic white,” by which
he meant not only in terms of their appearance, but also their mental capacities.56 Hence,
in Zimmermann’s racial system, climate was the determining factor, and hotter climates
bred a slowness of mind and activity.

Christophe Meiners also believed that climate made people mentally and
physically weak. Meiners was a historian and philosopher who believed was a vocal
defender of polygyny, or the notion that different races were actually wholly different
species. While in the minority of German philosophers by supporting polygyny, Meiners
was nevertheless highly influential.57 In fact, John Zammito argues that Immanuel Kant
and Johann Blumenbach first became engaged with the question of race so as to counter
Meiners.58
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Regarding climate’s effect on people, Meiners believed it was central to the physical and mental development of the races. In his *Outline of the History of Humanity*, Meiners wrote that the “strongest men and nations only… live in the mildest climates.” He argued that due in part to the effect of climate, the Caucasians possessed “not only greater strength of body, but also of mind,” and that both of these traits were due in no small part to the cooler climate in which Caucasians developed. Meiners also argued that warmer environments had a deleterious effect on peoples, writing that “even the noblest of human natures are inevitably corrupted and degraded in certain areas and climates,” of which he cited Africa, Southeast Asia, most of India, and assorted regions of South America.

In their discussions of Portuguese-Brazilians and their alleged laziness, some German writers did assert a climatic explanation. J. Friedrich von Weech wrote that climate, combined with a cavalier attitude toward religion, “seems to awaken too soon some natural instinct which was supposed to lie dormant until a person is developed fully,” and this leads very young Brazilians to become sexually active. This, in turn, leads to the loss of vitality and energy among young Brazilian men: “the decrepit young figures, the lack of the bold fire that is normally so beautiful in the youth, is only too clearly visible on the pale and lifeless faces of the urban youth.” Having lost their energy through this “early enervation,” young Brazilians turn to even greater debauchery, and in doing so, risk the future of their country.

---

60 Ibid., 64–5.
Thomas Davatz also connected Brazilians’ immorality and indolence to the effects of climate. Davatz was selected by the Swiss government to investigate alleged mistreatment of Swiss settlers in the sharecropping system in São Paulo. He penned a scathing report that accused Portuguese-Brazilian planters of a host of abuses, prompting further investigations in Brazil and outrage in the European German press.62

Regarding the impact of climate on Brazilians, Davatz writes that the Brazilians are unable to control their passions, often leading not only to fights, but even murder. Furthermore, Brazilians are marked by a love of idleness. Davatz relates all of this to heat and humidity, writing that “[t]hose vices… are promoted throughout the Brazilian’s life by the luxuriance of the tropical climate.”63 Like Weech, Davatz argues that the heat drove Brazilians, and the young especially, to succumb to their base sexual desires, leading to a loss of vitality and adolescents marrying too early. However, in the subtropical region of southern Brazil, Davatz argues, there are many people who live to an exceptionally old age: “People of more than 100 years should be no great rarity, indeed some of these will live to 120-130 years of age.”64 Davatz hence makes a distinction between the hotter climates of northern Brazil and the cooler region of southern Brazil.

Beyond relating climate to Portuguese-Brazilian indolence, Germanophone authors also expressed concern regarding the impact of the climate on Germans settling in the country. Carl Schlichthorst, a German who served as a mercenary in the Brazilian
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army between 1820 and 1822, in part blames climatic effects for the laziness of native-born Brazilians. Still, he writes that the “person born in the southern lands has many and great faults,” but that Brazilians balance such faults, including a tendency to lie and a general laziness, with their friendly nature and tendency to avoid over-drinking. However, the hot climate affects the Germans, and Northern Europeans in general, terribly: “almost all northerners who live in hot climates do not bear the particular virtue of their people, they merge in a very short time with the vices of the natives and their national faults.” German settlers bear none of the loyalty that Schlichthorst sees as marking European-Germans, instead turning to indolence and drunkenness.

Some Germanophone writers believed that Germans could not work in tropical heat. J. Friedrich von Weech argued that slavery was a necessity in tropical environments. According to Weech, Europeans are unsuited to the much of the climate in Brazil, making intensive farming impossible for them: “it as erroneous view of many learned men, that Europeans, in the hot climate of the tropics for the duration of their stay, could perform the same work previously done by the Negro.” Weech argues that based on his own experience with Europeans in Brazil, even the hardest working settlers lose their vitality within two years, reducing them subsistence farming. In his entry “Regarding Emigration” in 1847’s _Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft_, Robert von Mohl echoed Weech’s opinion that Europeans, and Germans in particular, could not
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work in the tropical heat. Mohl writes that “there can be no doubt that tropical countries are not good for Europeans, especially for Germans. Such climatic conditions do not allow members of the Caucasian tribe to work outdoors, and detrimental to their health, and nearly compel slave-holding.”

Slavery and Indolence - European and American Discourses

However, while some German authors believed the tropical climate was to blame for Brazilian laziness, Germanophone writers focused principally on slavery and its effect on the Brazilian view of and approach toward work as an explanation. According to these writers, slavery made Brazilians lazy, and this in turn helped make them incapable of advancing the country as they should.

The notion that slavery made slave-owners immoral and indolent was unique neither to Germanophone thinkers nor the Brazilian context. For example, Montesquieu recognized that slavery tended to breed immorality among both slaves and masters. He wrote that slavery in its extreme form (versus the milder slavery of the ancient world) robs slaves of the virtue that should be driving their actions, since they worked completely for someone else’s benefit. Slavery also affects slave-owners, making them “fierce, hasty, severe, choleric, voluptuous, and cruel.” Slavery was also contrary to good government, as it allowed one group to gain power and wealth through the work of others. However, while objecting to slavery in the abstract, Montesquieu argued that the
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enslavement of Africans was justified for racial reasons, arguing that “it is impossible for us to suppose these creatures to be men,” as well as climatic reasons, asserting that in the hottest regions of the planet, Europeans could not work and therefore required labor from some group better equipped to deal with the heat.71

Long before German settlers began arriving in Brazil, August Ferdinand Lueder, a German historian, political economist, and among the earliest proponents of Adam Smith in Germany, argued that slavery, in addition to creating immorality through sexual licentiousness and concubine, also destroyed the appreciation of work as noble among the slave-owning classes. Even in the ancient world, Lueder argues, those houses that grew to depend on slaves entirely became demoralized, coming to expect “bread without work.” According to Lueder, this was now the case in Russia and Poland, where “masters produce nothing themselves and we find that slaves make up the entirety or almost the entirety of the productive class.” The effect of this, Lueder writes, was devastating to society: “Everywhere, slavery diminished the spirit, it instilled the humility of a dog, it made men slovenly and lazy, it fed the vice of gluttony, it exterminated every nobler sensation and made master as callous as slave, - how could in development of the spirit be common in slave-holding lands?”72

European travellers in the U.S. often commented on the effects of slavery on American Southerners. In the first volume of his most famous work, Democracy in America, Alexis de Tocqueville argued that those in the North were more industrious and active than Southerners, in large part due to the effect of slavery on the Southern work
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ethic. The Northerner, Tocqueville writes, “sees no slaves around him in his childhood,” and thus “is usually obliged to provide for his own wants.” Forced to make his own way in the world to survive, the Northerner has little choice but to be diligent in his pursuits. Furthermore, Tocqueville argues that, unlike the Southerner who becomes used to reacting violently to challengers, the Northerner learns to earn consent through kindness, thereby becoming “patient, reflecting, tolerant, slow to act, and persevering in his designs.”

According to Tocqueville, Southerners were marked by a lack of ambition and (often violent) impatience, both of which due to slavery. Raised dealing with (allegedly) obsequious slaves, the Southerner “becomes a sort of domestic dictator from infancy,” and this sense of superiority defines how he approaches everyone with whom he deals. Besides making the Southerner excessively forceful, the dependence on slaves to provide “the more pressing wants of life” also spurs a love of luxury and indulgence. However, the trait that slavery produces most marking the Southerner, Tocqueville writes, was laziness: “nothing obliges him to exert himself in order to subsist… he gives way to indolence and does not even attempt what would be useful.”

English traveller and author James Silk Buckingham toured the American South and published a two-volume work in the early 1840s on his travels in the region. In this work, Buckingham made frequent reference to the role of slavery rendering many in the South unwilling to work. For example, outside of Red Sulphur Spring, at the time a part of Virginia, Buckingham and his party came across a group of settlers whom
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Buckingham said were, up until that point, the dirtiest people he had met in the United States. In fact, he wrote that this community was filthier and lazier than any “negroes, Indians, or savages among the wildest tribes of Africa or Australia.” Buckingham argues that the residents’ indolence was the source of their poverty, and that slavery was the foundation of this indolence; citing region’s moderate climate and productive soil, Buckingham asserts that the residents, if they were only willing to work, would be able to “lay a surplus every year and progressively get rich.” However, slavery had perverted their vision of labor itself, making the slave-owners see it as dishonorable: “but having negro slaves to do their work, they seem to think labour an evil to be studiously avoided; so that their dwellings and persons are dirty, and comfortless in the extreme.”

In discussing White Southerners as a whole, Buckingham believed that they were generally lazy, and that slavery was a primary cause of their unwillingness to work. “Industry,” he wrote, “in the sense in which we understand that term… is rarely seen among the white inhabitants of the South.” White Southerners, preferred to make money through trading and dealing than through strenuous activity, and “hard work is certainly more distasteful to them than to the same class of persons in England.” Groups of idle white young men, relaxing on porches and doing nothing, are a common sight throughout the South, Buckingham observed, “because the negro slaves can do the work.” White Southern women refuse to do housework and properly dress or bathe their children, because they relied totally on female slaves for these duties. Buckingham rejected the notion that the heat of the South prevented Whites from working, citing a large group of Irish and German immigrants successfully digging ditches who “bore the labour well,”

---

although they would have worked better had they been sober. Slavery, Buckingham determined, was among the leading reasons for Southern torpor: “The slave-system is, no doubt, one powerful cause of this general indolence and dirtiness of the whites, among the farmers and peasantry of the South.”

German travellers also cited the connection between slavery and indolence. In his travels in the Southern U.S., Julius Fröbel noted the impact of slavery on White Southerners. Fröbel was a Frankfurt Parliamentarian who later lived in the U.S., where he worked as a journalist and became a citizen. Prior to returning to Europe, Fröbel also toured parts of Central America. In 1857/1858, he published *From America: Experiences, Trips and Studies*, which details his journeys throughout the US and Central Latin America, as well as discussions of American politics, society and culture.

Discussing his time in Virginia, Fröbel writes that slavery produces indolence and neglect among slave-owners, while making slaves violent and rebellious. He asserts only through the immigration of small-holding farmers and craftsmen can the region be saved, since such people “not only bring the custom of free labor with them, but they also retain it.” Free farmers, growing food instead of cotton, and artisans would thrive in Virginia, Frobel argues, and with that society would be transformed: “and by the success of their industry, which occurs before everyone’s eyes, they create at the same time the most striking evidence that the current backwardness of the country has its sole basis in slavery.” Furthermore, Fröbel argues that “able white workers, so long as they are not
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demoralized by the example of slave labor,” are far more efficient than slaves, asserting that for every healthy and industrious free (White) laborer, one needs twelve slaves.”

Abolitionists also argued that slavery led to laziness among slave-owners. Speakers at the New York Anti-Slavery Convention at Peterboro, held on 22 October, 1835, argued that slavery led to laziness, violence, and general moral degeneration:

“Where slavery is, there are cherished indolence, pampered passions, eager, insatiable appetites. There vice grows rank like dunghill weeds.” In her *An Appeal in Favor of that Class of Americans Called Africans*, first published in 1833, abolitionist Lydia Maria Child not only focused on the harm the institution did to slaves, but also on the deleterious effects it had on slave-owners. She wrote that “in the habit of slavery are concentrated the strongest evils of human nature — vanity, pride, love of power, licentiousness, and indolence.” She argues that in the American South, as in any society in which “all the labor is done by one class there must of course be another class who live in indolence.” This, Child asserts, creates contempt for work among free people and “usefulness becomes degradation.” This was especially true of manual labor, which
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Child writes becomes “a degradation to white people” in societies wherein slaves dominate the workforce, and thereby “indolence becomes the prevailing characteristic.”

Portuguese-Brazilians leaders, too, saw a connection between owning slaves and lassitude among masters. No less than Dom Pedro I, the first emperor of Brazil, believed that dependence on slaves warped Brazilians’ notion of work. Writing under the pseudonym “O Filantropo,” Dom Pedro penned a letter to the editor published on 30 May, 1823, in O Espelho (The Mirror), a newspaper in Rio de Janeiro, in which he called for recruiting European immigrants to help break Brazil’s dependence on slave labor. In the letter, the emperor cited an engrained distaste for work among slavery’s effects: “We cease to be industrious, do not seek a way to earn a living, working neither for private or public benefit; we do not innovate to survive, because anyone who has a slave sends him out to make money.” Dom Pedro asserted that masters did not care if the slave stole or even killed to bring home some earnings, as long as the slave gave the master his due. Hence, the emperor believed that slavery created a culture of both immorality and idleness among free Brazilians.

In his 1845 pamphlet, The Substitution of Slave Labor by Free Workers in Brazil, Henrique Velloso de Oliveira echoed Dom Pedro I’s concerns regarding the impact of slavery on the Brazilian approach to work. De Oliveira was a judge in the Court of Appeals in Recife who, at one point, spent time touring Europe with funds from the

---

82 Ibid., 77.
83 Beyond the authors discussed in this chapter, see Costa, Memória sobre a necessidade de abolir; José Eloy Pessoa da Silva, Memória sobre a escravatura e projeto de colonização de europeus e de pretos da África no Império do Brasil (Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Plancher, 1826); Frederico Leopoldo Cesar Burlamaque, Memoria analytica a’cerca do commercio d’escravos e a’cerca dos malles da escravidão domestica (Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Typographia commercial fluminense, 1837).
Brazilian government. He initially wrote his invective against slavery in 1842, but claimed he feared retribution by the slave-owning class, prompting him to delay its publication.  

In The Substitution, de Oliveira stresses the moral and cultural necessity of work, writing that “work is the source that originally raised people with all that necessary and useful in life. the only difference there is between a civilized people and a savage people, between a powerful people and an ignoble people, between a great people and a minor people, is that one works and the other does not… If the people work, then everything works.” Promoting work, de Oliveira claimed, would totally transform Brazilian society, bringing peace, order, and morality. Furthermore, making work noble to and common among free Brazilians would help revitalize both the physical and the intellectual body of the country, since the “dissolute and enervated body of an idler… does not have sufficiently animated spirits to produce a man of genius, a Loke [sic], a Newton.” Slavery is the root cause of Brazil’s social and moral problems, de Oliveira argues, and far from being the best means of addressing the country’s labor shortage, the institution has reduced much of the economy to total dependence on slavery and to open rejection of free labor: slavery has managed to “whet the appetite of some industries, of whom one might say, once having tasted human flesh, they reject all other nourishment,
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and want nothing more than to devour men.”\textsuperscript{88} Thus, according to de Oliveira, slavery reduced Brazilians to idleness, stifled their moral and intellectual development, and made them dependent on others for work.

In 1875, João Cardoso de Menezes e Souza, a deputy from the province of Goiás, asserted a similar critique in his report on immigration policy to the Ministry of Agriculture. Menezes e Souza feared that the indolence of native-born Brazilians, created by slavery, would even corrupt European settlers: “The repugnance, almost invincible, manifested by the Brazilian for manual labor, \textcolor{red}{which the slave has degraded}, also influences the agricultural or industrial foreigner, who emigrated (sic) to Brazil” [Emphasis added]. He expressed concern that the Brazilian culture of idleness, combine with the effects of climate, would overcome the European immigrant, and thus “[the immigrant] loses his energy and adopts… the habits of those around him.”\textsuperscript{89}

This is not to say that the impact on masters was the primary anxiety of those Brazilians expressing concern regarding slavery. Throughout the Brazilian Empire, social and economic questions concerning slavery were common. With regard to society, there was anxiety among the Portuguese-Brazilian elite regarding the incapacity of slaves ever to integrate, creating a “heterogeneous society” that could, it was feared, disintegrate into violence. In 1821, João Severiano Maciel da Costa wrote \textit{Memoir regarding the need to abolish the introduction of slaves to Brazil}, wherein he called for a gradual end to the slave trade. Da Costa served a host of roles in the Brazilian government, including in the Constituent Assembly, as president of Bahia province, and Minister of Foreign Trade and
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Agriculture. He saw some benefit in slavery, especially in helping remove Africans from what he saw as the terrible conditions on that continent: “the status of Africans in their sad homeland (if it deserves this name) is horrible… without morality, without laws, in unending and barbarous war… suffering cruel captivity.” The anarchy and savagery of Africa makes those living there nearly animals, “practically vegetating barely above mindlessness.” Coming from such an environment, it is not surprising that slaves are so irrational and savage, despite what da Costa claims is kind treatment by most Brazilian masters: “everywhere large-landowners… such as the masters of sugar plantations, feed, dress, treat the infirmities of their slaves.”
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So, in spite of the allegedly honorable efforts of Brazilian masters to care for their
slaves, the enslaved remained unassimilated. The question remained, what was to be
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done with this “heterogeneous population, incompatible with whites,” so as to guarantee that they would not turn to mass violence against the rest of society, as slaves did in Saint-Dominque. The first step was ending the slave trade, so as to gradually decrease the number of especially savage slaves directly from Africa. Once the trade ended, masters could emancipate slaves whom they believed had learned the value of work. Freedmen, too, had to be taught to work, or else coerced to work by the state. Da Costa also called for training Amerindians and integrating them into the workforce. Da Costa quoted Tacitus, “remedies act slower than diseases,” to warn that this process could take decades.

This is not to say that the social impact of slavery was da Costa’s lone concern. He believed that the availability of slaves left Brazilian planters in a position to reject innovation, which in turn wasted resources and hurt the Brazilian character; instead of rationally planning plantations, da Costa argued, planters simply slashed and burned whole forests, and once the land stopped producing as it once had, a new area was cleared: “we have not taken a single step in perfecting farming,” da Costa complained.
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Furthermore, this approach failed to render a class of farmers whom he saw a necessary for a strong society; “nor will we have created that portion of people, who farmed through love of work and pouring sweat, such as formed throughout Europe the most solid and vigorous population.” Thus, da Costa was concerned with the effect slavery had on Brazilian planters’ approach to their labor, but on the whole, he was more troubled with slavery’s creating a dangerous, disaffected segment of Brazilian society.

In 1823, José Bonifácio de Andrada e Silva, Prime Minister at the time, drafted a plan for the gradual emancipation of slavery. In it, Silva echoed da Costa’s concerns regarding the institution’s creating a massive and dangerous sector of Brazilian society that could turn violent, and hence needed to be integrated somehow. Referring to slavery as “a fatal gift” and “a plague that fell upon” Brazil, Silva, too, laments that the institution allowed planters to maintain the simplest farming techniques, reducing Brazilian agriculture to “a blind routine from ancient times.” Stuck in this mode of thinking, planters ignore innovations from overseas, “introduced by the European spirit of work in processes of industry.”

Still, like da Costa, Silva’s primary concern was slaves’ forming a threatening element in Brazilian society, and again like da Costa, he called for the gradual abolition of slavery, first through ending the slave trade. Doing so would integrate slaves into the Brazilian social and political system: “It is time,” Silva wrote, “we end this traffic, so barbaric and butchering. It is also time that we gradually end the vestiges of slavery among us, so that we will form, in a few generations, one homogeneous nation, without
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which we will never be truly free, respected, and happy.” “It is the greatest need,” Silva believed, “to go ending so much physical and civil heterogeneity.” He had faith that with training, slaves and freemen could become fully integrated into Brazilian society.98

By the 1830s, fears regarding slavery’s creating a “heterogeneous society” became more radical.99 The Defender Society for Liberty and National Independence in Rio de Janeiro held a competition for the best work explicating why slavery needed to be done away with and how it could be replaced. One of the submissions was *Analytical Memoir Regarding the Commerce of Slaves and Regarding the Evils of Domestic Slavery*, written by Frederico Leopoldo Cezar Burlamaque, born in Piauí in northeastern Brazil and possessor of a doctorate in natural sciences.100 In this book, Burlamaque condemned slavery not only as immoral, but also as having created a dangerously heterogeneous society of the enslaved and the free. Unlike previous thinkers on this subject, Burlamaque was highly pessimistic as to the capacity of these two groups to coexist.

He opens *Analytical Memoir* by condemning slavery as “a fruitful source of immorality, despotism, and destruction” for the country. Slavery had hindered the development of Brazilian industries, as well as prevented “the spread of civilization.” However, beyond this, the most insidious effect of slavery was to create a mass of slaves, whom Burlamaque calls “a numerous race of domestic enemies, whose sole aim must be

the destruction of their oppressors.”101 Divided in this way, Brazilian society was doomed to failure unless this situation could be addressed: “murders, poisonings, and all the accelerating evils shall be common in a country divided into enemy races. Never will such an association form a homogeneous nation, rather one of heterogeneous merger of foreign individuals which will always be enemies to each other, alternatively oppressors and oppressed, full of prejudices, and always ready to take up arms.”102 Burlamaque was unsure if the violence that he alleged marked the behavior of “individuals of the black race” was due to the brutality they suffered as slaves or due to their biological inferiority, but either way, he saw them as inferior, calling them “stupid” and possessing a spirit “of negligence and unpredictability,” as well as dangerous, claiming they “vegetate in a state closely resembling that of the most brutish beast.”103

While thinkers such as da Costa and Silva believed that slaves could be educated and civilized, Burlamaque argued that this was pointless, asserting instead that, as the Americans had in Liberia, Brazil should create colonies in Africa and settle the slaves there; to facilitate this, the government ought to provide transportation across the Atlantic, farming equipment, and food to allow the ex-slaves to begin farming. Prior to leaving, slaves should also receive civil and religious instruction, so that the freedmen could contribute to the civic life of the colony. The government should also train a select group of slaves to become priests, to provide spiritual guidance in the African
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settlements. The Brazilian state should be the first to free its slaves and send them overseas, thereby creating an example for all Brazilian slave-owners to follow.\textsuperscript{104}

Hence, while Portuguese-Brazilians were concerned with the deleterious effect of slavery on the country’s work ethic and approach to innovation, they were also fretful of the rift the institution created between the enslaved and free, producing a “heterogeneous society,” the capacity of which to remain stable was questionable. As discussed in Chapter II, European immigrants, and especially Germans, seemed to offer the solution to all of these issues.

**Explaining Portuguese-Brazilian Indolence- The Impact of Slavery**

Hence, the notion that slavery bred indolence among slave-owners was commonly held throughout Europe and even in the Americas. However, in light of German-language claims regarding the incapacity of Portuguese-Brazilians to develop their country, the power of German settlers to civilize Brazil and Brazilians, and the alleged relationship between settlers and slavery (the latter two being discussed in Chapter II and IV respectively), the connection between Portuguese-Brazilian and slavery-induced indolence was fundamental to creating the image of Brazil as a land in need of German intervention. Germanophone authors’ connecting Portuguese-Brazilian laziness and slavery existed from the outset of German settlement and continued through the abolition of slavery in 1888, appeared in both European- and Brazilian-German sources, and occurred among many classes of sources, such as travelogues, newspapers, and general books on Brazil and German settlement there.

\textsuperscript{104} Ibid., 95–7.
European-Germans visiting Brazil for scientific exploration, travel, or work often noted the deleterious impact that slavery had on the Portuguese-Brazilian work ethic. In their account, Spix and Martius noted how slavery bred contempt for work. Johann Baptist von Spix and Karl Friedrich von Martius noted how dependence on slavery created a class of free men who refused to work. Spix and Martius explored Brazil as part of a scientific expedition. While Spix, a zoologist, and Martius, a doctor and botanist, originally arrived in Brazil as part of the future Brazilian empress Leopoldina’s retinue, King Maximilian I of Bavaria commissioned them to travel throughout the country and record their findings. Together, Spix and Martius explored several parts of Brazil, including the Amazon River region. They returned to Munich in 1820, bringing back enough specimens that Maximilian opened a gallery for them. Unfortunately, Spix died six years after returning to Europe, leaving Martius to finish two of the three volumes of the account of their travels.

Regarding slavery and work, during their stay at the Villa Campanha, an estate in the gold-producing region of Minas Gerais, they noted that the labor-intensive task of washing gold was assigned entirely to slaves. They wrote that this created in local Brazilians disdain not only for that task specifically, but for all manual work in general. In fact, whites in the region went so far as to see farming and cattle-raising as beneath them, to the degree that a whole class of people existed who refused employment in general (vadíos, or vagrants).\textsuperscript{105}

In his extensive discussions of slavery in Brazil, Tschudi makes special note regarding the position of the crafts in Portuguese-Brazilians’ eyes, and he relates that

\textsuperscript{105} Spix and Martius, \textit{Reise in Brasilien}, 1:303.
position to the issue of slavery. Tschudi observes that, excluding immigrants, craftsmen in Brazil are virtually always of African descent (free or enslaved). In explaining why this is, Tschudi writes “the white Brazilian, in whose eyes physical work dishonors… holds it deeply beneath his dignity to learn a craft.”¹⁰⁶ Instead, white Brazilians prefer to open small retail businesses. Tschudi notes, however, that should such a business fail, most Portuguese-Brazilians are willing to borrow themselves into bankruptcy and ruin rather than come to work with their hands. “A white father prefers to see his sons become an idler, gambler, and scoundrel, than a craftsman.”¹⁰⁷ Tschudi believes the institution of slavery was at least in part to blame for this devaluing of the crafts and labor in general among Portuguese-Brazilians. He notes that the white Brazilian, in addition to objecting to physical work, “views it as nearly a disgrace when someone does not own even a single slave”.¹⁰⁸

Tschudi laments the fact that only Afro-Brazilians and foreigners assumed positions as artisans, calling this “senseless arrogance” of white Brazilians a “true calamity for the empire.” He argues that the refusal by many Portuguese-Brazilians increases the ranks of poor whites, which leads to suffering and social unrest. Furthermore, Tschudi asserts that, in Europe, the artisan “is a powerful pillar of every state,” engaged in civic life and a dependable source of tax income. However, despite the socially and financially beneficial roles artisans could play, and even in the face of financial success among many European artisans in Brazil, Portuguese Brazilians still refuse to see the crafts as honorable: “Preferring to live in idleness in the most wretched

¹⁰⁶ Tschudi, Reisen durch Südamerika, 1866, 1:176.
¹⁰⁷ Ibid.
¹⁰⁸ Ibid.
manner and to starve with his wife and child rather than become a wealthy man through a
craft, that seems to be the maxim of a large portion of so many overrated Brazilians of
Roman descent.”

In discussing her experiences as a governess and teacher in Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo, Ina von Binzer also stresses the connection between slavery and the
Portuguese-Brazilian distaste for work. Born in Schleswig-Holstein and educated in
Westphalia, Binzer lived in Brazil between 1881 and 1884, serving as the governess in a
group of wealthy coffee-growers homes in Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo provinces. She
also spent several months teaching at a girls' school in Rio de Janeiro. During her time in
Brazil, Binzer wrote a series of letters to friends back in Europe, commenting on
Brazilians, their society, and slavery, among other things. She published these letters in
1887 in Germany under the pseudonym Ulla von Eck, and later also published two fiction
works under her own name.

Concerning Brazilians and slavery, Binzer writes that, within the houses of the
elite, Brazilians are dependent on slaves for virtually all work, going so far as to write
that “they [slaves] are more the masters than the slaves of Brazil.” Binzer asserts that
dependence on slavery creates distaste for work among Brazilians, so that “when he [the
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Brazilian] is poor, he prefers to live as a parasite in the house of his relatives or wealthy friends, rather than seeking honest occupation.” Binzer argues that while the U.S. South was, until 1865, also a slave society, one cannot compare the situation between Afro-Americans and Afro-Brazilians in large part due to each country’s respective view of work. “The North American respects work and the worker,” she writes, and while many whites in the U.S. dislike blacks, it is because they see them as racially inferior, not because Afro-Americans are associated with work. In Brazil, however, where the elite “despise work and the worker,” Afro-Brazilians are seen as inferior because they work. The Brazilian “himself is not devoted to work if he can avoid it, and regards idleness as a privileged the superior class.” Binzer sees this approach to labor as debilitating not only to the Portuguese-Brazilians, but to the slaves themselves, who are unprepared to remain productive once freed after having been raised in a society where productivity is shameful.112

Books targeting immigrants specifically also focused on slavery and its relationship to indolence in their discussions of Brazil. For example, Dr. Franz Xavier Ackermann was the director of the Central Baden Agricultural Society and he later served as consul to Brazil from Baden. A year after returning to Europe, he published a practical guide to Brazil for those considering immigrating there. The Brazilian Empire: Observations and Practical Comments for German Emigrants focused especially on the Doce River region, which flowed through the provinces of Minas Gerais and Espirito Santo, which Ackermann had explored as a naturalist. The book is full of useful
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information for potential immigrants, including the nature of Brazil’s climate, a review of
land laws, and a discussion of German colonies. It also contains several discussions of
slavery and its importance to the Brazilian economy.

While Chapter IV goes into detail regarding Ackermann’s stance on slavery, it
will suffice to say here that he was on the whole in support of the institution due to its
allegedly civilizing effect on Africans and its role in driving the Brazilian economy.\textsuperscript{113} However, Ackermann also recognized that slavery impacted Brazilian society negatively,
specifically helping make slave-owners lazy. He writes that because of slavery,
Brazilians avoid strenuous work: “In Brazil, all labor requiring physical effort is done by
slaves. It brings shame to the free community to work.” This, Ackermann argues, directly
affects German settlers. Since masters prefer to fill their workshops with slaves instead of
free workers, and since Brazilians have a bias regarding such labor, German immigrants
have trouble finding work. Hence, German journeymen who immigrate generally have to
start their own shops, with all the linguistic challenges and economic risks therein.\textsuperscript{114}

In the 1849 guide to emigration, \textit{How and Where? Emigration and Colonization
in the Interests of Germany and Emigrants}, originally presented as a lecture to Alexander
von Bülow’s Berlin Central Association to German Emigration- and Colonization
Affairs, Karl Gaillard discusses several potential destinations for \textit{Auszwanderer}, including
Eastern Europe, Australia, Africa, Asia, and the Americas. Gaillard was an author and
colonial theorist from Potsdam who believed that, through emigration, South America
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could become for Germans what North America had become for the English. In addressing Brazil, Gaillard concludes that he cannot yet recommend settlement there for Germans. Among the host of reasons he discusses, slavery and its effect on society are central; referring to the Brazilians, Gaillard writes “the dominant race, through slave labor, has become lazy, and harbors an abject contempt for white workers.” Additionally, for centuries slavery defined labor relations in Brazil, resulting in the incapacity of large landowners, who run their properties as if they were feudal fiefdoms, to treat immigrants as anything more than slaves.

Joseph Hörmeyer arrived in Brazil in 1851, part of a group of German mercenaries recruited by the Brazilian government to fight against Argentina. Hörmeyer earned the rank of captain and served in the 16th Infantry Battalion, but deserted the army in 1854 before his contract expired. He travelled extensively in Rio Grande do Sul and Santa Catarina, writing three books and maintaining correspondence with German-language newspapers in Europe regarding the character and experiences of German settlers in southern Brazil. In 1857, Hörmeyer published Southern Brazil: A Manual for Everyone’s Instruction, but Especially for Immigrants, meant to serve as an introduction to Southern Brazil for Germans in general, but particularly for those considering immigrating to the region.

Dedicated to Emperor Dom Pedro II, the book was generally supportive of German settlement in the area. It featured chapters on Brazil’s topography, weather, local agricultural goods, as well as discussions of the country’s population and institutions, including slavery. Regarding slavery, Hörmeyer believed the institution was positive for slaves, but negative for Brazilian society. He defends slavery by arguing that it introduces the enslaved to civilization and removes them from the violence and savagery of Africa. Hörmeyer writes that once enslaved, “the Negro first learns to think, for the first time sees and understands order, for him the road to the foundations of culture is not only open, but even required, a task which, in his own country, proved hitherto impossible.”

However, while slavery helped to civilize slaves, Hörmeyer asserts that it had a terrible effect on Brazilian society, leading free Brazilians to see work as something fit only for slaves. Hörmeyer writes that Brazil needed Europeans because the local population was totally unwilling to work, and this was a direct result of slavery: “From the fact that labor is the symbol of the slaves… idleness and luxuriousness is the mark of the free, in a word, it [slavery] defiles work. So much so, that no free person is willing even to carry a book in his hand, since carrying a load is work for a slave.” With this in mind, Hörmeyer calls for the gradual end of slavery for the sake of Brazil’s future development, since abolition would help overcome the culture of laziness that crippled the country. “The damage that such prejudice [against work] brings the country is probably greater than any benefits offered by the slave trade.”

---
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Hörmeyer echoed these views in his 1863 work, *What Georg Knows to Tell his Fellow Germans about Brazil*. The book was a semi-fictional account of a German settler arriving and prospering in Southern Brazil, but it also served as a primer for potential settlers in Germany. Like Hörmeyer’s previous book, *What Georg* discussed a host of issues concerning Germans in the region, including securing titles to land, which professions could find work fastest, and how to overcome the language barrier upon arrival. In the book’s discussion of slavery, Hörmeyer rejoices that in the German settlement region, it was illegal to own slaves.¹²⁰ Slavery perverts the very idea of work, which Hörmeyer argues should be revered. “[W]here there are slaves compelled to work, the free are ashamed to work so that they will not be associated with the slaves. And work is, after all, the greatest honor and highest prize for a man.” Hence, Hörmeyer writes that the German colonies are far better off without the specter of slavery.¹²¹

The notion that slavery explained the apparent inability of Brazilians to develop their own country was also present in the European-German press. For example, in 1858, the *Illustrirte Zeitung* published a three-installment article entitled “Brazilian Manhunt in Germany.” The piece is principally in reaction to recent events in share-cropping (*parceria*) settlements in São Paulo, wherein German emigrants found themselves in an inescapable spiral of debt and terrible working conditions, thanks principally (according to the author) to the large landowners for whom they worked. While there is a detailed discussion of the *parceria* system in Chapter IV, I address this piece now because it makes clear that the sharecropping contracts were not the only issue, but rather that the

¹²⁰ As will be discussed in Chapter IV, this ban was not always respected by German- or Portuguese-Brazilians.
very concept of work among Portuguese-Brazilians was, and had been for more than 300 years, degraded and perverted.

The article opens on the front page of the 17 April, 1858 edition, by explaining that, from its very earliest history as a Portuguese colony, Brazil (and its Portuguese residents) were dependent on the work of others: “Kidnapping, practiced in various forms and pretexts, has been for centuries and up to this very day a standard of Brazilian morality. The emigrating or deported Christian or Jewish Portuguese person found work in the tropical of this country too burdensome and exhausting, and in any case, it was easier to force others to work for him.”\(^{122}\) The author explains that first the Portuguese enslaved the Amerindians, and once the colonizers exhausted them, they turned to African slaves. According to the piece, with the end of the transatlantic slave trade in 1851, the Brazilians turned to Germany for a fresh supply of slave labor.\(^{123}\) The author goes into detailed accounts of abuses suffered by German settlers, but in addition to the unfair contract terms and corrupt legal system, he also stresses that Portuguese-Brazilian indolence and their disgust at the idea of work itself are to blame as well. In the second installment (24 April, 1858), the author asserts that Germans should never be advised to settle in a country like Brazil, wherein adages like “work is the symbol of the slave,” “work disgraces,” and “indolence and decadence are the distinguishing features of the free” are taken for truth.\(^{124}\)

\(^{122}\) “Brasilianische Menschenjagd in Deutschland,” *Illustrirte Zeitung* 772 (April 17, 1858): 245.
\(^{123}\) Ibid., 245–246.
\(^{124}\) “Brasilianische Menschenjagd in Deutschland,” *Illustrirte Zeitung* 773 (April 24, 1858): 262.
Here the author is arguing that the Brazilian national ethos itself was the cause of German suffering in the country; since its inception as a Europe colony, Brazil was a land where the elite rejected work as debasing and was willing to take any means necessary to avoid it, including the enslavement of Amerindians and Africans. This approach towards work and towards those who performed it became so central to the Portuguese-Brazilian spirit that, when faced with an end to African slavery, they were willing even to “enslave” Europeans.

An 1884 article by Dr. Wilhelm Breitenbach in *Globus*, “The Current State of the Slavery Question in Brazil,” illustrates how the image of the Portuguese-Brazilian crippled by slavery continued through the period of abolition. Breitenbach was a zoologist and Darwinist, and his *Globus* piece came as a wave of abolitionism overtook the Riograndense capital of Porto Alegre, leading to the end of slavery in most of the province in 1884 through labor contracts, wherein “emancipated” slaves had to provide labor for a certain period of time to their former masters. Breitenbach praised the plan as levelheaded and practical “because it prevented a sudden shortage of labor and made the slaves themselves far more accustomed to their new life.” However, Breitenbach stresses that slavery in Southern Brazil, thanks in large part to the German influence, has waned in importance, since “here it was no longer a disgrace to perform work that, in the northern provinces, would be done only be slaves.” Hence, the German appreciation of work was becoming dominant.

Still, there remained some Portuguese-Brazilians so crippled by their dependence on slavery that they were not able to make the transition that current events and the tide
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of history required. “Namely, there are numerous families or single individuals.”

Breitenbach writes, “who are nourished, in the truest sense of the term, by their slaves, while they themselves do not seem to know anything about work.” Such families rent their slaves outside the home, where the slaves work as craftsmen, laborers, or washerwomen, but they must give their earnings to their masters. Breitenbach cites that some Brazilian families are so desperate to support themselves through the work of their slaves that they even force the oldest slaves to panhandle: “In Porto Alegre, several Brazilians are known to us, who by day send their slaves to go begging, and they [the slaves] must deliver a specified sum of money every night, and from this the masters maintain a very good life.” However, with the coming of emancipation, such slave-owners are faced with a choice: “either perish or learn to work for yourselves!”

Breitenbach muses that it might be for the best if this class of degenerated and indolent people should perish, since these people could replaced by the growing number of Brazilians who, through the German example, are now happy to work.\textsuperscript{127}

Some German-Brazilian administrators published books in Europe so as to generate support for settlement in Brazil. While arguing that Germans should colonize the country, these former bureaucrats also argued that slavery had rendered the Portuguese-Brazilians unable to work. For example, Adalbert Jahn was a former official in S\~{a}o Leopoldo and recipient of the Brazilian Order of the Rose, presumably for his service in government. Like most Germanophone writers before him, Jahn believed that Portuguese-Brazilians lacked the work ethic that he saw as inherent within Germans. However, Jahn asserts that this had not always been the case. In discussing the earliest

\textsuperscript{127} Ibid.
period of Iberian settlement of South America, Jahn argues that the Portuguese were initially superior to the Spaniards in their industriousness: While the Spanish focused on mining and mineral extraction, the Portuguese instead concentrated on agriculture and creating administrative systems to assure the defense of their holdings against attacks from other European powers. However, while the Spanish exploited Amerindian labor, the Portuguese were not so successful in this regard, turning instead to slaves from Africa. Jahn believes this marked a turning point in the Portuguese approach to work, wherein the previously “hard-working” (arbeitsamen) Portuguese came to see labor as dishonorable: “With this evil, of which the ancestors of the Brazilians were guilty and with which they instilled the worst element of their generations, the Brazilian people suffer even today.” Concerning the effects of slavery, Jahn mentioned specifically the effect on the Brazilian “appreciation for work” (Arbeitssinne) as one of the unfortunate byproducts of institution.\footnote{Adalbert Jahn, \textit{Wichtige Beiträge zur Einwanderung und Kolonisation in Brasilien} (Berlin: Verlag von J. Guttentag (D. Collin), 1874), 23.}

In a presentation before the \textit{Centralverein für Handelsgeographie} in Berlin, A. W. Sellin, the former director of the settlement of Nova Petrópolis in Rio Grande do Sul, presented Brazil as ripe for German colonization, due in large part to the Portuguese-Brazilian dependence on slavery. Sellin describes Brazil as “well-known to be no industrial country,” and says the Brazilians were “little qualified for industrial enterprise.”\footnote{Alfred W Sellin, “Süd-Brasilien in seiner Bedeutung für die deutsche Colonisation,” \textit{Deutsche Zeitung}, May 9, 1879.} Sellin praises German settlers in Brazil, and called for more, so as to teach
the Brazilians, whose “non-development was based on slave labor,” the “value of free labor,” and claimed this was Germany’s “cultural-historical task.”¹³⁰

In his two-volume 1885 work on Brazilian history and society, The Brazilian Empire, Sellin echoed Jahn’s sentiment that slavery was at the heart of the alleged Brazilian aversion to labor: “The importation of negro slaves has become particularly disastrous for Brazil and Brazilians, because the latter have degenerated far more by their connection to this [slavery]… they have as slaveholders forgotten how to work, at least holding the same [work] as unworthy of a free man”. ¹³¹ Sellin calls the Portuguese-Brazilians’ “aversion to sustained, regular activity” their “worst feature,” writing that because of this characteristic, the country’s economic and intellectual development is stunted. “Paciencia” is the guiding principle behind most interactions, and for this Sellin blames the dependence on slaves: “Obviously, this is also a fruit of slavery, which has reared among the people a misguided sense, as if the free man is disgraced by work and as if idleness was his inviolable privilege.”¹³²

The Brazilian-German liberal press also associated Portuguese-Brazilians’ use of slavery with indolence and immorality. However, German-language newspapers in Brazil were less pointed in their critique of slavery and its alleged effects on non-German-Brazilians. While most discussions of slavery presented the institution as socially harmful and immoral, Brazilian-German journals also stressed the need to eliminate it slowly and

¹³¹ Alfred W Sellin, Das kaiserreich Brasilien, vol. 1 (Leipzig; Prague: C. Freytag; F. Tempsky, 1885), 123.
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thoughtfully so as protect Brazil’s economy.\textsuperscript{133} This reflected the social and economic integration of Brazilian-German journalists into their new society, wherein abolition raised practical concerns for the country as a whole and, in some cases, for the authors personally.\textsuperscript{134} Such adaptation of European thought to local circumstances is unsurprising, as reflected in the German immigrants’ experience in the slave-holding United States.\textsuperscript{135}

In discussing the movement to ban slavery in Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre’s Deutsche Zeitung emphasized the economic importance of preparing slaves for freedom before emancipating them. In April 1883’s “To this Chapter of Emancipation,” the newspaper cites that more than a decade after the Golden Law of 1871, which freed the children of slaves throughout the country, there remains no specific systems in place to educate and train the newly freed youngsters. Instead, they are abandoned by the government, which mistakenly assumed the owners of the freed children’s parents would take the burden of helping make the liberated productive. The children of enslaves parents grow up without structure and learned few skills, leaving them “meaner and more
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corrupt than their parents were once when under the violence of the whip.” “Man must be trained for freedom,” the author asserts, and the state bears the responsibility to establish trade schools and training centers “so we can educate him [the enslaved Afro-Brazilian] so that he will be useful to the state and society one day, as a free citizen.”

However, while warning of the dangers of freeing slaves too quickly, the article also stresses slavery’s negative effects on Brazilian society. Calling the institution “a malady to state and society,” the author writes that both slaves and masters have suffered due to the importation of enslaved labor from Africa: “It was from the outset a disaster for the state that it resorted to the so often abusive exploitation of Blacks, it was even a crime against the interests of their own [Brazilians’] society, and no less an offense against the spiritual and material development of the deeply declined Ethiopian race.”

Slavery makes everyone, from owner to owned, more violent, and the author even claims that freed slaves are often crueler to their own slaves than their former masters had been to them. However, besides making people depend more on violence, slavery also renders masters dependent on slaves to work and slaves less willing to work hard. Therefore, slavery breeds indolence across the whole of Brazilian society: “It brings into families and into society the seeds of boundless corruption and laziness. So away with it!”

Koseritz’ Deutscher Volkskalender für die Provinz Rio Grande do Sul featured an article in 1884, “Regarding the Slave Emancipation Question,” that linked the supposed Portuguese-Brazilian distaste for work with slavery. The article calls for gradual
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abolition, stressing that slaves need to be prepared for their freedom through educating them in useful skills, thus making sure they will not become a threat to society. Additionally, the question of who would replace the slaves in the agricultural economy, since it was assumed they would not work the fields as freeman, also remains unanswered. However, despite these practical issues, the author is wholly convinced that slavery has to be done away with due, first due to its immoral nature and secondly for its impact on the Brazilian work ethic. The article calls slavery “a social cancer” to be condemned for its deleterious effect on Brazil’s moral, social, and even political development. In terms of that social development, the author emphasizes the denigration of work as noble as a key negative result. In asking why the Portuguese first turned to slave labor, the author rejects the climate-centered explanation, writing that Portugal is often as hot as Brazil. In the authors’ view, it was a cultural issue, wherein the Portuguese came to see manual labor as something demeaning. Portuguese-Brazilians “were reared for centuries in the belief that difficult, purely physical, menial labor is to be done only by Negros,” and thus the country has little respect for such work and even less for those who perform it, even if they are free. This view of work helps fuel the country’s dependence on slavery, which in turn further strengthens the association of work with slaves.\textsuperscript{139}

German Colonial Discourses of Backwardness and Indolence Outside Brazil

Hence, Germanophone authors presented Brazil as a backward place whose Portuguese-Brazilian leadership was not up to the task of modernizing their country due to their indolence. In explaining the cause of this sloth, some authors referenced climate, but slavery was the primary root of the problem in European- and Brazilian-Germans’ eyes. However, this trope of incompetent and indolent natives, requiring German intervention, was not unique to Brazil. In fact, it existed in German colonization efforts globally.

Within German colonial holdings in Africa, perceptions of the capacity to work were foundation in defining the boundary between colonizer and colonized. George Steinmetz writes that in referring to non-Germans within German-colonized regions, settlers and business interests especially made reference to populations in terms of “idleness and usefulness,” since those German groups were often the most interested in using non-German labor.140 However, such seeing non-Germans in such terms also occurred outside of these groups, with the Ovaherero described by some German military officers not only as violent and uncivilized, but also as lazy.141 Notions of work shaped discussions of the Basters in German Southwest Africa, who were the descendants of Cape Colony Dutch men and African women. Many German observers viewed the Basters quite positively, and expressed their approval in part through reference to the Basters’ work ethic; Lieutenant Hugo von François called them “useful for all purposes as workers,” while a representative of the German Colonial Society in the colony described them as “peaceful, diligent, and orderly people.” However, those were those
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who saw the Basters as unreliable and little better than other groups of African descent. In a report to the German Colonial Society regarding sending colonists to Southwest Africa, Baron von Üchtritz referred to the Basters as “very indolent.”

German education policy in Southwest Africa focused on teaching German settlers’ children to appreciate work, an allegedly central aspect of Germanness, thereby maintaining the distinction between themselves and non-Germans, as well as “questionable” Germans whose drinking and indolence isolated them from the majority of settlers. In his 1905 book, *German Schools Abroad*, educational historian and pedagogical theorist Hands Amrheim wrote that schools were the best means to maintain settlers Germanness, which in turn “helps the advancement of German work.” Daniel Joseph Walther writes that this principle guided German colonial schools in Southwest Africa and helped make the specific cultural education of German children, including the appreciation of work, “a means to distinguish Germans from the indigenous population.”

In this colony specifically, officials also used schools to assure the political loyalty of the local Afrikaner population to the German Empire through acculturating their children. In both cases, the distinction between German (or German-Afrikaner) and African remained clear; settlers would appreciate the importance of work, while the Africans would not.

Fears of “going native” in Southwest Africa spurred anti-miscegenation laws and recommendations against German mothers using African nannies. As a solution for the latter issue, Lüderitz Bay and Windhoek each boasted children’s homes, where mothers,
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needing to attend to work at home, could leave their children, knowing they would receive proper German cultural training. Part of this training was learning the importance of discipline and work.\textsuperscript{145} Hence, work and diligence were central to the colonial senses of Germanness, while Africans were often defined by the opposite characteristics of laziness and ineffectiveness.

In his sweeping study connecting race, labor, and modernization (among other themes, Andrew Zimmerman demonstrates how connections between Germany and its colonial empire, the American South, and Booker T. Washington’s Tuskegee Institute shaped European-German thought regarding the role of Germans in Africa, a German version of the “Negro Question” (\textit{Negerfrage}): “Like the American ‘Negro question,’ the German \textit{Negerfrage} \textsuperscript{italics added} posited a contradictory identity for black people, holding that only with the outside authority of whites could their potentially valuable characteristics… triumph over countervailing characteristics of political restlessness and self-assertiveness.” German officials, like their counterparts in the U.S., saw the capacity to work as central to this, and believed that “educating the Negro to work” was their civilizing obligation.\textsuperscript{146} During the period surrounding the 1907 election, the so-called “Hottentot-election,” Bernard Dernburg, who would soon become head of the Imperial Colonial Office, praised the effect of Germans and German colonial policy on Africans; thanks to the Germans, Dernburg argued at a forum sponsored by the “Colonial-Political Action Committee,” Africans were becoming agricultural workers and contributors to colonial success, while avoiding what he claimed was the unfounded self-confidence of
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African-Americans. Hence, in German Africa, making the allegedly indolent natives into workers was a guiding principle of colonial policy and means to justify the German presence on the continent.

However, German colonial discourse concerning native laziness and the need for German intervention was not limited to overseas spaces. As David Blackbourn writes, “[t]he real German counterpart to India or Algeria was not Cameroon: It was Central Europe.” In this regard, Poland was the definitive German colonial space. As Kristin Kopp and other historians have shown, Germanophone authors utilized the trope of ineffectual, uncultured laziness when referring to Poland as well, although without reference to slavery as a means to explain the nature of Poles. Presenting Poles, and thus, Poland, as disorganized and undeveloped became a means to justify German colonialism in the region, whereby Germans allegedly would act to rectify the situation.

147 Ibid., 192–3.
The connection between alleged incapacity of Poles to develop their country and the need for German intervention had a long-standing history. Frederick the Great used claims regarding the alleged disorder nature of Poland to justify calls for its partitioning in 1772. Georg Forster, German naturalist and travel writer, was born in Poland to German parents that same year. Forster travelled throughout the world, including with Captain Cook in the South Pacific, before taking a position at the University of Vilnius. Forster was far less impressed with Poland than with the Pacific, expressing shock at the lack of development and the overall uncleanliness of the cities and people. Forster referred to the “half-wildness” and “half-civilization” of the Poles, and Larry Wolff notes that “Forster made the expression ‘polnische Wirtschaft,’ Polish economy, a byword for backwardness.”

In the opening decades of the nineteenth century, many patriotic Prussian writers argued that Germans, specifically Prussians, were responsible for bringing order and culture to the eastern region. In 1847, Moritz Wilhelm Heffter published The World Struggle of the Germans and Slavs, wherein he posited a battle between the cultured Germans and uncultured Slavs. In discussing how Slavs were inferior to the Germans, their alleged incapacity to develop their own land was part of Heffter’s calculus. He writes that prior to the German arrival in Slav-controlled lands, “everywhere brutality,

151 Wolff, Inventing Eastern Europe, 18.
ignorance, poverty, lawlessness and abuse of rights, robbery, violence, extortion, civil strife, etc.” Beyond their incapacity to establish an ordered society, Slavs also failed to utilize their natural resources. “The soil for farming… the abundance of metal in several mountains, the best situated areas for trade, all were used poorly or not at all.” Heffter compared the Slavs to the American Indians or the Asian nomads, who had no idea how to exploit the easily accessible resources surrounding them. Furthermore, Slavic society was one of despotic control by a small group over the majority.155

This image of Poland (and Poles) as undeveloped and uncivilized was perhaps best expressed by Gustav Freytag. Born in Silesia in 1816, Freytag went on to become successful author and playwright.156 Freytag was stridently anti-Polish independence and pro-German colonization in the region, as reflected in his presentation of Poles as backward and unable to progress themselves, therefore needing the help of industrious Germans to “civilize.”157

In 1848, an article entitled “Observations on a Business Trip in the Grand Duchy of Posen” appeared in the liberal newspaper Grenzboten. While signed by “William Rogers,” historians conclude that Freytag was actually the author.158 The piece presents Poland as a land of great potential that remains untapped due to the backwardness and

resistance of the Poles. Commenting on the quality of the land, Freytag writes that corn grows so well that it can become overabundant to the point of wildness in a field that it “would annoy a regular German farmer as being disorderly,” but not so the Polish farmers.\textsuperscript{159} Freytag contrasts the country’s potential with its actual use in his discussion of cattle owned by a Polish farmer. Freytag writes that the cattle are “poorly fed and never groomed” to the point that the creatures could not even make milk, despite “the luxurious growth of grass” and soil that he calls “powerfully resilient.”\textsuperscript{160}

In discussing the Poles, the narrator presents them not only as backward, but even resistant to the help the Germans provide. Looking at a group of Poles in their field, the narrator compares them to Pawnee Indians in their wildness and simplicity. In general, he writes, the Poles are a “shabby, slovenly, and ossified rabble” who meekly beg at the feet of the local nobles. Fortunately for the Polish peasants, the narrator comments sarcastically, Prussia had the baseness to destroy their [the peasants] patriarchal dependence on the landowner” by making their feudal obligation into a yearly monetary payment.” \textsuperscript{161} A Polish official, “a stunted figure with a wild beard, gnarled stick, and a battered, swollen eye,” reminds the writer of a backwoodsman from the swamps of Mississippi. Furthermore, the official, speaking in poor German, openly rejects the idea that the farmers require supervision from outside of the community, saying that the local landowners were lords and gentlemen, so they could manage their own affairs and

\textsuperscript{159} Gustav Freytag, “Beobachtungen auf einer Geschäftsreise in das Großherzogthum Posen,” \textit{Grenzboten} 3, no. 27 (1848): 37.
\textsuperscript{160} Ibid., 36.
\textsuperscript{161} Ibid., 39–40.
command their Komornicks, or day laborers who work the land in exchange for a plot of their own, as they say fit.\textsuperscript{162}

In this piece, Poland is a land of great potential, but remains backward and unproductive due to the incompetence and uncivilized nature of the Poles. Furthermore, they resist the intervention of the civilizing Germans, to the detriment of their own country. Freytag was just as critical of the Poles in his book, \textit{Soll und Haben}. In it, the lead character envisions himself as a cowboy, moving in the unsettled American West, despite his going into East.\textsuperscript{163} The Poles represent an impediment to (German) civilization: “There is not another race so little qualified to create progress and achieve civilization and culture… as the Slavs.” Freytag argues that “they [Poles] have no culture… and it is amazing how powerless they are to create a class that represents civilization and progress.”\textsuperscript{164} Again, the Poles are the antithesis of progress.

This discourse manifested itself in politics as well. With the revolutions of 1848, the Polish question took center stage as Frankfurt parliamentarians debated whether the new, united Germany should include territories with large Polish populations. Posen, in eastern Prussia, was especially a topic of debate, as ethnic Germans there represented only 1/3 of the population.\textsuperscript{165} In the July 1848 “Poland Debate” in the Frankfurt Parliament, Kristin Kopp argues, those supporting a Polish nation-state and those arguing against it came to agree through the creation “of a colonial binary separating Germans

\textsuperscript{162} Ibid., 36–7.
\textsuperscript{163} Kopp, “Reinventing Poland,” 20–8.
\textsuperscript{165} Vick, \textit{Defining Germany}, 149–59.
and Poles,” wherein Poles became the recipients of German culture and industry, since they could not advance by themselves.\footnote{Kopp, Germany’s Wild East, 18.}

Arnold Ruge, the representative from Breslau, became a leading voice calling for Polish independence in the debate.\footnote{Ping, Gustav Freytag and the Prussian Gospel, 59; Vick, Defining Germany, 192; Matthew Bernard Levinger, Enlightened Nationalism: The Transformation of Prussian Political Culture, 1806-1848 (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 121–2.} However, even in his spirited defense of the Polish right to a nation, Ruge still presented Germany as the sole source of progress in Poland. He asserting that Prussian efforts had brought “a higher civilization” into Poland, and that “it is an honor for the German nation that German industriousness and German culture have been introduced there.”\footnote{Franz Wigard, ed., Stenographischer Bericht über die Verhandlungen der Deutschen constituienden Nationsversammlung zu Frankfurt am Main, vol. 2 (Frankfurt am Main: Gedruckt bei J.D. Sauerländer, 1848), 1184; Kopp, Germany’s Wild East, 18.} Hence, whatever development Poland could boast had come from outside the country, specifically from the Germans. Wilhelm Jordan, a representative from Berlin, argued that Germans were not obligated to grant Poland independence, since the land belonged to Germany by right of conquest. However, this was takeover through settlement and development, not through violence, “not so much conquests of the sword as conquests of the plowshare.”\footnote{Wigard, Stenographischer Bericht, 2:1146; Kopp, Germany’s Wild East, 19.} Hence, the land belonged to whomever made it productive, and while the Poles could not bring the soil under cultivation, the Germans certainly could. This idea of “conquest through plowshares”

\[^{166}\text{Kopp, Germany’s Wild East, 18.}\]
\[^{168}\text{Franz Wigard, ed., Stenographischer Bericht über die Verhandlungen der Deutschen constituienden Nationsversammlung zu Frankfurt am Main, vol. 2 (Frankfurt am Main: Gedruckt bei J.D. Sauerländer, 1848), 1184; Kopp, Germany’s Wild East, 18.}\]
\[^{169}\text{Wigard, Stenographischer Bericht, 2:1146; Kopp, Germany’s Wild East, 19.}\]
became a common trope in German discussions of Poland, lasting into the Third Reich.\footnote{For example, see Hagen, Germans, Poles, and Jews, 271; Vejas G. Liulevicius, War Land on the Eastern Front: Culture, National Identity and German Occupation in World War I (Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 257.}

Hence, Germanophone writers and thinkers represented Portuguese-Brazilians and Poles in much the same way: as indolent, disorganized, and in desperate need of German assistance. However, unlike in the case of Poland, the Germans presented Portuguese-Brazilian indolence as rooted primarily in slavery. Regardless, the central notion of civilized German core and backward non-German periphery was present in both cases.

\textbf{Conclusion}

European- and Brazilian-German presentations of Brazil and Brazilians focused on both the country and the people as undeveloped and backward, using slavery as the primary means to explain why Portuguese-Brazilians were incapable of moving their country forward. This was, to a degree, reminiscent of German colonial discourse in Poland. This construction of Portuguese-Brazilians made them the inverse of the German-Brazilians: The former representing a backward past, who were rendered lazy, incompetent, and parasitic thanks to their dependence on slavery, while the latter signified a civilized future through their industrious, skilled, and selfless example, which reflected the purity of their Germanness. Without the settlers, German nationalists argued, Brazil appeared doomed to backwardness.

Chapter IV will explore the German-language presentation of slavery, specifically looking at claims concerning how German-Brazilians interacted with the institution.
Slavery became a means to demonstrate the civilizing capacity of the Germans, either through denying that Germans held slaves or by representing German masters as kind to and transformative for their slaves. In both cases, Germans remained free of the effects of slavery that allegedly crippled the Portuguese-Brazilians. Additionally, German sources made claims that connected settlers’ cultural impact (bringing honor to work) and abolition Southern Brazil. Thus, discourses of slavery, foundational to the construction of Portuguese-Brazilians as lazy and inept, also reinforced the image of the civilizing German on several levels.
Chapter IV
Slavery, Civilization, and Race: German-Language Claims Regarding Slavery and Brazilian-German Settlers

Introduction: Germans and Slavery

This chapter examines how German-language discussions of the connection between German settlers and slavery in Southern Brazil acted to make the institution a means to demonstrate simultaneously the uniquely civilizing role of colonists in the country and to emphasize the racial nature of the alleged civilizing mission of Germans in the region.

While some Germanophone authors affirmed that Brazilian-Germans owned slaves, others denied it. Such denials distanced the allegedly civilizing settlers from an institution that, by the 1840s, most Europeans recognized as immoral. Furthermore, whereas Germanophone writers saw slavery as making work itself, especially manual labor, dishonorable in the eyes of Portuguese-Brazilians (discussed in Chapter II), discussions of slavery among Brazilian-German settlers made no such allegation. Instead, German authors in Europe and Brazil presented settlers as civilizing and educating their slaves while treating them justly and kindly. Thus, while German authors on both sides of the Atlantic focused on the ways in which slavery transformed Portuguese-Brazilians, when discussing Brazilian-Germans and slavery, they emphasized instead how settlers transformed slaves, making the very act of owning slaves a facet of the alleged civilizing effect and mission of the German settlers. However, the transformation of Afro-Brazilians made possible through the influence of the Germans remained defined and
limited by German perceptions of race; while Portuguese-Brazilians fell within the scope of the German civilizing mission, culturally advancing Afro-Brazilians remained the duty of other parties, especially the Brazilian state.

Studies of German immigrants’ views and interactions with slavery that move beyond the local (i.e. keep the European context as part of the analytical foreground) focus mainly on the United States. Alison Efford examines how German-American 1848ers related and crafted their opinions regarding slavery as part of their attempt to make claims to rights and create space for the German immigrant community in the American political landscape.¹ She argues that German-American Republicans connected the notion of anti-slavery to their Germanness, making their negative views of the institution a reflection of their Deutschtum, and hence a means to demand greater inclusion for the German community: “German-American Republicanism conveyed distinctive ideas about citizenship because it connected antislavery to immigrant rights through the myth of the freedom-loving German.”² Mischa Honeck’s study of German immigrants and American abolitionists explores how Germans adapted their views regarding slavery to the American context, often running afoul of their non-German counterparts.³ However, as studies of the United States, a country seen as among the most advanced and democratic in the world by Germans in Europe and elsewhere, neither

¹ Efford, *German Immigrants*.  
² Ibid., 75.  
Efford nor Honeck focus on German settlers’ roles as civilizers, much less on the connection between that role and slavery.\(^4\)

There are several works looking at the interaction between Germans and slavery in the Brazilian context. For example, Marcos Justo Tramontini explores slave-owning among immigrants in São Leopoldo in the context of settlers’ social and political integration.\(^5\) Others, such as Miquéias Henrique Mugge, Paulo Staudt Moreira, and Maria Angélica Zubaran look at slavery among German-Brazilians from a social historical perspective, seeking to place German masters in the context of Brazilian slave-holding practices.\(^6\) Helga Iracema Landgraf Piccolo has contributed several works looking at the intersection of Riograndense party politics, settlers, and slavery.\(^7\) Still, while all of these authors have added much needed nuance and detail to the realities of German-Brazilians and slavery, with the exception of Roland Spiegart’s study of Germans in Southeastern Brazil, works examining German-Brazilians’ interaction with slavery have focused solely

\(^4\) For a discussion of the dark side of the United States’ power in the eyes of German nationalists, see Chapter III.
on the local Brazilian context and excluded discussions of European-Germans.\textsuperscript{8} Furthermore, while scholarship on the practice of German-Brazilian slave-owning is abundant, the discourse surrounding settlers’ and slavery remains a scholarly lacuna.

This chapter is an attempt to fill this both this spatial and conceptual gap through investigating European- and Brazilian-German discussions of slavery among settlers, placing them in the larger context of Southern Brazil as a German colonial space. How did German-language sources address settlers’ interaction with slavery? How did this alleged interaction relate to the German civilizing mission in the region, and how did slaves fit into that mission? This chapter addresses these questions.

Claims regarding German-Brazilians’ interaction with slavery served to demonstrate the German civilizing capacity by either distancing settlers from the institution or making slavery a means of civilizing individual slaves through the kind, educating nature of German masters. However, while German-Brazilian slave owners helped make slaves less savage, assumptions regarding the racial inferiority of Africans remained the basis for inclusion in the German mission in the region: While settlers could exercise a civilizing effect on their individual slaves, the slaves remained inherently different based on their race. Furthermore, while the German settler community as a whole bore the duty of transforming Portuguese-Brazilians, German-Brazilian nationalists argued that civilizing Afro-Brazilians in general was the obligation of the state and slave owners. Hence, race defined the German “cultural-historical task” in Southern Brazil. However, this distancing of settlers from slavery (in many cases) and from Afro-Brazilians did not stop German-Brazilians from relating settlers’ lack of

\textsuperscript{8} Spliesgart, “Verbrasilianierung” und Akkulturation.
political rights to slavery, arguing that colonists were no better off than slaves. Thus, slavery served a political function both in terms of the transnationally constructed German civilizing mission and in the local Southern Brazilian context.

**Evolution of European-German Thought on Slavery in Brazil: 1820s-1840s**

This is not to say that German-language sources’ approach toward slavery was static during the period of German settlement in imperial Brazil; in many German-language works regarding Brazil prior to the 1840s, authors recommended that settlers purchase slaves. These endorsements rested on two criteria: Economic, wherein colonists could gain monetarily through using slave labor, and cultural, whereby slavery helped civilize Africans. However, by the 1850s, such recommendations disappeared and Germanophone writers in both Brazil and Europe acknowledged the institution’s immorality and socially deleterious effects. This shift could in part be explained by the rise of agreement in most Europe and the New World that slavery needed to end, albeit the speed of that end remained open to debate.

Concerning German-language sources advocating that settlers buy slaves, such recommendations existed practically from the outset of German immigration to Brazil. George Heinrich von Langsdorff was a doctor and naturalist who served on an 1803 Russian expedition around the world, after which he spent a year in Santa Catarina, Brazil. In 1813, Langsdorff returned to Brazil as the Russian consul. During his service, he established a coffee-plantation where he played host to several visiting European naturalists, including von Spix and von Martius.⁹

In addressing whether German settlers can succeed in Brazil, Langsdorf argues that while the decision to emigrate must not be taken lightly, Brazil offers opportunities the German states cannot. To illustrate this, he writes that even well-off German farmers in Europe, with land worth 100,000 guilders, pay so much in taxes and tithes that at the end of the year, they might have only 4,000 guilders remaining. With so scant a profit, many farmers live on the edge of disaster, unable to maintain themselves if something unexpected should arise. However, if that farmer went to Brazil, he could buy enough land, purchase and maintain 40 slaves, and build a house and storeroom for just over 60,000 guilders. With the slaves, he could plant coffee trees for production, as well as a host of plants for food, such as bananas and mandioca. Within six months, the farm will produce enough food to feed the family, and after 18 months, the coffee trees will be producing, enabling the farmer to plant more trees and purchase more slaves. To demonstrate that even older farmers can succeed in this way, Langsdorff discusses one Dr. Lezesne, who came to Brazil after many years in Santo Domingo, and through his own work and that of his 38 slaves (2 died in the first year of production), his farm boasted more than 100,000 coffee trees. This is not to say that all settlers in Brazil succeed in this way; Langsdorf knew of a German settler who purchased slaves and tried his hand at raising sugar, but due to his ignorance of the plant and of the processes required to make cane, he went bankrupt. Regardless, according to Langsdorff, Germans with relevant skills and knowledge can certainly succeed, and clearly, owning slaves was a central part of his calculus for success.10

10 Langsdorf, Bemerkungen über Brasilien, 35–46.
J. Friedrich von Weech, discussed in Chapter II, called for Germans settling in Brazil to buy slaves upon their arrival. He writes that any large-scale farming in Brazil requires slaves, as the actual working of the soil is left in their hands exclusively. Europeans, he argues, are not as well suited for farming in the tropical heat than Africans.\textsuperscript{11} He discusses the whole process of how slaves arrive in Brazil, from their capture and sale in Africa through the trip across the Middle Passage. Weech warns his reader that most Europeans will be moved to pity on their first seeing the slave market in Rio de Janeiro, where the recently-arrived Africans are treated as if they were cattle. However, he advises his readers that they must abandon those feelings and give their entire attention to the business at hand, else they be cheated.\textsuperscript{12} As discussed below, Weech also urged settlers to use harsh discipline if necessary to train their slaves, otherwise they will not act properly.\textsuperscript{13}

Carl Schlichthorst believed that outside of farming, German craftsmen arriving in Brazil should also buy slaves. Schlichthorst came to country as a mercenary in the 1820s, serving as a lieutenant in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Grenadier Battalion, made up principally of Germans. He returned to Europe after serving two years in the Brazilian army, where he published a book concerning his experiences in 1829.\textsuperscript{14} Schlichthorst warns German craftsmen considering immigrating to Brazil that life for journeymen in the country is extremely difficult, since what few Brazilian craftsmen there are tend to employ large numbers of slaves in their shops. This means that the first years in Brazil for young German artisans can be quite perilous, unless, that is, they can save enough money to purchase a few
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slaves and open a shop of their own. Schlichthorst writes that slaves without a specific skill are quite cheap, and even those trained in a craft are within reach of a settler willing to save money for some time. Once a craftsman can support his business with slaves, his success is much more likely, since, according to Schlichthorst, the upkeep cost for slaves is minimal, and through their labor the return on investment is abundant: “A craftsman who buys brute slaves helps his business, having not only the advantage of the support of his assistants, whose upkeep costs him next to nothing, but they themselves are for him a commercial asset, from which he has can earn a great deal.” Schlichthorst writes that unskilled slaves can be rented for 200 milréis, which those with a craft, such as tailors or shoemakers, can earn their owner up to a 1,000 milréis. Hence, slaves provide both labor and capital. Some slave-owning artisans do so well, according to Schlichthorst, that they earn enough to return to Europe when they retire.  

Part of the defense of slavery was that the institution acted to civilize slaves, making them productive and even, to a degree, educated. Within Germany, this view had a long history. In his treatise on the character of Africans, Regarding the Nature of the African Negro, Christophe Meiners defended slavery as a means by which Africans, currently at a lower stage of development than Europeans, could be assisted in advancing. In keeping with this civilizing vision of slavery, however, Meiners also called for the most violent abuses within slavery be ended: “Negroes are… many degrees more unfeeling, limited in their understanding, and less benign of disposition than Whites.” Hence, Meiners asserts, “one must admit that other laws and institutions [slavery] are

---
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necessary… to make them as happy and useful as their limitedness allows.”

Hegel recognized that slavery was against the “essence of humanity,” but that not all people were prepared for freedom. Like Meiners, he argued that due to Africans’ lack of cultural and moral development, slavery was, for now, a blessing meant to advance Africans: “[S]lavery is itself a phase of advancement from the merely isolated, sensual existence, a moment of education, a mode of becoming a participant in a higher morality and the culture connected with it.”

In his discussion of slavery in Brazil, J. Friedrich von Weech portrayed the institution as meeting the Africans’ need for help in controlling their wild natures. Weech advises that slave-owners must be especially careful when first purchasing a slave, since this period is most formative of the slave’s future behavior. Weech believes that the slave’s nation of origin determines how he/she will initially behave, writing that “some nations are less raw, often quite docile and willing, while others are like beasts in all respects, and they live as such.” However, Weech believes that regardless of their origin, all Africans share some characteristics, specifically that “all are lazy, have a strong tendency to steal, and have a weakness for spirituous beverages.” If treated well and praised if performing well, Weech says, Africans are generally responsive. However, without fair but very stern disciple, the Africans’ wild character will manifest itself. Weech advises that slave-owners keep a slave to communicate with newcomers in their own language, so that when new arrivals’ “passions, their anger, unruliness, weakness for

---

stealing and drinking” take hold, they can be warned to stop. However, Weech warns that words will often not suffice to keep Africans behaving, so “should they lapse into old errors, you must punish them most severely, without compassion and mercy.” Masters must not allow even the slightest sign of disrespect, since Africans will repay any weakness with fierceness. Weech warns that newly arrived Europeans must cleanse their minds of the notion of compassion when it comes to slaves, since they require discipline to remain controlled, else they will return to their natural, bestial state: “Anyone who imagines that he will be able to pull up this raw and passionate people with kindness and consideration alone will be wrong, to their harm. They [slaves] will not be grateful for kindness, and one will become convinced that they have less obedience and devotion for such so-called good and gentle men, than those who treat them harshly.”  

Dr. Franz Xavier Ackermann was less pessimistic regarding the nature of Africans, but only assuming if they had been exposed to civilization through being enslaved and sold to Whites. Ackermann asserts that this is especially the case in Brazil, where, he argues, slavery is rather mild: “the fate of slaves in Brazil could be called not just bearable, but relative to that which the Africans in their own native land escaped, might be called happy.” Unlike Weech, Ackermann believed that slaves could rise above their allegedly animal nature, not only above that of free Africans, but even achieving real intelligence and culture: “From the African savages, which is similar to the animals, arises a person, a Christian, often even an artist or scholar.”  

George Gade was a German-Brazilian landowner who resided in Novo Hamburgo. Gade also served in the Brazilian government as an advisor on education.

---
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policy. He was a knight of the Imperial Brazilian Order of the Rose, presumably for his service to the state. Gade became embroiled in a public battle with S. Gottfried Kerst, Frankfurt parliamentarian and later member of the Prussian Landtag, regarding the suitability of Brazil for German settlement.\textsuperscript{20} The necessity and justification for slavery was one of many topics about which the two disagreed. Gade believed that slavery was objectionable not because of the suffering of Africans, but rather because of the effects of the institution on the morality of slave-owners.\textsuperscript{21} Kerst, on the other hand, believed slavery hurt both slave and master.\textsuperscript{22}

Concerning the impact on Africans, Gade praises slavery as an effective means to civilize the slaves; “for the Negros, the condition of slavery is extremely charitable and educational. It is fortunate for them when they are torn from the truly awful conditions in which they live in Africa, and compelled to work in Brazil and other countries.” Gade writes that anyone who has seen a group of newly arrived Africans at the docks, the brutish conditions in Africa are clear since the slaves look more like undifferentiated animals than people. Africans, reduced to living like beasts for centuries, “can never, by themselves and without the help of civilized nations, arrive even at the inception of true culture.” No, Gade writes, “if Europe wants to save these terribly unfortunate people, then it must bring great expeditions into all the African lands inhabited by Negros” for
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the purposes of enslaving them, thereby saving them from Africa. Through slavery, Europeans introduce the savage Africans to religion and science, and Gade does not discount the powerful effect this can allegedly have Brazilian slaves, whom he calls “infinitely more developed than the free Negros in Africa.” In fact, Gade bemoans the end of the slave trade, calling it “a true misfortune” for Africans, because it will end the primary means by which Whites brought culture to the continent’s residents.23

Thus, in the opening decades of German settlement in Brazil, many European-German authors had no qualms regarding urging immigrants to purchase slaves.

**Evolution of European-German Thought on Slavery in Brazil: Post-1850**

However, by the 1840s, recommendations by European-German authors for settlers to purchase slaves all but disappeared. Developments within Germany, associating conditions there with that of slavery, and internationally, in the global-European acceptance of slavery’s immorality, could explain this shift.

In examining slavery in the context of German political and national development, it is clear that German authors utilized images of the institution to comment on the situation in the German states and Europe.24 However, this began long before the middle of the nineteenth century. For example, the slave ship in Heinrich Heine’s poem

---

“Das Sklavenhiff” is widely seen as symbolizing exploitation within European society as a whole, in addition to acting as a commentary on the European role in the slave trade.25

Still, by the 1840s, there was growing interest in and distaste for slavery in the German states. German liberals commonly connected slavery to the situation in what would become Germany, connecting slavery with serfdom. In the entry for “Slavery” in the Staats-Lexikon of 1848, Friedrich Murhard writes that slaves in the ancient world were generally either prisoners of war or debtors. However, during the feudal period, a new type of bondage arose that bound the person to the land on which they lived: “A distinct type of slavery was introduced in the Middle Ages as a result of feudalism, the glebae adscripto.” He also warns that those who supported slavery, logically, might also have to defend feudalism, as the two were based on a similar premise.26 Friedrich Ludwig Georg von Raumer, a historian and Frankfurt parliamentarian, also associated slavery and serfdom: “There is no doubt in the minds of philosophers, statesmen, historians, and Christians in our times that slavery and serfdom (the tyranny of the minority over the majority) is condemnable.”27 Friedrich Kapp was an 1848 revolutionary who emigrated to the U.S. and became involved in the anti-slavery movement in the country. In his 1854 book, The Slavery Question in the United States,

Kapp relates the slave-owning elite of the American South directly with the reactionary and anti-democratic elites of Europe. “What the Holy Alliance, Carlsbad and Laibach Congresses were for Europe,” Kapp writes, “so was the slavery question and the Missouri Compromise for the United States.” The issues of American slavery and European liberalism are related, according to Kapp, “because here, as over there, a relatively small minority imposed its will and its interest on the entire people.” The slave-holding minority of the American population is, Kapp argues, exactly like the reactionary leaders of Europe, preventing the proper spread of liberty: “The slave-holders of the South assume here the provocative role of Emperor Nicholas [of Russia], the Eastern question corresponds to the Nebraska Bill of Senator Douglas, and what the Western powers stand against from Russia, so is the whole free North in the United States against the pretensions and attacks of the slaveholding aristocracy of the South.”

Slavery made the relationship between the liberals and slave-holding states, the US in particular, complicated. As Mischa Honeck writes, “[f]or the early nineteenth-century liberal German intelligentsia, chattel slavery was a moral and political anachronism,” especially in light of the founding principles of the United States. Some thinkers were quite pointed in their critique of what they saw as the contradiction between the supposed principles of American freedom and the existence of slavery. Author and republican Alexander Ziegler wrote that, based upon his experiences travelling in the US, the idea of all men being created equal was far from the practice in an American society that still defended slavery. Liberal representative to the Frankfurt
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Parliament, Carl Mathy, went so far as to argue that in considering the free nations of the world, the US could not be counted among them due to the institution.\textsuperscript{30}

Heike Paul argues that increasing contact between American abolitionists and Germans in Europe helped create a strong imagined connection between European-Germans and slaves, whereby Germans displaced the notion of race with class, relating the plight of slaves to that of workers and servants in Germany. The publication of \textit{Uncle Tom’s Cabin} in Germany in 1852 had a considerable impact; between 1852 and 1864, at least 29 editions appeared, dozens of German theaters produced dramatizations, and it even helped spawn a new genre of German literature, the \textit{Sklavengeschichte} (slave story), in which German authors presented German workers as slaves while denying the harsh reality of slaves in the United States.\textsuperscript{31}

Outside of Germany, or rather, not simply within Germany, the overall political and intellectual environment of Europe was becoming less friendly to slavery. Politically, the British took the lead. Having banned the slave trade in 1807, the British ended slavery in the British West Indies in 1833, but required an “apprenticeship” period for freed slaves that ended completely in 1838. Under pressure from the British, between 1835 and 1850, numerous countries agreed to devote increased resources to patrol against the slave trade: among others in Europe, Sweden, Norway, Spain, Denmark, Belgium, and the


German Hansa cities, and in Latin America, Argentina Uruguay, Bolivia, Chile, Ecuador, Venezuela, and Mexico. Smaller European powers, such as Sweden (1846) and Denmark (1847), also ended slavery in their colonies. In 1831, France suppressed the slave trade, but did not abolish slavery until 1848.\(^{32}\) In 1850, Britain even managed, using the threat of British naval intervention in Brazilian ports, to pressure Brazil into ending its participation in the transatlantic slave trade.\(^{33}\) Hence, beginning in the 1830s, the slave trade especially, and slavery itself, to a lesser extent (the U.S., Brazil, and Cuba maintained the institution), was in decline in the Atlantic World.

There was also a growing intellectual movement calling for the end of the slave trade or slavery itself. Beginning in the eighteenth century, regional abolitionism was already showing signs of becoming transatlantic. By 1788, there were four major abolitionist societies operating in the Atlantic World, with two in the U.S., one in Britain, and one in France. Quakers helped bridge the gap between these societies, especially those in the U.S. and England.\(^{34}\) Throughout the opening decades of the nineteenth

---


century, the strength of transatlantic abolitionist networks grew, blending with the rising progressive and nationalist movements in Europe. An integral part of early nineteenth-century nationalism was a focus on “national sovereignty, individual rights, and civic equality,” and this helped make the notion of freedom fundamental to that of national unity. In his examination of American slavery in international perspectives, Enrio Dal Lago writes that “[n]national independence, political self-determination, and freedom from oppression were all linked together in a great struggle whose aim was the progression of humankind toward a new, improved era based on the principles of liberty and justice.” Movement between the United States and Europe by activists and revolutionaries helped disseminate anti-slavery thought, and European nationalists became active in the anti-slavery movement. Daniel O’Connell’s efforts to achieve Catholic emancipation provided a model that Atlantic abolitionists emulated, while he also became a vocal voice in Parliament against the slavery and the apprenticeship system. Italian nationalist Giuseppe Mazzini spoke out against all types of privilege, often attacking slavery as an example of such. Mazzini even knew American William Lloyd Garrison and was a friend of British abolitionist William Henry Ashurst. The tide


of transatlantic abolitionism crested in 1840, with the convening of the World’s Anti-Slavery Convention, attended by Mazzini and participated in by O’Connell and Garrison.\textsuperscript{38}

Hence, changes within the view of slavery within Germany (focusing on its connection to serfdom) and in the larger transatlantic world (end of the slave trade in the Atlantic and contraction of slavery in Europe and its colonies) could explain why, by the 1840s, Germanophone authors stopped urging German-Brazilian settlers to purchase slaves.

The rising negative view of slavery within Germany is evident in the popular press. In 1844, the \textit{Illustrated Times} published “Slavery and Slave Trade,” wherein the paper attacked slavery. “Slavery itself is in and of itself immoral,” the piece says, since the institution alienates slaves from society and demoralizes them: “as soon as the chain is shackled to him, as soon as the whip is wielded against him, the slave loses awareness, having a will, and thus loses his self-respect.” Driven only by violence and divorced from their labor, slaves come to think only of freedom, and are willing to flatter, lie, and even kill to achieve it. This is only understandable, but it leaves the society of slave-owning

countries full of potentially dangerous slaves, driven to their current state through the violence they have endured.39

The liberal magazine *Grenzboten* attacked those defending slavery in the U.S. in 1856. In “The Battle for Slavery in the United States,” the author rejects Southern farmers who argue that farming cotton, tobacco, and rice would be impossible for whites to do. The piece refers to slavery as an example of “injustice and moral shamefulness,” asserting that now even many slave owners acknowledge that Christianity and morality more generally require the end of the institution. Regarding those slave owners who justify the institution by arguing that Africans were at a lower level of civilization, the article rejects such allegations, since whether or not this is true, “the authority to deprive completely the less gifted race of its human rights and, in fact, to use it as domestic animals, does not follow in the least.” The piece laments slavery’s persistence in the U.S., blaming a combination of material interests and the incapacity of Congress to act. Because of these issues, “the only eyesore that detracts from their [Americans’] honor in the eyes of the civilized world” will continue.40

The *Gartenlaube* was also explicit in its moral repugnance at slavery. In 1853, *Gartenlaube* published a report on the exploits of the HMS Semiramis, which patrolled the coast near Mozambique for slave ships. the *Gartenlaube* praised the British for their actions, writing that “[n]o one can fail to recognize the good intentions of England, as it insists on the suppression of the slave trade.” Referring to slave-traders “human flesh dealers,” the article presents a pursuit by the British of a Brazilian slave ship,
emphasizing the humanity of the slaves aboard throughout; attempting to escape, the
Brazilians steer their ship onto a reef, resulting in the total destruction of their boat;
“horror seizes the [British] spectators- hundreds of Negros, bound together and trapped in
the ship’s hold, are visible in the foamy surf.” Despite the quick actions of the British to
deploy small boats to rescue the slaves and crew, all some 630 slaves drown. Further
underscoring the suffering of the slaves brought on by the trade, as well as the heroic
quality of the sailors working to end that trade, the article closes by discussing how
deeply affected the British crew were, having “heard with their own ears the heart-
rending screams of the dying” within the sinking Brazilian ship.41

Following the secession of South Carolina in 1861, the Gartenlaube printed “The
Slave State South Carolina,” a stinging indictment of slavery and its defenders in the
Confederacy. Citing not only that South Carolina boasted 100,000 more slaves than
whites, but also the unrestrained love of slavery by those whites, the article calls the it
“the greatest tyrant state of slavery” in North America; “the doctrine that these beasts of
burden should be regarded as human beings is nowhere hated and resisted so fiercely, as
in South Carolina… the Negro-phobia, the fear of Negros as people, free people, is
nowhere greater… than here.” South Carolina’s slave owners have no excuse for such a
backward attitude, according to the article, since, unlike in Alabama or Kentucky, many
of the masters in South Carolina are educated. However, the obsessive defense of slavery
made the state one of the most intellectually repressive: No books advocating abolition
are allowed in the state, despite the large universities in Columbia and Charleston.
Comparing censorship there to that in Russia or Naples, the article asserts that “the

watchful eye of voluntary vigilance committees, or patriotic police spies,” keep even the slightest implication that slavery should not be continued, much less immoral, out of the every corner of the public sphere. Furthermore, while ideas are met with censorship, those resisting slavery are met with the worst kinds of violence. Abolitionists are tarred and feathered if caught once, killed if caught again, while anyone aiding in the escape of slaves is “beaten, hung, burned, or otherwise tortured cannibalistically to death.”

Hence, this article, like those discussed before it, presented slavery as morally reprehensible and contrary to civilization, leading everyone involved in the institution, from slave to slave-trader to master, demoralized and corrupted.

Thus, German-language views of slavery underwent an evolution in the period of settlement in Southern Brazil; in the opening decades, authors often called on German settlers to purchase slaves due to the potential economic advantage slave labor could offer colonists, as well as the positive impact slavery allegedly had on slaves. However, such recommendations disappeared by the 1850, although the idea that slavery could civilize Africans remained present in Germanophone sources even after that period. Hence, there was a discursive distancing between Germans and slavery, wherein discussions of slavery focused increasingly on the institution and decreasingly on how settlers related to the institution.

**Representations of German-Brazilian Slave-holding**

In his painstaking and thought-provoking study of the acculturation of German Protestants in the provinces of Rio de Janeiro and Minas Gerais, Roland Spliesgart

---

devotes a chapter (pg. 335-387) to slave-holding among Germans in the area.\footnote{Spliesgart, “Verbrasilianierung” und Akkulturation.} He concludes that the existence of slavery among Brazilian-Germans is undeniable, adding his own research to that of previous scholarship on the topic.\footnote{Regarding previous scholarship regarding slave-holding among Brazilian-Germans, Spliesgart cites Zubaran, “Os teutos-rio-grandenses”; Witt, “Os escravos do Pastor”; Angela Tereza Sperb, “O inventário de João Pedro Schmitt,” in Anais do IV Simpósio de História da Imigração, 1980 (São Leopoldo, RS, Brasil: Museu Histórico “Visconde de São Leopoldo” : Instituto Histórico de São Leopoldo, 1987), 17–33; Tramontini, “A escravidão na colônia alemã”; Moreira, “Se era negro, não era da sua cozinha! Experiências e interdependências entre escravos, imigrantes e forros no Brasil meridional.”} However, it is his discussion of representations of slavery in the European-German public sphere that interests me here. He cites several cases of German travelers in the second half of the nineteenth century discussing slavery in the Brazilian-German community, saying that such authors “regularly referred to the fact of slave-ownership among ethnic German immigrants.”\footnote{Spliesgart, “Verbrasilianierung” und Akkulturation, 344.} In fact, representations of German slave-holding in Brazil were more varied than he presents, and that instead of agreement regarding the relationship between settlers and slavery, there was ambivalence in the European- and Brazilian-German public spheres. However, all discussions concerning colonists and slavery, both denials and affirmations of settlers owning slaves, supported the image of the German as a civilizing force in Brazil.

By the 1860s, the discursive distancing between settlers and slavery became more extreme, wherein some Germanophone authors denied directly that settlers had ever owned slaves. This denial reinforced the image of the German as a civilizing force for two reasons: First, by the 1850s, there was a growing sense of slavery’s immorality within Germanophone sources in Europe and Brazil, and thus denying that settlers held
slaves made Germans appear more ethical;\textsuperscript{46} secondly, as discussed in Chapter II, the alleged impact of slavery was among the primary means by which Germanophone authors distinguished themselves from their non-German neighbors. In light of this discourse of Portuguese-Brazilian indolence fueled by slavery, and the alleged industriousness of the German settlers discussed in Chapter III, it is unsurprising that some Germanophone writers took the ban on slavery within colonies (discussed further below) at face value. Regardless of intent, the result was clear: Sources denying that settlers owned slaves perpetuated the image of the German-Brazilian as the hard-working and moral presence in a lazy and degenerate country.

Friedrich Gerstäcker, the explorer and author of both fiction and non-fiction, wrote several pieces concerning German settlement in Brazil and the country more generally. These included \textit{A Sharecropping Contract}, which was a scathing indictment of the Brazilian sharecropping system.\textsuperscript{47} Gerstäcker was also a frequent contributor to German newspapers, and in some of these articles he addressed the relationship between German-Brazilians and slavery.

In 1869 in the \textit{Gartenlaube}, Gerstäcker wrote an article in which he denied German settlers’ owning slaves. “Southern Brazil and Herr Sturz” is mainly a polemic against Johann Jakob Sturz, the former Prussian consul to Brazil who became a leading voice against German immigration to the country, especially to the sharecropping zone in São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro. Gerstäcker attacks Sturz for failing to make a proper distinction between the sharecropping zone, unsuited for German settlement, and the


\textsuperscript{47} Gerstäcker, \textit{Ein Parcerie-Vertrag}. 
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three southernmost provinces, which Gerstäcker sees as a fitting destination for German immigrants.\textsuperscript{48} In this discussion, Gerstäcker emphasizes the distinctiveness of German-settled Brazil from the rest of the country and stresses the purity of the southern Brazilian community’s \textit{Deutschtum} while claiming that Germans there do not own slaves.

Gerstäcker first underscores the climatic distinctiveness of Rio Grande do Sul, Santa Catarina, and Paraná, writing that he cannot recommend immigration “to the hot provinces of Brazil,” but he fully supports settling in the southernmost provinces to those “who want to choose not too cold a place for their next homeland.”\textsuperscript{49} In reference to the three southern provinces, Gerstäcker calls them “a great, rich, and fertile land,” thereby discursively separating the region from the rest of the country and stressing how southern Brazil (or Southern Brazil, by his presentation) should be thought of a single, distinct entity.\textsuperscript{50}

However, there is more than the richness of the soil that makes southernmost Brazil a good place for Germans to settle: “Thousands of our fellow Germans live there


\textsuperscript{50} Gerstäcker, “Süd-Brasilien.”
and are comfortable, indeed have sired a magnificent blond-haired progeny. Slavery in
not tolerated there- it is all free labor.”51 In describing the “blond-haired progeny” of the
Brazilian-German settlers, as well as the magnitude of the German population,
Gerstäcker presents an overseas community whose Germanness remains unadulterated
and strong, as evidenced by the phenotypically “German” look of their children.
Additionally, by stressing simultaneously the success of the Germans in the region and
that slavery was supposedly “not tolerated,” Gerstäcker was emphasizing both the
rejection of slavery by settlers and that the “comfort” achieved by the community was by
their hands alone: German-settled Brazil was distinct from the rest of the country due to
its climate, but more importantly, due to the progress the slavery-rejecting settlers
realized for themselves.

Denials of German-Brazilian involvement with slavery also appeared in Globus, a
popular magazine established by moderate liberal nationalist Karl Andree. In the two
years prior to the passage in 1871 of the Brazilian Law of the Free Womb, Globus
featured several articles on Brazilian slavery, some of which commented on German
settlement in the country.52 In these pieces, the author avows that German-Brazilians do
not own slaves by relating the supposed rejection of slavery to the community’s
Germanness.

51 Ibid.
52 The Rio Branco Law freed all children of slaves born after 28 September, 1871. However,
many masters chose to exercise the option of keeping the child’s labor
until he/she turned 21, and thus it is debatable if “free” is a proper way to describe
those supposedly emancipated. See Chapters VI and VII of Conrad, Destruction
of Brazilian Slavery; Leslie Bethell, “The Decline and Fall of Slavery in Nineteenth
Martha Abreu, “Slave Mothers and Freed Children: Emancipation and Female
Space in Debates on the 'Free Womb' Law, Rio de Janeiro, 1871,” Journal of Latin
For example, in 1869, the journal published “The Southern-Brazilian Province Rio Grande do Sul and Immigration,” which served as a primer on the history and population of the province, although the article does refer to all of the southernmost Brazilian provinces as “healthy and beautiful” collectively. The piece praises the German settlers in Rio Grande do Sul, claiming that some there were some 80,000 Brazilian-Germans living in the province, whom it alleges were “all prosperous and satisfied, upholding and honorably preserving their Germanness, and not, as is so often the case in North America, in danger of having to surrender to another nationality.”53 Beyond commenting on the quality of settlers’ Germanness, the article also asserts that, while some 76,000 slaves remained in Rio Grande do Sul, German-Brazilians did not own slaves: “In none of the German settlements are slaves held. In them only free labor is permitted, therefore they have no Negro plague”.54 As in Gerstäcker’s article, the author here implies a connection between the community’s Deutschtum and its alleged rejection of slavery by stressing the purity of the former while asserting the latter simultaneously.

In 1870, the Globus published “Number of Slaves and Mortality in Brazil,” which concerned the effects of a Yellow Fever outbreak on the Brazilian population, although slaves especially. The author writes that it is now clear that abolition is inevitable, and all that remained to do was determine the least destructive way to end slavery. The piece warns that it is imperative for Brazil first to secure a new source of labor prior to any large-scale freeing of slaves, since slavery is the foundation of Brazilian society and economy: “[I]n other South American countries… the sudden abolition of negro slavery has acted so injuriously in a moral sense and so disruptively in economic terms that, in

53 “Die südbrasilianische Provinz,” 74.
54 Ibid., 75.
Brazil, one has every reason... to proceed very slowly and with caution, and above all first to secure the necessary workforce”.55 Yet, the author asserts that the issue will be less troublesome in the southernmost provinces, where “the plantation system is virtually absent”, and thus in this region “you have a comparatively small number of slaves”.56 However, besides the lack of plantations in the region, the German settlers themselves help explain why the area has a smaller number of slaves, in that “from the outset the German colonists have kept themselves away from slavery.”57

This notion that Germans had, from the outset of settlement, rejected slavery, also appeared in another Globus article from 1870, which also addressed the relationship between abolition and the settler community. Like the previous article, “Slave Emancipation in Brazil” begins by stressing that because of Brazil’s economic dependence on slavery, abolition must be achieved carefully and deliberately. As in “Number of Slaves,” the author of “Slave Emancipation” believes that the northern provinces of the country will be most affected, asserting that this region will perhaps turn to Chinese labor to replace that of slaves. However, Southern Brazil, with its cooler climate and large European settler population, will be less affected by the end of slavery. Thanks in part to the presence of European labor, the author argues, “the number of Negros there [the southernmost provinces] is relatively insignificant.” In discussing those

56 While there was no plantation-style economy in these provinces, this did not necessarily mean there were fewer slaves. In 1874, slaves represented only 8.8% of the population in Paraná and 9.5% in Santa Catarina, but 21.3% in Rio Grande do Sul. In terms of percentage of population per province that year, Rio Grande do Sul held the third largest in the country, behind only Rio de Janeiro and Espírito Santo. See Conrad, Destruction of Brazilian Slavery, 284.
57 “Anzahl der Sklaven,” 238.
Europeans, the article stresses the role of the Germans especially in helping reduce the number of slaves in the region, claiming that “German settlers never held slaves”.  

In both articles, the authors affirmed directly that German colonists never owned slaves. While these pieces featured discussions of the climatic or economic reasons behind the smaller number of slaves in the southernmost provinces, they both addressed the alleged Brazilian-German rejection of slavery in ethnic terms. While these provinces in general did not feature large plantations, large plantations were not in and of themselves requirements for slavery. Small farms or urban craftsmen could also employ slave labor, but the articles did not discuss the nature of the Brazilian-German economy specifically. Hence, the reasoning for settlers’ supposed refusal to use slaves was not economic, but rather ethnic. It is the character of the colonists, who “have kept themselves away from slavery” [Emphasis added], that leads them to reject slavery, instead of a material explanation: their Germanness, not their circumstances, explained their view of slavery.

It should be noted that Germanophone claims that settlers did not own slaves were based in part on laws outlawing slavery within colonies. Beginning in the 1840s, Brazilian officials at both the provincial and imperial level passed laws restricting slavery in the settlement-zone. In May 1840, the provincial assembly of Rio de Janeiro passed Law 226, which allowed for the creation of agricultural colonies for immigrants but banned settlers there from owning slaves. Imperial Law 514 (24 October, 1848) set aside land in each province for the creation of immigrant settlements, but also banned slavery in these new colonias. In Rio Grande do Sul, Provincial Law 183 (18 October, 1850)

outlawed the entry of new slaves in both current and future settlements, and in 1854, the Riograndense assembly banned slavery in all new *colonias*. However, all of these laws applied only until the *colonia* (settlement) achieved the legal status of *vila* (town), which São Leopoldo reached in 1846, and in cities in which Germans settled but were never *colonias*, such as Porto Alegre, the restrictions never applied. Furthermore, as will be illustrated by examples of settlers owning slaves despite the ban, there were cases of colonists keeping slaves in contradiction to the law.

Beyond denials of Brazilian-Germans owning slaves, there were also instances wherein authors acknowledged slave-holding among settlers. These discussions presented German settlers as kind and educating masters who acted to civilize their slaves. Hence, even confirmations of settlers’ participating in the institution of slavery reinforced the positive image of the German bringing virtuousness and order to a land crippled by slavery’s deleterious effects. However, images of German masters civilizing their individual slaves still reflected the notion of inherent difference of Afro-Brazilians, whereby slaves became more civilized but remained clearly Other in relation to settlers, and the duty to refine Afro-Brazilians as a whole remained outside of the German civilizing mission, falling instead to the state and slave-owners to achieve.

In April 1869, the *Deutsche Zeitung* published “Colonization and Slavery,” which contained the text of a petition sent from a group of German colonists living (at an unspecified colony) in the interior of Rio Grande do Sul to provincial officials demanding

---

that the local police enforce the Brazilian ban on slave-owning in colonial territory. The petitioners complain that the uneven enforcement of the ban was of the utmost importance, since slaves in the colonies were causing a crisis in morality and public order in the colonial region.

The petitioners praise the Brazilian government for turning to the free labor of Germans in the 1820s so as to lessen the country’s dependence on slavery, a decision the petitions praise as “advancing culture and humanity in Brazil.” To help assure the success of this effort, the government banned the owning of slaves in colonial territory, based on the legal rational that since the land came from the state and the settlers received support upon arrival, the province had the right to ban the institution in the colonial region. In helping keep (or at least limit) the moral scourge of slavery from the settlements, “[t]his law had, for the colonies, a greater beneficial effect than the government, which had no experience in this economic sphere [settling free laborers], would have liked to expect.”

However, the inability (or refusal) of the government to enforce universally the ban allowed slavery to exist in the settlement-zone, bringing strife and violence into the colonies. In a colony free of slaves, the petitioners assert, farmers get along amicably and respect one another’s property. However, when a slave-owner lives in the community, his slaves’ “tendency to lie and steal” leads to conflict, as they abscond with livestock (large and small) and agricultural produce. “Hence, it is certainly too much to expect of community members to be continuously exposed to such thievery just so that the slave-owning neighbor can enjoy the advantage of slave labor.” Beyond being thieves, however, the petitioners believe that slaves represent a much more serious threat: that of

60 “Die Colonisation und die Sklaverei,” Deutsche Zeitung, April 21, 1869.
sexual predators: “What sad experiences will we have in the wild, unbridled, bestial sexuality of the African race against [our] currently unprotected white women and girls, even of a child’s age?” For these reasons, the police must act immediately to enforce the law and “to sweep the evil leaven of slave-holding from the colonies.”

While the petition does not specify whether the slave-owners discussed are German settlers and/or Portuguese-Brazilians living in the colonies, it does comment on the nature of German-Brazilians as masters. To illustrate the need for government action against slavery in the settlement-zone, the petitioners recount the recent activity of a particular slave; the slave in question allegedly robbed his master’s neighbor of forty milréis, and after the master discovered the crime, he put the slave in irons. That night, the slave managed to escape his handcuffs and, with the help of an axe, broke his foot shackles. Grabbing some Christmas cakes and sausages (suggesting that the owner of this specific slave was German), the slave stole a horse and rose toward the forests near Leoner-Hof. Having gotten his first horse stuck in a ditch, he stole one from a German colonist and disappeared. After several days search, the authorities recovered both slave and horse, and the slave’s master sold him to an owner in Rio de Janeiro.

In discussing the possible reasons for the slave’s behavior, the petitioners stress that this particular slave was not mistreated, and his rebelliousness was part of his own flawed character; he was “far from overburdened with work,” but still had a sense of “arrogance and half-idleness” about him. These characteristics drove the slave to become a thief, and the petitioners assert that even in the imperial capital, “his mischievousness is even more likely to make him play evil tricks.” However, the petitioners recognize that

---
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some slaves are not to blame for becoming thieves: “Some masters drive their slaves to thievery with hunger and nakedness,” the petition claims. But, this was far more commonly the case with slaves owned by non-Germans, since “this is rarely or nearly never the case with the German master. Rather, the serving slaves [of Germans] have an abundance of nutritious food, adequate clothing, and shelter among them.” Hence, German masters were, according to this petition, almost always kinder and more caring toward their slaves, giving them what they needed to survive, while non-German slave-owners often deprived their slaves of the basic of human needs, leading them to turn to thievery.

Some European-German sources also presented German-Brazilian masters as kind. Hugo Zöller acknowledged slavery among German settlers in rural colonies, but he too emphasized the intimate connection between German master and Afro-Brazilian slave through discussing the linguistic “assimilation” of slaves. Discussing the southernmost Brazilian province, Zöller wrote that “in the virgin forest of Rio Grande do Sul, a very significant number (perhaps one thousand) of German colonists own negro slaves.” Concerning the slaves, Zöller presented them as friendly, linguistically assimilated into German settler society, and well-treated to an extreme degree: “One finds there Eifler, Hunsrück, Pomeranian, Mecklenburg negroes… who don’t understand a word of Portuguese, who welcome you in the purest local dialect”. Furthermore, Zöller clearly asserts that the violence that marked master-slave relations throughout Brazil did not exist in the German-Brazilian case, since Germans’ slaves “feel so comfortable that they
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do not ask for their freedom.”

In this presentation, German masters are benevolent to the degree that the line between slavery and liberty is blurred, and enslavement under a German appears equivalent, if not superior, to freedom.

Hermann Billroth, a Pomeranian who served as a pastor in Rio de Janeiro, presented an even deeper level of intimacy between slave and German master, wherein service under the German was superior even to freedom. In his 1867 account, *An Evangelist in Brazil*, Billroth notes a case wherein a German immigrant freed a slave as reward for his years of good service. After squandering his money on luxurious clothes and jewelry, the freedman left town and his former master heard nothing from him for a year. One morning, the freedman reappears at the German’s door, along with a young slave whom the freedman purchased. The ex-slave asks to live with this former master because, according to Billroth, “he does not know what to do with his freedom.”

While Billroth saw Afro-Brazilians in general as intellectually and emotionally childlike, with “no judgment, no sense of time, no appreciation of maturity,” his citing this example specifically presents the reader with the image of the German slave-owner particularly as kind and just. In this case, the German’s benevolence is represented not only by his freeing his slave, but also by the willingness of the freeman to return to the home of his one-time master. This image is in sharp contrast to Billroth’s presentation of non-German masters: “In cruelty of the treatment of slaves, Brazilian slave-owners appear to have surpassed all others in previous periods,” citing floggings, confinement, and hunger as characteristic of most Brazilian slaves’ lives. Hence, it is not only the

---
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childlike nature of the freedman that brings him back to his former master but the distinctly kind nature of the German slave-owner.

Thus, while some sources denied that German-Brazilians held slaves at all, others presented colonist slave-owners as kind and paternalistic. Through these two tropes, Germanophone sources constructed the alleged relationship to settlers and slavery/slaves that emphasized the role of Germans as a civilizing force in Brazil, either through distancing them from the immoral and harmful institution or by making German slave-owning a means to demonstrate the greater morality of the German-Brazilians more generally.

In addition to the image of the kind German-Brazilian master, that of the educating German-Brazilian slave-owner also existed in German-language sources. In this construction, authors stressed that settlers taught their slaves German to the degree that they could (linguistically) pass for Germans. In doing so, these sources stressed not only the caring approach German-Brazilian masters took toward their slaves, but also emphasized the transformative effect that these masters had on their slaves, making them less “threatening.” However, the transformative power of Germans was limited by a sense of inherent difference between German- and Afro-Brazilians, whereby Germans could help slaves mimic civilization through their learning German but the slaves remained “outside” the German community.

During his journey of Rio Grande do Sul, Jacob Tschudi toured Picada Nova, a colony in the interior near Nova Petrópolis. There he met a settler named Kolling who owned an estate where he farmed, bred pigs, and operated a mule-train business by which he traded with nearby settlements. Tschudi notes that in Kolling’s fields, he employed
slaves. Additionally, Kolling is not exceptional, writes Tschudi, as many older colonists also hold slaves, and Tschudi estimates close to 160 slaves live in this settlement alone. Tschudi does not discuss at all the effects that slavery had on settlers individually or on the village as a whole. Rather, he only comments on the assimilation of the slaves into the German settler community, noting that “[m]ost of them speak German, naturally in their master’s dialect.”

To demonstrate this, Tschudi imparts the story of a slave, owned by one Pastor Klingelhöfer, who worked near the docks in Porto Alegre. The “rascal of a Negro” spoke such perfect Hunsrückisch that he often played a trick on the German immigrants as they came off the boats. As they disembarked, he greeted them in their native tongue, which disturbed most of the colonists, who expressed shock that an Afro-Brazilian could speak German, to which the slave would reply that he was actually a German, but “[w]hen you have lived in the country for thirty years like me, you will look exactly the same!” This apparently caused some of the younger women to break down into tears over their apparent “black future.”

The image Tschudi projected of the Brazilian-German slave owner was that of a civilizing force. First, the slave was lighthearted and good-humored, playing pranks on arriving Germans, instead of downtrodden or defiant. Secondly, Klingelhöfer did not simply teach his slave enough German to understand basic orders, but rather took the time and effort to educate his slave to the degree that the slave could pass for a German himself.
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This last issue, of the slave’s “passing for a German,” is telling as a reflection not only of the colonial nature of settlers’ alleged effects on Afro-Brazilians, one that both emphasized inherent difference while diminishing that difference enough to make the Afro-Brazilian less dangerous, as illustrated by Tschudi’s lack of outrage at the notion of slave frightening newly arrived German women.

In speaking a perfect German dialect, the Afro-Brazilian slave can fool newly arrived settlers, but this capacity is short-lived; only those with no experience in Brazil would believe he were a German who “became black,” while anyone else would realize this were impossible. The slave here mimics a German, but never becomes one.

Regarding mimicry and its centrality to colonial discourse, Homi Bhabha writes that in the eyes of the colonizer, mimicry appears to elide difference, but actually accentuates it, creating “a reformed, recognizable Other, as a subject of difference that is almost the same, but not quite.” This creates a dual effect, whereby the colonizer’s program of reform and discipline is validated, but only while the need for this program and its status as destined to fail are brought to light;\(^{67}\) the behavior of the colonized Other is changed, but their nature remains inherently different from that of the colonizer. Klingelhöfer’s slave was made, through his master’s time and effort, to speak German, but only those who had just arrived in Brazil could be fooled into thinking he was German.

Still, Tschudi’s reaction to a slave bringing German women to tears is not one of outrage, but rather amusement. This demonstrates how, despite the persistent “otherness” of the slave, Tschudi perceives him as radically, though not inherently, changed by his

\(^{67}\) Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 85–7.
German master. The slave is mischievous, but not dangerous, his joking at the expense of newly arrived Germans playful, but not treacherous.

In order to understand this last point, it must be noted that there was a precedent in the German imaginary, partly literary and partly historical, for German immigrants suffering an inversion of status or even race, thereby becoming slaves or even “becoming” a “black” slave. In European-German literature, fears regarding Germans becoming slaves can be found beginning in the first decade of Germanophone settlement in Brazil. In 1828, Amalie Schoppe published *Emigration to Brazil or the Cabin on the Gigitonhonha*. Schoppe was a prolific author, publishing close to two-hundred books total, principally for young adults. Born in 1791 in Burg on the island of Fehmarn, Schoppe would immigrate to the US in 1851, dying in Schenectady, New York, in 1858.68

*Emigration to Brazil*, as discussed briefly in Chapter I, is the story of the Riemann family from Württemberg. With only a small hut on leased land and a garden to their name, the Riemanns begin to face mounting debt. The father runs into a group of Germans headed to Brazil, and they tell him wild stories of easy money in the country. Herr Riemann sells everything the family owns, producing a measly three hundred Thalers to cover the entire trip from Württemberg to Brazil. When the Riemanns arrive in Holland, the oldest son, Conrad, arranges for the captain of their ship to sell him into slavery upon arrival in Brazil. After pulling into Rio de Janeiro, the captain sells Conrad to the overseer of the imperial gardens, despite the desperate cries of Herr Riemann that his son be spared. Only with the help of a Brazilian-German mercenary and an

68 Neumann, *Brasilien ist nicht weit*, 75–76.
intercession by the Brazilian Empress Leopoldina, herself a Hapsburg, is Conrad finally
freed from slavery and reunited with his family.69

Richard Hildreth’s novel, Archy Moore, the White Slave, offers another fictional
eexample of Germans becoming slaves. Hildreth’s book told the story of a pale-skinned
mulatto (Archy) who escapes slavery and begins his life anew as a white man. After
going to England, Archy returns to the American South and takes the opportunity to try to
see slavery from the viewpoint of the white Southern gentry.70 Heike Paul notes that
translations of the book were “well-received in Germany.”71: Between 1852 and 1853
alone, at least four publishers produced the book in Leipzig, as well as a publisher in
Berlin. Translated as Der Weisse Sklave, Hildreth’s book featured a discussion between
the narrator and a slave-trader, in which the trader discussed how abducting European
children was not an unheard of practice: “Simply catch a stray Irish or German girl and
sell her- which happens sometimes- and she becomes a nigger immediately, and can be
equally as good a slave as if she had African blood in her veins.”72 Hence, Germans were
aware of instances through fictional accounts wherein immigrants ended up as slaves.

There were also actual cases of German immigrants not only enslaved, but even
“becoming black.” One such example was that of Salome Muller. Muller was born in
Langensoultzbach. The daughter of a shoemaker, her family left for the US in 1817.
However, when they arrived in Den Helder in Holland, they found that the agent whom

69 Amalia Schoppe, Die Auswanderer nach Brasilien, oder, die Hütte am Gigitonhonha:
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Jugend von 10 bis 14 Jahren (Berlin: Verlag der Buchhandlung von C.F. Amelang,
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72 Richard Hildreth, Der Weiße Sklave, oder Denkwürdigkeiten eines Flüchtlings; eine
Geschichte aus dem Sklavenleben in Virginien u.s.w. (Leipzig: Friedlein, 1853), 216.
they and other families had paid for passage to Philadelphia had stolen their money.

Stuck in the Dutch port for four months and nearly out of money, some in the group turned to begging to survive. Finally, the Dutch government intervened and booked the emigrants, including the Mullers, in three ships bound for the US. The journey proved devastating, with nearly two-thirds of the passengers dying before reaching land, including Salome’s mother and infant brother. Additionally, the emigrants discovered that the ships were not bound for Philadelphia, but rather New Orleans.73

When the Mullers finally arrived in New Orleans, the captain of their ship, despite having been paid in full by the Dutch government, announced that he was selling some of the Germans into indentured servitude. The Mullers were among the unfortunate group sold, and some members were sent north to the Attakapas region or to Opelousas, northwest of Baton Rouge. In their voyage to Attakapas, Salome’s father and brother both perished. What happened to Salome, only four years old at the time, was unknown until 1843, when a childhood friend discovered her cleaning the floors of a New Orleans café.74

Salome had no recollection of Europe or her arrival in the US. The first mention of her in the records following her leaving New Orleans as an indentured servant is in 1821, when she is sold as a slave to John Fitz Miller, who held her until 1838. During this time, Salome was a house servant and bore three children with another slave. In 1838, Miller sold Salome to Louis Belmonti, who owned the café where Salome was discovered. Salome, supported by the local German-American community, filed a lawsuit

73 Carol Wilson, “Sally Muller, the White Slave,” Louisiana History: The Journal of the Louisiana Historical Association 40, no. 2 (April 1, 1999): 134–137.
74 Ibid., 138–139.
claiming that she was wrongly enslaved and thus deserved her freedom. During the trial, John Miller claimed Salome was a mulatta named Bridgett, while the plaintiffs presented witnesses who testified that “Bridgett” shared Salome’s birthmarks. The case would go before the Louisiana Supreme Court, which ruled that Belmonti could not prove beyond a doubt that Bridgett was not Salome Muller, and thus Salome was freed. In celebration, German-Americans held a party in Lafayette for the now former slave.75 The incident was later referred to in several German books on the US, including in Ludwig Baumbach’s *Letters from the United States* (1851) and Theodor Griesinger’s *Freedom and Slavery under the Star-Spangled Banner* (1862).76

Hence, in light of the image of immigrants made slaves within the German imaginary of the period, Tschudi’s lack of concern regarding Klingelhöfer’s slave frightening German women is surprising, and thus illustrates the effect of the German masters on his slave in Tschudi’s eyes: While still mischievous, this Germanophone Afro-Brazilian was now in no way dangerous, either to the German women he frightened or to the character of his Brazilian-German master. Still, through his discussion, Tschudi emphasizes how the slave could mimic Germanness, but remained a racial Other despite his linguistic affinity to the Germans.

However, as will be discussed, while colonists purportedly positively influenced both Portuguese- and Afro-Brazilians, the nature of the German effect and calling to advance these two groups was quite different: While European- and Brazilian-German liberal nationalists asserted that they were the driving force behind changing the
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Portuguese-Brazilian national spirit, specifically through making farming and work more generally honorable, such nationalists did not see themselves as responsible for doing the same for the Afro-Brazilians. While asserting that German settlement in Brazil represented a unique expression of the German capacity to civilize, that expression remained shaped by perceptions of race that projected the Portuguese-Brazilians as perfectible, while portraying Afro-Brazilians as limited in their capacity to advance. Furthermore, while transforming the Portuguese-Brazilians was allegedly the duty of German settlers, Germanophone sources asserted that slave-owners and the state were responsible for improving the nature of Afro-Brazilians, as opposed to that of the German-Brazilian community as a whole.

**Germans’ Role in Changing Non-German Brazilians: Civilizing Afro-Brazilians as Different from Civilizing Portuguese-Brazilians**

Hence, the idea that Germans had a responsibility as a people to transform the Portuguese-Brazilians, and that the Germans were successful in fulfilling this mission, marked discussions of settlement in Brazil. However, German-Brazilian sources treated the civilizing of Afro-Brazilians quite differently from that of Portuguese-Brazilians. The Germanophone press in Southern Brazil represented Afro-Brazilians as inferior to white Brazilians (Portuguese- or German-), although German-Brazilian writers did believe that Afro-Brazilians could be improved and made constructive citizens of the country. However, while such writers asserted that civilizing the Portuguese-Brazilians was the duty of the German community, any such efforts concerning Afro-Brazilians, and slaves especially, were the job of slave-owners and the state, not settlers.
In 1869, the *Deutsche Zeitung* published “Considering Slavery and Its Abolition from a Practical Standpoint,” wherein the author critiqued those European who called for the immediate end of slavery in Brazil. Having never seen slavery nor the state in which slaves really live, the author argues, such critics are unaware how insensible full abolition was, “yet, how soon these opinions change of all those who have lived here [Brazil] for some time.” The writer stresses that his view is based solely on slavery in Southern Brazil, and not on the plantation-style slavery present in coffee- and sugar-growing regions.\footnote{Die Sklaverei und ihre Aufhebung vom praktischen Standpunkt aus betrachtet,” Deutsche Zeitung, December 22, 1869.} However, this does not stop the author from generalizing about all Afro-Brazilians as a race.

The author argues that Afro-Brazilians are inherently inferior to Whites:

“Whoever has a Negro (*Schwarze*) in his house and is forced to deal with them will agree increasingly with the Darwinian method, because it is undeniable that the Negro is at a significantly lower level of development than Whites.” The author even compares Afro-Brazilians to apes, asserting that “his physique testifies… the ration of the occiput to the face, the face itself… the conditions in his bone structure assume similarity to the skeleton of the orangutan.” The biggest obstacle to Afro-Brazilians’ development, the piece continues, is their incapacity to control their passions, which results in an arrested sense of morality. Unable to control themselves, slaves, the author argues, are better off not being free, since as long as the Afro-Brazilians is a slave, “he is industrious, frugal, and faithful.” However, once freed, he becomes a drunkard and indulges in vice until he is unable to work at all, while the freed woman turns to prostitution.\footnote{Ibid.}

\begin{footnotesize}
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\item Ibid.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
With the reality of slaves’ intellectual and moral development in mind, the author asks why anyone would call for abolishing slavery. Instead, the key to eliminating the institution is allowing it to gradually disappear via the end of the slave trade from Africa. The writer asserts that slaves were not reproducing enough to replace the trade, so, over many decades, the institution will die as the slaves themselves perish: “Slavery disappears by itself, this is certain.”

Hence, any calls for ending slavery quickly were, according to the author, based on the failed premise that slaves were intellectually and morally capable of handling freedom. In terms of whose duty it was to make sure that slaves at least moved toward a higher level of development, the author argues that the masters were responsible. He writes that due to their lack of self-control and moral compass, Afro-Brazilians need to be controlled, by measured force if necessary, by their owners “like a child and needs to be supervised by a master who, if need be, through fear inspires in him [the Negro] that he must continue to live a life anchored within the boundaries of virtue and justice.” The author laments the fact that in some instances (which he believes are the minority), masters take no time to teach their slaves proper morals and instead use violence as the only means of instruction. The piece calls on government action in such cases, calling persecuting such cases “the responsibility of the state and a point to which ordinances should be created.” At no point in the article does the author discuss Germans specifically, even when discussing how slavery is necessary to get Afro-Brazilians to work.
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Perhaps inspired by the passage of the Free Womb Law in 1871, later discussions of abolition in the German-Brazilian press recognized that slavery would likely end faster than the time required for the demise of every slave. Furthermore, German-Brazilian writers became more optimistic regarding the capacity of former slaves to become productive and morally upstanding citizens. As before, these journalists believed that (former) slaves would require training to civilize, but also as before, such writers did not believe that the Germans, whose spirit for work was reshaping the Portuguese-Brazilians, were specially suited for this task. Instead, Germanophone journals argued that the state should be responsible. Hence, while the Germans held a mission to change the spirit of the Portuguese-Brazilians, no such calling existed regarding the spirit of the Afro-Brazilians.

In April 1883, the Deutsche Zeitung published a discussion of the rising tide of abolitionism in Rio Grande do Sul. In “Regarding this Chapter of Emancipation,” the newspaper warns against eliminating the institution too quickly in the province, calling instead for a more measured approach. The author acknowledges that slavery is morally reprehensible and socially destructive, calling it “an evil to the state and society, a cancer that allows no real development to arise.” Slavery is, according to the author, economically and socially destructive. However, he refuses to agree with those who oppose slavery for humanitarian reasons, instead calling Africans “the deeply spiritually and materially low Ethiopian race.” “In fact,” he writes, “it is difficult to invoke humanity in favor of the slaves, because the history of humanity speaks to us only of the oppression of one race by the other,” and thus, White’s domination of Africans is only part of the natural flow of human history. The article further dismisses those who call
slaves their “black brothers” as being naive, since anyone living in a slave-holding society has seen how some of the cruelest slave-owners are former slaves themselves.\textsuperscript{81}

However, the economic and social benefits that ending slavery will produce do not, the author argues, justify mass, immediate abolition. Besides the question of replacing the labor of slaves, the issue of preparing them for freedom was central to the article’s objection to quick abolition. Looking back at the Free Womb Law, the article points out that the law failed to require the education of the emancipated minors, and that many received no moral upbringing by their parents’ masters: “They are as abundant as cattle and prove that in their free state, they are far more unbridled, meaner, and more depraved than their parents once were under the force of the slave-whip.” It remains unclear, the article warns, if freeing the children of slaves was a good idea, since, based on their uncivilized condition and actions, they might come to rise up and “settle the bill with the oppressors of their ancestors in a bloody manner.”\textsuperscript{82}

Freedom without education is dangerous, the author argues, reminding the reader that “man must be trained for freedom,” and Afro-Brazilians especially: “The wise, culturally-superior Caucasian is not the same as the morally depraved and bestial Negro,” and if one wants to give slaves a future, education is key, “so that he will, one day as a free citizen, become useful to the state and society.” In addressing how this training should take place, the author calls for the government to create a system of trade and agricultural schools for freed slave children, which would create workers and farmers instead of “slackers, idlers, parasites, and beggars who are… capable of any and all crime.” As freed children are trained in these institutions, and thereby learn to work, the

\textsuperscript{81} “Zum Kapitel Emancipation.”
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institution of slavery will gradually disappear as no new slaves are born.\textsuperscript{83} Thus, the state, not the settlers, were responsible for civilizing Afro-Brazilians.

In October 1884, \textit{Koseritz' Deutsche Zeitung} published “Slave Emancipation in Rio Grande,” which reviewed debates regarding abolishing slavery throughout the province, with the provincial capital of Porto Alegre having done so in September.\textsuperscript{84} The piece focuses especially on the notion of work contracts, which would require emancipated ex-slaves to work for former masters for up to five years without compensation. The article rejects the argument by some that the contracts were inhumane and designed only with the needs of slave-owners in mind, not those of slaves. Slavery remains legal throughout most of Brazil, the author reminds the reader, and he predicts that resistance by the coffee-growing elite will extend the institution through 1900. “So, the local slaves would prefer to be freed in the manner indicated [work contracts], if the majority could still have had to serve 16 more years without it.” Additionally, under the contracts, the slaves would be free, thereby protected under the law from whipping and other forms of punishment reserved for slaves.\textsuperscript{85}

The article also warns of the potential economic and social effects of freeing slaves without binding them to work for a period. Economically, “[y]ears would pass before labor could be reorganized, and all branches of production would suffer tremendously.” Socially, the articles asserts that the contract period is necessary for the slaves to adapt to the responsibilities of free citizens, especially in terms of their
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willingness to work. If not taught the value of work through their time as freemen bound by contract, “the roving freedmen would also form a real danger to public peace,” turning to crime and filling the cities with masses that refused to work, thereby forming “a true proletariat.” The article cites the American South as an example, which it claims faced ten years of social disorder following immediate abolition. Those who oppose the contracts, the author argues, must keep in mind what the result would be: “economic ruin, moral degeneration, and the disruption of civil order.” Work contracts would solve all of this, since the time wherein the ex-slave is bound to work would allow him “to grow gradually accustomed to his new position in life” as a productive and law-abiding citizen. This manner of ending slavery while maintaining the economy and preparing the ex-slaves for full freedom “is a huge step forward,” and the author argues that it should “be accepted as the model for the whole of the empire.”

Here again, the Brazilian-German press asserted that slaves were in need of education and training to become productive citizens by learning the value of work. However, any reference to Germans’ specific capacity to teach that value or civilize non-Germans, unlike in discussions of Portuguese-Brazilians, is gone; those duties belong to slaves’ masters in this case, and not to the settler community specifically.

The same year that “Slave Emancipation in Rio Grande” appeared, Koseritz’ Deutscher Volkskalender published “Regarding the Slave Emancipation Question,” written by German-Brazilian journalist Victor Esche. The article summed up recent debates within the province and country, and it reflected the German-Brazilian view that gradual emancipation was the best course, both for economic reasons and to allow time
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for slaves to learn to be productive and law-abiding. Like in the articles already discussed, Esche too saw the need to civilize and educate slaves as a duty for masters and the state, not one for the German settler population specifically.

Like most Brazilian-German commentaries of the 1880s on slavery and abolition, Esche begins by establishing that slavery is immoral and destructive for the entire country, calling it “a cancer on society” that perverted social relations in Brazil. Esche argues that due to slavery, “the Brazilians were brought up for centuries that heavy, purely physical, menial jobs were to be done only by Negros,” and this further strengthened the country’s incapacity to create a functioning free workforce.

Furthermore, the refusal of slave-owners, beginning with the Portuguese and continuing among the Brazilian, to provide education for their slaves led to further decline of the slaves’ intellectual and moral development, creating a huge population that was totally unready for freedom, and this is the current dilemma in Brazil. This situation, Esche writes, makes unrestricted abolition not only undesirable, but dangerous: “The consequences of this neglect will come to pass in a frightening way for the state, should emancipation ex abrupto come into being.”

Esche argues that the state needs to create a network of trade, farming, elementary schools to help inculcate morality and useful skills into the slave population, thereby opening the door for their becoming productive citizens in the future. Again, the Brazilian government and masters, not German-Brazilians, were called on to civilize and educate the slave population.

Thus, while German-language sources recognized that individual German slave owners had a positive impact on their slaves, there was no recognition of Afro-Brazilians
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as a whole being targets of the German mission to civilize Brazil. Instead, the civilizing of Afro-Brazilians remained the duty, according to German sources, of the state or individual slave-owners. This was in sharp contrast to discussions of Portuguese-Brazilians, whom Germanophone authors presented as transformed through the work and example of colonists.

**German Nationalism, Race, and Views of the Other**

That Germans did not feel explicitly compelled to civilize Afro-Brazilians is unsurprising, based on the long-standing view of Africans as inferior among Germans, and Europeans more generally. Most studies of race concerning Germany have focused principally on the Enlightenment, the Third Reich, or the period following 1945.89 Those studies that did look at the Imperial period tended, until recently, to focus solely on the
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metropole. However, there is a growing effort to integrate thought within Germany into the global context, both through formal German colonies and otherwise.

Throughout the construction of the modern notion of “race,” Germans were actively engaged in the discussion. In 1684, François Bernier, a French physician and philosopher, published *New division of Earth by the different species or races which inhabit it*. This was among the first books to divide and categorize humanity based on observable characteristics. However, the idea that humanity could be divided as such was challenged from the beginning. For example, German mathematician and philosopher Gottfried Wilhelm Liebnitz argued that there was only one race, and physical differences were due to interactions with the environment.
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However, organizing humanity along taxonomic lines continued. In the tenth edition of his *Systema naturae*, Swedish botanist and physician Carl von Linnaeus was the first to make humans part of the animal kingdom: the genus *Homo* was in the order of Primates, but divided into two species, *Homo sapiens* (humans) and *Homo troglodytes* (apes). Linnaeus further divided *Homo sapiens* into four varieties, which he defined by physical characteristics, but also by their character: American (ruled by custom); Asian (ruled by opinion); African (ruled by impulse); European (ruled by law). 94

By the late-eighteenth century, German thinkers became more heavily influential in the European construction of “race.” Robert Bernasconi argues that “if any one person should be recognized as the author of the first theory of race worthy of name, it should be German philosopher Immanuel Kant.” 95 Kant published works regarding race in 1775, 1785, and 1788. 96 He based his view on the Comte de Buffon’s work on animal reproduction: Only animals of the same type could produce fertile offspring, and since humans, regardless of their origin or physical characteristics, could produce fertile offspring, it followed that humans shared a single origin and belonged to the same species. 97

96 Strack, “Physical Anthropology,” 289.
In “On the Different Races of Men,” originally published in 1775, Kant referred to “race” to refer to varieties within humans that continued despite changes in the environment and reproduction. Kant asserted that racial variety was based “seeds” (Keime), which existed in all animals, including humans. These seeds allowed organisms to adapt to environments, but once a seed began developing in a particular way, the other seeds ceased developing and the changes became permanent. So, this made “racial” characteristics not only based on the environment, but also permanent. Still, Kant believed that humanity shared a single origin, and became a strong defender of monogenesis. However, while Kant avoided explicitly ranking races based on quality, he did believe that the “original” humans were white, and that race-mixing was, on the whole, to be avoided.98

Heavily influenced by Kant, Johann Friedrich Blumenbach was a comparative anatomist who also played a central role in shaping the European notion of race. Like Kant, Blumenbach argued that all humanity shared a single origin, and thus races were not distinct species. Rather, physical differences were the product of the environment in which a group lived. Blumenbach divided humanity into five varieties (Caucasian, Mongolian, Ethiopian, Native American, Malay), but was explicit in his rejection of assertions that Africans were inferior, arguing instead that humanity’s variety is too vast to divide along lines of quality.99 However, Blumenbach’s writings reflected a growing

association between race and heredity, with “Varietät” and “Spielart,” used in his earlier
corrections, replaced by “Race” and “Rasse” by 1806.100

While Kant was not explicit in accepting the notion of racial
superiority/inferiority, and Blumenbach rejected it outright, there were supporters of
these ideas in Germany. The two leading voices were Samuel Thomas von
Soemmerring and Cristoph Meiners. Soemmering was a physician and anatomist, while
Meiners, already discussed in Chapter II, was a philosopher and historian, as well as a
colleague of Blumenbach’s at Göttingen. As will be discussed in greater detail below,
both men asserted that Africans were racially inferior to Europeans. Soemmering based
his conclusions largely on dissections of a group of blacks living in Kassel, most of
whom died from tuberculosis, while Meiners based his analysis largely on travelogues, as
well as on Soemmerring’s findings regarding black’s allegedly smaller skulls and
brains.101

In looking to find a relation between the development of race and German
nationalism in the eighteenth-century, Johann Gottfried Herder is a useful example to
consider. Herder believed that a combination of shared cultural, linguistic, and historical
factors created a specific people, or Volk. The Volk was not dependent on the existence of
a nation-state, although Herder believed in the close relation of cultural and political
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spheres when possible, with each infusing the other.\textsuperscript{102} This vision of nation based on culture was heavily influential in the development of German nationalism, due to the lack of a single German nation-state for the first seven decades of the nineteenth century. In his study, \textit{Roots of German Nationalism}, Louis L. Snyder asserts that in the rising anti-French nationalism of the German states in the early-nineteenth century, “the tone was set by Johann Gottfried Herder.”\textsuperscript{103}

In discussing nation, Herder was explicit in his rejection of Enlightenment universalism. Instead, he emphasized how each people had its own specific characteristics.\textsuperscript{104} Furthermore, Herder ostensibly disagreed with ranking national communities, as well as races, qualitatively; in 1785’s \textit{Ideas for a Philosophy for the History of Mankind}, Herder attacked Kant for dividing humanity into four races.\textsuperscript{105} However, in his discussions of national characteristics, while Herder emphasized climate as driving their formation, he also believed that those characteristics could become hereditary. In this way, Herder’s vision of race did have a biological determinist characteristic. Additionally, there were cases wherein he made reference to certain groups being less developed than others, such as the alleged underdevelopment of
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Chinese sense organs and their national character, as well as asserting that Africans were adapted more for physical than mental activity. Hence, while Herder emphasized the unity of humanity as a single species, he also classified some groups qualitatively, although this was not central to his overall view. Still, it should be noted that Herder was quite explicit in his rejection of slavery, asserting that it violated the rights to freedom that each Volk enjoyed.

That Herder’s view of race had a biological aspect should not be surprising. During the opening decades of the nineteenth century, race grew increasingly “biologized.” In France, the zoologist and naturalist Georges Cuvier refused to connect alleged inadequacies of blacks with biology in his later eighteenth-century writings, but by 1817, when he published his four-volume work, *The Animal Kingdom*, Cuvier connected what he saw as blacks’ lack of intelligence to the stunted development of their nervous system. In England, the term “race” as a biological category remained less common than on the Continent until the 1830s, when it became more widespread. By 1850, with Robert Knox’s *The Races of Man*, the concept of race was as much being discussed in Britain as in France and elsewhere. In *The Races of Man*, Knox argued that conflict between the races drives history, and that hatred among the races was the natural
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state of things. “Race is everything,” write Knox, “literature, science, art, in a word civilization, depend on it.”

However, in the German context especially, there remains a debate if race prior to the 1850s was fully or only partly biological. Brian Vick argues a middle position, wherein he recognizes that German thought on race before the 1850s was different from that of the post-Darwinian period, but that there were “at least partially biologically determinist racial doctrines” present between the 1780s and 1850. Still, Vick argues, the German idealist vision of the power of free will, human agency, and education to overcome innate qualities remained central in the earlier period.

The introduction of Darwinism caused a huge stir in Germany, not only among intellectuals, but among the masses as well. Alfred Kelly writes that “Darwinism became a kind of popular philosophy in Germany more than any other country, even England.” Thanks in part to work of “scientific populizers,” such as Ernst Haeckel, Friedrich Ratzel, and Wilhelm Böltsche, popular Darwinism moved from liberal and intellectual circles in

109 For assertions regarding Kant’s racism, see Bernasconi, “Kant as an Unfamiliar”; Wulf D. Hund, Rassismus: die soziale Konstruktion natürlicher Ungleichheit (Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot, 1999), 119–26; Larrimore, “Sublime Waste”. For works denying Kant’s view as fully biological, see John H. Zammito, “Policing Polygeneticism in Germany, 1775: (Kames,) Kant, and Blumenbach,” in The German Invention of Race, ed. Sara Eigen and Mark Larrimore (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2006), 35–54; Strack, “Physical Anthropology.”
the 1860s to the working class in the 1880s. With the arrival and spread of Darwinism, culture and biology became increasingly linked through the concept of race. German biologist and morphologist Ernst Haeckel reflected this. He asserted that each race was a species and he ranked the races’ capacity for cultural development based on physical characteristics. Haeckel also ranked Germans as among the races with the most potential for development, including them with the Jews, Greeks, and Romans. However, it should be noted that Haeckel’s connecting biology and culture were not unopposed through the 1870s. Naturalists and anthropologists such as Oscar Peschel, Ludwig Rüttermeyer, and Alexander Goette, among others, disputed many of Haeckel’s findings. Nevertheless, as Robert J. Richards writes, by beginning of the twentieth century, “most naturalists and anthropologists… simply took racial hierarchy as empirically given.”

Hence, German thinkers were engaged with the question of race from the eighteenth century onward, and their positions reflected the larger evolution of the concept in Europe. Beyond the theoretical realm, cases of German contact with groups
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113 In discussing German radical nationalists in the Kaiserreich, Peter Walkenhorst portrays this blending of culture and race as the combination of the views of the Comte de Gobineau, Darwin, and Houston Stewart Chamberlain, which these radical nationalists adapted in such a way as to not only judge Slavs and Jews as outsiders to the national community, but also those “racially” German whose behavior was seen as deviant. See Peter Walkenhorst, Nation-Volk-Rasse: radikaler Nationalismus im Deutschen Kaiserreich 1890-1914 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 102–15.
perceived as outside the ethnic and later explicitly racial community reflected a relationship between German nationalism and race. While Germany did not hold colonies overseas during most of the period examined in this dissertation, the development of views regarding the Poles is illustrative of the growing connection between race and biology in German thought, wherein what were formally seen as cultural characteristics came to be seen as inherent and immutable, thereby making assimilation of the Poles into Germans impossible.

As Wolfgang Wippermann notes, many German authors of the mid-nineteenth century made reference to a “struggle of races” in reference to the Germans and the Poles, but in this period these writers used the term “race” more in a cultural-historical sense. However, by the beginning of the twentieth century, discussions of Slavs as a “race” reflected a stronger biological sense.117

For instance, during debates in the Frankfurt Parliament, delegates raised concerns regarding “race-war” against Germans by Poles in Poznania and by Slavs more generally. Brian Vick notes that such terms were not present when discussing the Danes of Schleswig-Holstein, since German nationalists saw them as being part of the larger Teutonic people. Many deputies saw Scandinavians more generally in the same way, and this helped fuel calls for alliances with those northern countries against the Russians. However, this understanding of community was mainly cultural, referencing similarity of language most often: “If language and nationhood were distinct, language affinity provided all the more useful a marker of these grander, protoracial divisions.”118

Furthermore, as Vick notes, differentiation of racial categories of this period was more
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117 Wippermann, Der “deutsche Drang nach Osten,” 102–3.
118 Vick, Defining Germany, 191–4; Levinger, Enlightened Nationalism, 122–3.
nuanced, with many categories of Europeans, versus in later periods, wherein Europeans were categorized as Caucasian.\textsuperscript{119}

Even into the 1870s, there were many who saw this difference as cultural. During the \textit{Kulturkampf}, Chancellor Otto von Bismarck engaged in a policy of “Germanization” in Eastern Prussia. As in the rest of Germany, the state took over the role of overseeing schools from the Catholic Church. In the Polish territories, Germany enforced German as the language of government, the courts, and instruction. This, Bismarck and others believed, would end Polish nationalism and make the Poles into Germans. However, Polish resistance to the policy proved incessant, while growing numbers of Poles moved westward into Germany. By the 1880s, however, Germany moved from trying to Germanize Poles to Germanizing the land through internal colonization, settling Germans on land once held by Poles.\textsuperscript{120} As Kristin Kopp writes, with the shift in policy reflected the end of the notion that Poles could be made into Germans. Citing the document that established inner colonization, “[g]one… is the notion that the Poles can be Germanized,” and she asserts that the “inner colonization campaign was designed to push back a population now deemed unassimilable.”\textsuperscript{121} Thus, the German view of Poles gradually

\textsuperscript{121} Kopp, \textit{Germany’s Wild East}, 68.
moved from seeing them as culturally inferior but improvable to permanently inferior and beyond help, thereby becoming fully racially inferior.

While Poles represented a racialized Other for European-Germans, Brazilian-Germans settled in a country with a massive population of African descent. As will be discussed, there was a strong sense among Brazilian-Germans of African racial inferiority. This was a reflection of the long-standing German opinion of Africans. In the eighteenth century, Soemmering asserted that Blacks were closer to apes than Whites. In 1784, Soemmering published *Regarding the Physical Differences of the Moors from the Europeans*, in which he argued that Africans were more like apes than Europeans, but in which he also asserted that regardless to their similarity to apes, Blacks were capable of intelligence and retained the rights of humanity. Meiners concluded that lighter skinned people were superior to those with darker skin, calling the latter “not only much weaker in body and spirit, but also is by nature more full of faults and emptier of virtue.” In discussing whites, Meiners concluded that “[p]rovidence gave the Caucasians peoples not only greater advantages of body, but also of mind.” While agreeing with Soemmering that slaves deserved to be treated as humans, Meiners defended slavery directly by asserting that the system made blacks, who were “many
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122 In 1872, free Afro-Brazilians alone accounted for more than 40% of the country’s population. See Graham, “Free African Brazilians,” 30–2.
124 Samuel Thomas von Soemmerring, *Über die körperliche Verschiedenheit des Mohren vom Europäer* (Mainz, 1784), 5; 32.
more degrees unfeeling, limited in understanding, and less good-natured in temperament” than whites, productive and protected from their less developed nature.  

While Kant attacked Meiners’ view of blacks (and each race) as a different species, Kant was not above some racist generalizations himself. For example, Kant believed that blacks were not capable of governing themselves, and he opposed the mixing of races.  

Obviously, this view carried into the nineteenth century. As discussed in Chapter II, Hegel referred to the African as “the natural man” who was savage and without civilization. Hegel said that “there is nothing akin to humanity in his character.” As Bradley Naranch discusses, Karl Andree’s popular magazine Globus reflected Andree’s view of Africans as savage and his opposition to the notion of racial equality. “Andree’s magazine,” Naranch writes, “functioned as a central European outpost for post-Reconstruction reactionary discourses of racial antagonism to enter the German public sphere.”  

Hence, that Brazilian-Germans viewed Afro-Brazilians as racially inferior, uncivilized, and lazy is unsurprising, based on the dominant view during this period. That the German-Brazilians saw the Portuguese-Brazilians as inferior and lazy has been well-established in previous chapters, but so too has the fact that this view was based on  
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129 Hegel, Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Geschichte, 115.  
external factors, such as the Brazilian dependence on slavery, as opposed to the immutable character of those of Portuguese descent. The belief that the Portuguese could be improved and, to an extent, “Germanized” in their approach to work through observing the German example reflected this. However, as discussed above, German settlers saw current and former slaves as inherently flawed, and hence it was doubtful is even the industrious German example could reshape the Afro-Brazilian masses.

Coercion, as slavery had shown, could force the Afro-Brazilians to work, and coercion was the duty of the state, not German settlers. Thus, German-Brazilian nationalists saw their role as transforming Brazil through the Portuguese-Brazilian population, but any transformation of the Afro-Brazilians was not part of their civilizing mission.

**The Ideology of Vagrancy**

The idea that Afro-Brazilians were, by their nature, lazy, was not simply a German one. The Brazilian elite saw the free poor, many of whom were Afro-Brazilian, as unwilling to work. This idea has become known as the “ideology of vagrancy,” and its influence on Brazilian policies relates directly to the perceived need to increase the number of European immigrants coming to the country.

As Laura de Mello e Souza established, the ideology of vagrancy existed before the end of the slave trade, but as Lúcio Kowarick among others discuss, it became especially prevalent as Brazil shifted from a slave-labor model to that of free labor. Briefly, the Brazilian elite saw the free poor in a very negative light, envisioning them as uncivilized, lazy, and even dangerous. Hence, planters and the state developed repressive means to maintain order. Naturally, the lower class met these efforts with resistance, forming a feedback loop in the minds of the elite: the lazy and violent nature of the poor
required repression, and when they resisted, this only proved that they had to be compelled, even with violence, to act properly. Furthermore, while former slaves saw work on plantations an affront to their freedom, planters interpreted this as evidence that Afro-Brazilians were inherently unwilling to work. In this way, the alleged indolence of the free poor became a means by which the system of slavery was defended: Without compulsion, so the argument went, Afro-Brazilians would avoid work, producing economic and social anarchy. Throughout much of Brazil, systems to force the poor to work appeared during the closing decades of the Empire and into the Old Republic.

As Brazilian elites constructed the image of the free, Afro-Brazilian poor as indolent, they asserted the European immigrant as the solution to the labor issue. Arguing that Brazilian farmers lack “the stimulus of having to maintain a civilized standard of living” and that they were reluctant to “work hard and continuously,” Minister of Agriculture João Lins Vieira Cansanção de Sinimbú, at the Agricultural

132 Lúcio Kowarick, Trabalho e vadiagem: a origem do trabalho livre no Brasil (São Paulo, SP: Editora Brasiliense, 1987), 115; Souza, Desclassificados do ouro, 304.
134 For a discussion of how, during the end of the Empire and throughout the Old Republic, visions of immigrants and freed slaves helped construct the notion of the freed poor as lazy and criminal, thus disrespecting “the supreme law of society,” that of work, see Sidney Chalhoub, Trabalho, lar e botequim: o cotidiano dos trabalhadores no Rio de Janeiro da belle époque, 2nd ed. (Campinas, SP: Editora da Unicamp, 2001), 64–89.
Congress of 1878, called for increasing European immigration to solve the problem.\textsuperscript{135} Thus, German- and Portuguese-Brazilian thinkers were in agreement regarding both the need to compel Afro-Brazilians to work and the role of European immigrants in addressing the labor issue that Afro-Brazilians alleged indolence produced.

\textbf{Slavery in the Local Context: Germans Treated as Slaves due to Lack of Political and Religious Rights}

Beyond the transatlantic level, Brazilian-German groups also utilized claims regarding slavery at the local level to improve their political situation; speaking for the community as a whole, Brazilian-German newspapers often compared settlers’ legal situation to that of slaves.

As discussed in Chapter III, German-Brazilian settlers faced a host of restrictions on their political rights and religious rights. For instance, not until January 1881 could non-Catholics or naturalized citizens (those not born in Brazil) serve in office or vote, while the government did not recognize non-Catholic marriage at all until 1863, but Protestant marriage would not become fully recognized until 1889.\textsuperscript{136} As the tide of

\begin{flushleft}

abolition began to reach its peak in the 1880s, the German-Brazilian press engaged in a novel strategy for demanding that the state lift all religion-based restrictions on settlers: Journalists argued that, in light of these restrictions, settlers’ position in Brazilian society was no better than that of slaves. In doing so, these Germanophone writers utilized abolition as a means to demand the full integration of Brazilians Germans.

In a letter published in the *Deutsche Zeitung* in 1881, a Brazilian-German farmer in the colonial zone compared the political and religious position of settlers to that of a state of slavery. Emil Schlabitz, whom the newspaper claims is a well-read and well-informed farmer, stresses the settlers’ role in making Brazil productive, as well as the incapacity of the Portuguese-Brazilian legislature to meet the basic needs of the colonies. Schlabitz does this by emphasizing the lack of Brazilian-Germans in the government.137 He opens his letter by referencing the American colonies’ position that taxation without representation was a form of servitude. While the American Revolution solved this issue, it took the Civil War and the work of politicians after the war to make the former American slaves full citizens. However, the matter of citizenship remains an open question in Brazil, at least for immigrants. Schlabitz puts this state of affairs in terms that stress his outrage that African Americans enjoyed rights that Brazilian-Germans did not: “For some time it seemed as if the rights granted by the whites in North America to blacks would be denied to the whites here in Brazil by the colored people, as the former
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137 This article was published only two months after the passage of the Sariava Law, prior to the law’s effects being felt in earnest.
were not the equal to the children of slaves.”\textsuperscript{138} In this, Schlabitz is emphasizing that those emancipated under the Free Womb Law will gain the right to vote upon becoming adults, but not until the Saraiva Law of two months earlier was it possible for the settlers to do so.

Schlabitz argues that even with the recent rights bestowed by the legislature, settlers remain second-class citizens in the Brazilian political system. He cites abuses by Portuguese-Brazilian officials, who “may remove [our] rights … and rob us according to his whim, like a Turkish pasha”. This is shameful, since the settlers arrived in Brazil “to work, live, and probably die here” and the colonists “raise children… that they should be proud to be sons of this country [Brazil].” Additionally, Brazilian-Germans are “the main agricultural faction of the population, with the greater part of the Brazilians of this province living by cattle- raising, and we can expect neither understanding nor interest in farming from them.” Thus, the settlers were the force that tamed the wilderness and made the province productive. Furthermore, Schlabitz writes, the legislature so far, controlled by Portuguese-Brazilians, has proven unable to help the settlers expand on their success. “The colonies are in difficult terrain,” he writes, and this makes it “absolutely necessary” that the government act to improve conditions for colonization, farming, and trade. “The creation of transportation routes… the opening of the port of Torres [in northern Rio Grande do Sul], the end of battles regarding land titles can be achieve only through the legislature.” This underscores the need for colonists to use their newfound rights to elect fellow Brazilian-Germans. Until such time, settlers will continue to pay taxes to a government unable to meet their needs and without a voice of their own in policy-making.

\textsuperscript{138} “Eine Stimme aus dem Urwald.”
and thus “live in a state of slavery.” However, the recent granting of voting rights provided the means to end this form of tyranny and civilize Brazil: “we are free men… and as free men we will go to the polls and exercise our right to vote, for our honor and for the best of the fatherland. 139

In August 1888, only two months after full abolition in Brazil, an article in Koseritz’ Deutsche Zeitung asserted that the conditions for Brazilian-Germans were essentially worse than that of slaves during slavery. The article opened by stating that Brazil had long been dominated by the colonial heritage of the metropole, wherein Portuguese language, institutions, and Catholicism dominated the country, so that “[e]verything not Portuguese was suppressed or merely tolerated”, including any residents on non-Portuguese descent. The author cited the enslavement of Amerindians and later the importation of African slaves. The Germans, too, according to the piece, suffered from this Portuguese-centric nativism, so that “members of the Germanic peoples… have been merely tolerated with their different language and religion.”140 Hence, the piece both distanced Brazilian-Germans from slavery by stressing its connection to the Portuguese and their descendants, as well as argued that slaves and Germans alike suffered at the hands of the those groups.

However, even the Portuguese-Brazilians could not deny that the spirit of the century “has different requirements for a civilized people”, and thus Brazil could no longer maintain a system as inherently unequal as slavery. In this way, the author argued that the Brazilians could hardly be lauded for abolition. Instead, it was the world, not Brazil that changed, and that outside pressure brought Brazilians to finally accept that

139 Ibid.
140 “Zur Slavenbefreiung,” Koseritz’ Deutsche Zeitung, August 8, 1888.
slavery had to end: “Thus, the abolition of slavery dropped like an over-ripe fruit into the bosom of the Brazilian people.” However, “spiritual bondage” remained alive and well in Brazil, and until Protestants enjoyed the same rights as Catholics, Brazil would remain unfree. The author argued that freedom of worship must follow the end of slavery, since it was absurd that Afro-Brazilians should enjoy rights that certain whites, specifically Protestant Germans, could not. “Yet, spiritual liberation is not as worthy to challenge as physical liberation? A curious country, this Brazil.”

Here, the article equated directly the status of slaves and the legal situation of Protestant settlers. In doing so, it argued that freed Afro-Brazilians actually now were of a higher status than non-Catholic colonists, at least in terms of equality of rights. Additionally, in asserting that “spiritual liberation” was as important as “physical,” the author correlated the suffering of those without the latter (slaves) with those who lacked the former (Protestants in Brazil). This made a dramatic, if not overstated, case that Brazil instated full religious equality, it would remain an “unfree” country.

**Conclusion**

Hence, while discourses regarding slavery were a primary means to stress the incapacity of Portuguese-Brazilians to civilize their country, allegations regarding German-Brazilians and slavery further emphasized the Germans’ unique role in advancing the country. Whether by distancing settlers from the institution or emphasizing the intimate and positive connection between slaves and German masters, these sources portrayed the Germans as the driving moral force in Brazil. Furthermore, Germans were allegedly so transformative to the spirit of the Portuguese-Brazilians whom they
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contacted, Germans helped drive slavery from Rio Grande do Sul four years earlier than most of the rest of Brazil. Still, despite such claims concerning the sweeping power of Germans to remake Brazil and Brazilians, these claims remained structured by race, wherein Portuguese-Brazilians could be fully civilized and they fell within the scope of the German mission, while Afro-Brazilians’ perfectibility remained questionable and they were not specifically part of the German civilizing mission. Furthermore, Brazilian-Germans utilized claims regarding slavery to further their demands for full political inclusion through emphasizing the role of Germans in advancing Brazil. Hence, German discourses of slavery on both sides of the Atlantic were a means to underscore the German civilizing role in the country in both the transnational and national settings.
Conclusion

This dissertation is a study of German colonial thinking regarding Southern Brazil throughout the Brazilian imperial period, and as such pushes at the temporal boundary of the narrative of Brazilian fears regarding Germans. Shortly after sunset on Monday, April 16th, 1917, a group of angry residents gathered on the Rua 7 de Setembro in Porto Alegre. They stood in front of the largest German-owned trading firm in all of Brazil, crowbars and axes in hand. Tensions in the city were high, with a German submarine having sunk a Brazilian freighter, the Paraná, off the coast of France only 11 days earlier. By the afternoon of the 16th, anger towards the local German population had reached a boiling point and riots engulfed a group German businesses and homes. By early evening, the rioters attacked the Bromberg Company, and by 10:30 PM, the building was in flames, with the inferno spreading to neighboring buildings. Barrels of petroleum stored inside the Bromberg property fueled the fire, and the ensuing explosions lit up the sky for miles. Over the next three days, some 300 more buildings would be damaged, mostly owned by European- and Brazilian-Germans.¹

While the deaths of the sailors on the Paraná served as the immediate spark igniting this violence, a deeper distrust by Brazilians of Germans also played a part; German settlers appeared to be a nation within a nation, unwilling to accept the language and culture of their Brazilian fatherland. Such concerns began in the middle of the

¹ Luebke, Germans in Brazil: A Comparative History of Cultural Conflict During World War I, 130–5.
nineteenth century and grew increasingly extreme following Germany’s unification and adoption of a foreign policy based on *Weltpolitik*. During this evolution, Brazilian anxieties focused increasingly on the potential of political disloyalty among settlers, and by the early twentieth century, some even feared the formation of a formal German imperial colony in Southern Brazil. As this dissertation shows, however, the development of German colonial thinking regarding Southern Brazil began far before the German Empire, dating instead at least as early as the opening years of the Brazilian Empire.

By the 1850s, Portuguese-Brazilians worried about disloyal intentions among German settlers. In October 1852, Deputy João Jacinto de Mendonça voiced such concern in the Riograndense Assembly. Referring to the failure of the government to assimilate German-Brazilians, Mendonça warned that culture often reflected politics, meaning that the colonists’ failure to adopt local language and customs could represent a considerable threat: “‘one cannot predict the difficulties resulting from a national population with strictly foreign habits… I believe that this evil is itself very serious, and that we should remedy it.’”¹ Deputy José Bernardino da Cunha Bittencourt echoed his colleague’s concern, making direct reference to settlers’ alleged political disloyalty. Referring to the alleged willingness of other European settlers to adopt Brazil as their homeland, Bittencourt asked “[c]an we say the same about the miserable Germans? It does not seem so to me. In general, there is no son or even grandson that fights for Brazil the way that he would for his homeland [Germany]: following the example of their
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parents, they see this land more as a stepmother than as a mother.”

Settlers, Bittencourt claimed, remained German not only in culture, but also in loyalty.

By the twentieth century, concerns regarding the political loyalty of German-Brazilians blended with the expansionist foreign policy of Imperial Germany, intensifying into out-and-out fear of German (settler and European) colonial designs for Southern Brazil. Sílvio Romero, a politician and literary theorist, became the spokesperson for such fears. In 1906, he published *Germanism in Southern Brazil*, wherein he called for immediate action to assure the cultural and political loyalty of German settlers, whom he saw as quite possibly traitorous. Romero warned that the leading elements of the German-Brazilian community, as well as many of the community at large, accepted as fact that sooner or later, the settlement region would join with Germany, or at least would become independent from Brazil, much as the Boers did in the Transvaal: “When they [German settlers] feel strong enough in numbers and wealth to confront us, will come the signal to constitute politically their departure.” The armed response by the Brazilian government would lead Germany to intervene militarily, making the newly independent Southern Brazil a “moral protectorate” of the German Empire. So as to prevent this from happening, Romero called on forbidding large sales of land from German companies, establishing a stronger Brazilian military presence in Southern Brazil, and banning the use of German in all legal and government documents.

Scholarship regarding fears of German-Brazilian political disloyalty and of German imperial intentions in Southern Brazil focus only on the period after the
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3 Quoted in ibid., 93.
4 Sílvio Romero, *O allemanismo no sul do Brasil, seus perigos e meios de os conjurar.* (Rio de Janeiro: H. Ribeiro & c., 1906), 47.
5 Ibid., 18; 52.
Germany’s turn to world power, often using the Pan-German League, created in 1891, as a pivot-point for analysis. In this way, the field remains tied to the threat of formal colonization by Germany, and does not examine the roots of German colonial thinking concerning the region.\(^5\)

This is not to deny that there was not potential for formal colonization of Southern Brazil by Germany.\(^6\) Still, this dissertation illustrates how discussions of German colonial aims in Southern Brazil cannot be understood without first recognizing how on both sides of the Atlantic, German perceptions of the region were colonial far before they became “imperial” (relating to a political relationship to the German Empire); German


\(^7\) For a discussion of fears in the United States regarding possible German colonial plans for Southern Brazil, see Nancy Mitchell, The Danger of Dreams: German and American Imperialism in Latin America (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), Chapter 3.
nationalists in Europe and Brazil perceived settlers as the sole bearers of civilization and fonts of development in Southern Brazil, acting to transform the land and its (white) residents from examples of idleness to models of productivity.

The connection between race and German nationality is also a well-tread topic. Peter Martin’s book examining German views from the twelfth century shows how Africans gradually transformed in German eyes from a means to distinguish between German classes, through the use of African servants to indicate wealth, to being seen as inherently different from and inferior to Europeans.7 Vera Lind and Heike Paul, on the other hand, look at how Germans identified, to a limited extent, with African slaves in the United States, Lind’s subjects with slaves they met during the American Revolution and Paul’s with those they saw in fictional accounts during the nineteenth century.8 The implications of race and the functions of empire have also been investigated. For example, Lora Wildenthal’s study of pro-colonial German women exposes the tricky business of balancing difference in Germany with the sexual sphere of the colonies, wherein colonizer “meets” colonized in assorted ways.9 Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann notes how German colonial administrators often saw the German role as one of changing Africans’ behavior through coercion, rejecting the notion of ever changing natives’ “nature.”10
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8 Peter Martin, Schwarze Teufel, edle Mohren: Afrikaner in Geschichte und Bewußtsein der Deutschen (Hamburg: Junius, 1993).
11 Strandmann, “The Purpose of German Colonialism.”
Hence, race was undoubtedly important in shaping how Germans saw themselves, as well as exercising a strong influence on German colonial policy post-1884. However, as postcolonial theorists such as Homi Bhabha and Edward Said as well as historians like Susanne Zantop have shown us, colonies are not a prerequisite for the formation and operation of colonial relationality, and colonial thinking can long predate the establishment of colonies, if not exist without ever translating into formal holdings overseas. With the millions of Germans who emigrated during the nineteenth century, as well as the mounting interest discussed in the preceding chapters within Germany regarding those migrants, we must expand the horizon of German colonialism even further; the emigrants should be integrated as constellations in the ever growing and brightening scholarly firmament of German colonialism.

With this in mind, the question of slavery’s connection to German colonial thought also mandates further academic exploration. Perceptions of slavery’s impact on Portuguese-Brazilians helped establish and define the German civilizing mission in Southern Brazil: to remake Brazil and the Portuguese-Brazilians through the transformative example of German settlers. However, in the United States, which received far more German immigrants than anywhere else and featured slavery, the institution played only a local function (helping immigrants find a place for themselves in the American political party system), instead of a creating a transnational (which included the local) vision of the German role as it had in Brazil. This was in part a reflection of slavery’s existing only in sections of the U.S., as well as of racial assumptions regarding the dynamic nature of Anglo-Saxons. In Brazil, slavery permeated society and allegedly rendered the Latin-descended ruling class indolent and
incompetent; thanks to slavery, according to German nationalists on both sides of the Atlantic, Brazil and its residents needed Germans to develop, thereby making the country a zone of German colonial relationality.

Bringing this link between slavery and colonial thinking to light prompts some interesting questions with regard to the U.S. That German liberals struggled with balancing their vision of the United States as a land of freedom with the harsh reality of slavery is clear. Furthermore, as discussed in this dissertation, that German nationalists in both Europe and Latin America saw the U.S. as a place where settlers lost their Germanness is also evident. However, did the existence of slavery, so central to the construction of perceptions of Brazil, relate to German nationalists’ negative view of the United States? How did the outbreak of the American Civil War effect discussions of German settlers’ role in the South, such as those in Texas? Following the Civil War, did Germans in Europe and America discuss teaching the Southerners to work, as they had said of the Brazilians? In short, was the “cultural-historical task” of the Germans in the U.S. related to slavery, and if so, how?

Related to the development of a German colonial relationality that connected to slavery is the question of German identification. Slavery and its alleged effects were foundational to the way in which European- and Brazilian-Germans constructed the image of the settler community and its role in Southern Brazil. Through claims concerning settlers’ impact, related directly to the institution’s alleged influence, and allegations regarding colonists’ cultural-linguistic purity, a love of work and the civilizing effects such a love created became central features of Deutschtum. Until now,
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12 See Lerg, Amerika as Argument.
investigations of slavery and German thought have focused mainly on philosopher’s positions regarding the institution, such as those of Herder, Meiners, and Kant.\textsuperscript{12} Such studies lack engagement with the overseas spaces wherein Germans and slavery interacted. While recent work is bringing to light how slavery shaped the formation of thought in the local context, this does little to connect immigrants with Europe.\textsuperscript{13} More work needs to be done linking the \textit{experience} of Germans overseas and slavery, or at least the alleged experience, with the evolution of European-German thought concerning the institution, especially regarding how notions of Germanness related to it. As this dissertation illustrates, there were far deeper connections between Germanness and slavery than the lack of German engagement with the slave trade and absence of plantation colonies would suggest.

Making slavery’s connection to German-Brazilians a central topic of analysis also foregrounds the lack of scholarship regarding settlers and Brazilian abolition. While slave-holding among colonists has been a topic of some academic interest for the past two decades, there is little work examining how Germans interacted with those groups urging an end to slavery.\textsuperscript{14} Did any part of the outspoken and multi-lingual German-Brazilian middle-class studied here make abolition a part of their program to increase political engagement? Were Portuguese-Brazilian leaders of the antislavery movement, often enamored with “European” sensibilities, drawn to recruit German-Brazilian to speak to or join their groups? Did European-German visitors to the country monitor the

\textsuperscript{13} For example, see Feuser, “Image of the Black”; Samuel Thomas von, Soemmerring, \textit{Über die körperliche Verschiedenheit des Negers vom Europäer (1785)}, ed. Sigrid Oehler-Klein (Stuttgart: G. Fischer, 1998); Zammito, “Policing Polygeneticism.”
\textsuperscript{14} Efford, \textit{German Immigrants}.
\textsuperscript{15} The one exception is Piccolo, “A Colonização alemã.”
development of Brazilian antislavery groups, and if so, could their observations shed light on how slavery and Germanness related? I admit that my discussion of the German-Brazilian position regarding ending slavery is inadequate to answer any of these questions, but just as scholars such as Maria Zubaran and Paulo Roberto Staudt Moreira have revealed the nature of German as slave-owner, so too should historians seek to fill-in the details of German as abolitionist.

Thus, linking slavery, settlement in Southern Brazil, and German colonialism and identification helps shift the sites of assorted historical foci, prompting us to pan our lens of analysis from the publishing houses of Europe to the forests of Brazil to informational flows across the Atlantic, as well as “zoom” between the local to the transnational.15 This movement reveals how notions of the alleged role of Germanness in the world formed transatlantically, in the context of slavery, and operated differently yet similarly, like variations on a theme, depending on the site. This is not to say that the notion of a German civilizing mission would not have existed without slavery, rather that discussing such a mission without referencing Southern Brazil and slavery is to miss an undeniable element of its development.

16 I borrow the latter term from Douglas Northrop, who uses it in his undergraduate global history course title, “Zoom: A History of Everything.”
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