Ilinca Iurascu
University of Pennsylvania

Note: the title of this paper has been changed
Do not quote without permission of author

Seeing Race in Time: The Berlin Arcades and the Age of Accelerated Colonialism

1. Zoological Ghosts

> "Where are you all, you Africans, Indians, you red sons of the wilderness, you Eskimos and Laplanders who trusted yourselves to my leadership in the land of those remarkable Whites who gazed at you in crowds, as if you were fabulous animals."[1]

As this month is drawing to a close, the administrators of the Augsburg zoo in Germany may be looking back upon what has proven to be quite an eventful year for their institution. Its highlight: the "African Village", a four-day festival gathering "[a]rtisans, silversmiths, basket makers and traditional hairdressers … situated in a unique African steppe landscape," as its promoters had advertised[2]. Indeed, with the sub-Saharan setting already provided (the green pastures of the so-called African Panorama, home to a large number of zebras, giraffes and watusi buffaloes), the popular and, implicitly, financial success seemed guaranteed.

But the organizers and the public officials of the city of Augsburg were baffled to discover that even before its start their festival had already turned into a *cause célèbre*. To their surprise, an avalanche of protests followed upon the public announcement of the planned venue, warning against the implications of what risked to become one of the most memorable blunders in the recent history of German (multi)cultural event-planning. A tardy response from director Barbara Jantschke, who retaliated by pointing out that, after all, the main organizer was a "black-skinned African" himself and that the zoo was, in fact, the ideal space for "disseminating an atmosphere of exoticism," left little, if anything, to hope for, in terms of a possible dialogue with the protesters. The African Village opened its gates, as scheduled, to thousands of curious visitors. Much has been said and written since that day. A group of researchers from the prestigious Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology did field-work on the site and returned with a full report on what – in the search for *le mot juste* – they concluded was a blatant instance of contemporary 'racialization' (*Rassierung*), commercialized as 'difference' on the global market of multiculturalism[3].

But in a certain sense, there was nothing **particular** about the Augsburg affair: both supporters and opponents conversed symptomatically with ghosts from the past. It was hardly surprising that the debate revolved around the affirmation (and rejection) of colonial genealogies. The lines of argument directly linked the African Village to the tradition of the ethnographic shows, the so-called *Völkerschauen* developed and perfected around the turn of the 19th century by (in)famous entrepreneurs such as Carl Hagenbeck and his numerous imitators. Hagenbeck and his elaborate human zoo productions,

ranging from 'simple' gestures of display (like the initial 1874 Laplander exhibit) to complex dancing, singing, hunting and battle re-enactments (like the 1886 Duala group from Cameroon, performing with message drums, or the 1895 Somali show, replete with camels, gunshots and 'Arab' slave traders), have been for some time now at the center of critical attention, particularly against the broader context of German colonial history[4].

As has been pointed out, the "birth of the modern zoo[5]" in Germany under Hagenbeck's direction is a fold within broader imperial discourse-formation structures around the 1870s. The economy of the *Völkerschauen*, their codes of organization, have been shown to operate as/with colonial capital, in other words, to be largely dependent upon 'human material' imported from the colonies[6] that was set into circulation within a mode of production in which use- and surplus-value coincided, since the financial success of the shows derived from the stimulation of *Schaulust*, the pleasures of spec(tac)ular consumption. Further, it has been argued, publicity for the shows intersected with and proliferated across a network of discursive platforms, from official imperial policies to local economic interests and scientific institutionalization practices. Especially in its first phase of operation, the Berlin Society of Anthropology, Ethnography and Prehistory run by Rudolph Virchow acted as the prime warrant for the claim to authenticity promulgated by Hagenbeck with respect to his exotic displays. Photography, medical examinations, anthropometric measurements established the codes according to which the natives and their equipment were 'confirmed' to be genuine. In their turn, scientific bodies benefited from the immediate availability of artifacts and human subject matter for research and as a basis for disciplinary (self)-validation, often in connection with museal strategies that invested the material with supplementary display-value[7].

Such aspects already complicate the genealogical argument that has informed the reading of the 'Augsburg event'. If the zoological ghosts of the turn-of-the-century *Völkerschauen* haunt the scene of the African Village, that lineage must be traced across a broad spectrum of discursive and material practices that are involved in the production and distribution of meaning in individualized contexts. The participants in the Augsburg Festival sell souvenirs and braid hair against a background that already points to another stage: that of the African Panorama. And that in its turn sends us back, by way of a detour, not only to the *Kolonialpanorama*, that functioned starting with 1885 in Berlin, around the same time as Hagenbeck's shows, but also to a whole range of pre-cinematic institutions (dioramas, panopticons), entertainment establishments (theaters, cabarets, music-halls) and exhibition sites (wax cabinets, museums, fairs) that operated, often in close proximity to one another, in the German urban centers around the turn of the 19th century. To paraphrase Mark Sandbergh, visual practices are not institutionally specific. Spec(tac)ular engagement rather presupposes "composite viewing habits"[8] and interpretive mechanisms that are traded among different regimes of (re)presentation.

How then is the spectacle of racial alterity at the turn-of-the-century *Völkerschauen* informed by other visual practices and signifying strategies and how do figurations of 'race' intersect with other projections of difference? I would like to address these questions by focusing on one of the most prominent sites for the production and circulation of "composite viewing habits" in imperial Germany, the Berlin Arcades, or, as it was known at the time, the *Kaisergalerie*. A closer look at the types of attractions that the arcades make available to the public may allow us to understand how racial signifiers

proliferate across institutional borders and ultimately destabilize the fantasy of a mastering spectatorial look that can 'capture it all'.

2. The Berlin Arcades

Most of what we know about the Berlin Arcades today comes to us in piecemeal fashion: not unlike Benjamin's *Konvoluten* from the *Passagen-Werk*, the texts that evoke the memory of the *Kaisergalerie* return to its ruins via the trope of historical decay. Nostalgia turned sour, mocking itself: Karl Kraus, Franz Hessel, Siegfried Kracauer and E. E. Kisch, inspect, each in their turn, the anatomy of an imperial corpse and voice their fascination with its spectacle of decomposition.

> So many store fronts, display windows, and so few people. You can almost feel the beer-hall renaissance decay under these high vaults with their brown contours. The dust of the years darkens the glass of the arcade; it cannot be cleaned away. The displays are the same as they were twenty years ago. Knickknacks, travel souvenirs, purses, thermometers, rubber bands, postage stamps, rubber stamps […] The whole center of the arcade is empty. I rush quickly to the exit; I feel ghostly, hidden crowds of people from days gone by, who hug the walls with lustful glances at the tawdry jewelry, the clothing, the pictures are tempting reading material of earlier bazaars. At the exit, at the great window of the great travel agency, I breathe more easily; the street, freedom, the present.[9]

For Hessel and the others, the Imperial Gallery is a busy site of frozen materiality, a place of serialized excess that spills even beyond the line where the "great travel agency" marks the dubious entry-point into the present. The ghostly interior effects of the exterior, of the passages without an outside[10] proliferate across temporal borders. The texts incessantly re-inscribe the moment in which matter dissolves into sheer absence, calling to mind the deserted crime-scenes that Benjamin discovers in Atget's urban photographs. Modernity commemorates here its always already ruinous origins. Another passage by Karl Kraus expands the catalogue of funeral signifiers and explores its grotesque dimensions:

> All organic life is dried up and exhibited in this state. Kastan's Panoptikon. Oh, to be there on a Sunday in summer at six o'clock. An orchestrion plays for Napoleon III lithotomy. An adult can see a nigger's chancre. The last Aztecs who cannot be brought back. Chromolithographs. Street cowboys with thick hands. Life goes on outside…[11]

But if Hessel and Kraus place death (and its future) at the center of their discourse, that is first of all because the temporality of the Arcades has always been bereft of a present. Only a few years after its inauguration, in 1875, contrasting it with its Milanese equivalent, Theodor Fontane is ready to exclaim:

> … next to it [our arcade] shrinks down to a mere alley. Oh, what a city! Oh Berlin, how far you are from a real capital of the German Reich! You became it overnight because of the political situation, and not because of what you are yourself. And from this point of view you will not become it

> for a long time. Perhaps it is the materials which are lacking, or certainly the disposition…[12]

Fontane's critique points to broader contexts. Modeled after the grandiose Arcades in Brussels and Milan, the capital's "first independent, so-called modern, purely commercial building"[13] represents an initial response to the call for urban refashioning launched in the *Gründerzeit* period. It is, in a sense, also an architectural prerequisite to confirming Berlin's status as *Weltstadt*[14]. But as such, the establishment becomes the object of unfavorable comparisons that extend well beyond its borders. The 'provincialism' of the *Kaisergalerie*, its obsolete character carry symbolic weight and are projected onto the capital itself in its metonymical relation to the *Reich*. Ultimately, Fontane's critique should be read against the widespread concern with 'belatedness' that informs the discourses of empire-formation in the newly constituted German state. Anxieties about the nation's late arrival onto the scene of modernity (with imperialism serving as just one of its forms of manifestation and discourses of validation) are not infrequent. The 'solutions' are then also configured in terms of a temporal rhetoric, through the deployment of 'speed' and 'acceleration' as strategies that may serve to counteract the crisis of the historical lag and that may guarantee symbolic visibility for the state and its subjects.

Germany's colonial project begins precisely under these premises. Starting with Friedrich Fabri's popular pamphlet *Bedarf Deutschland der Colonien?*[15] from 1879 and the mobilization of several geographical societies, economic interest groups and political bodies in the service of the colonial cause, the question of the Empire's 'official' presence in Africa and the Far East (in the sense of concrete claims to territorial possessions) gains a quality of urgency that calls for immediate action. And indeed, only a few years later, in the final phase of the 'scramble for Africa', with Germany presiding over the Congo Conference, and the inclusion of the first 'protectorates' under the imperial flag in 1884/5, the inhabitants of Berlin may already begin to exercise their colonialist allegiances and project their fantasies of possession *in situ*, not merely as spectators of Hagenbeck's ethnographic shows, but also as *flâneurs* through the passageways of the *Kaisergalerie*. Between the Zoological Garden, the *Kolonialpanorama*, opened in 1885 (containing, along with the grand canvas of the victory over the Cameroon rebellion, several dioramas as well as ethnographic displays), and the various sights offered at the Arcades, the viewers are confronted with a wealth of spec(tac)ular contexts in which racial *cum* colonial signifiers constitute the main point of interest.

But such a rapid development of historical conditions and their immediate availability in the form of popular attractions also presuppose the radical transformation of practices of vision and modalities of spectatorial engagement. The obsession with velocity that characterizes Germany's turn to the empire also leaves its mark upon the 'fleeting sights' circulated at the Arcades. At a time when "the 'gaze' ha[s] long since given way to the 'glance' and 'just looking' describe[s] the basic urban encounter", the attractions of the *Kaisergalerie* are predicated upon the consumption of "quickened sensations"[16] and require an effort of constant repositioning in the field of vision. Thus, once they have walked past the gates of the Arcades, the members of the public have to repeatedly readjust their position as spectators and consumers across a whole range of entertainment models and commercial spaces: wax cabinets, anatomical museums (both

featured in the *Passage Panoptikon*), a theater that hosts daily freak shows, August Fuhrmann's *Kaiserpanorama* with its weekly stereoscopic picture-tours, dioramas, amusement park rides, a ballroom, numerous restaurants, cafés and post offices.[17]

But how is 'race' more specifically codified in such spaces and how do viewers engage with its representations? If 'modernists' like Kraus already associate racial figurations with the grotesque decay of imperial fantasies, the visitors from the heyday of the Arcades are still fully immersed in the celebratory discourses of the colonial age. Or so it seems, since official ideologies, aimed at inculcating notions about both the availability and the productivity of colonial spaces (i.e. the configuration of the colony as a fully accessible, risk-free territory, but also as a source of potential gain) often cross paths and partly overlap with the profit-oriented goals of the show-organizers. The 1896 Berlin Trade Fair for example (also promoted as the nation's first colonial exhibition) features ethnographic attractions, which subsequently return to the Arcades in the form of the popular slide shows presented at Fuhrmann's Panorama. Further, within the space of the *Passagen*, ethnographic displays seem to allow spectators to position themselves as educated 'specialists': the scientific validation of racial 'authenticity' confers upon them the status of knowledgeable imperial subjects. Part of the popular success of *Castan's Panoptikon*, with its plaster casts of "human types" and exotic exhibitions of natives is due to the collaboration between the directors of the institution and the Berlin Society for Anthropology.

At first sight, projections of race appear thus to fall into well-established categories and to be neatly contained within a tight network of ideological representations. And yet, let us not forget that, within the space of the Arcades, 'seeing' follows a temporal imperative – namely, that of acceleration. Over the span of barely a decade, the *Kaisergalerie* continuously expands and diversifies its supply of commercial and entertainment locales: Fuhrmann's *Kaiserpanorama* opens its gates in 1880, promising its visitors the thrills of undertaking "new [stereoscopic] journeys every week"[18] closely followed by the *Passage-Panoptikon* in 1888 with its Anatomica Museum, Hall of Abnormalities and its numerous ethnographic displays – just around the corner from the similar establishment run by the brothers Louis and Gustave Castan since 1873. All of the above stage, whether as temporary exhibits (like the Togo-show from the *Passage-Panoptikon*), weekly installments (like Fuhrmann's Africa-cycles) or as permanent attractions (the *Panoptikon*'s Chamber of Curiosities) spectacles in which 'seeing race' becomes an increasingly complex activity, demanding not only rapid reorientations of the viewer's 'look' (from colonial panoramas to exotic dance performances and back to waxwork exhibits) but also the permanent remapping of perceptual codes imposed by the various spatial and technological organizations of the respective sights. Transitions (and symbolic translations) between live productions, photographic and stereoscopic shows, ethnographic artifact exhibits and anatomical presentations are never effortless since they entail profound shifts across different optical regimes and modes of consumption.

Spectatorial practices associated with late 19th century exhibitions of 'race' have been often discussed in terms of economies of reification, nostalgia, and the pleasures of voyeurism. But while the *Völkerschauen* and the diverse attractions offered at the Arcades can be understood to foreground the thrills of scopophilic engagement, I would like to argue that the visual gratification that derives from it is often interrupted and

frustrated by other mechanisms that intervene in the process of reading Otherness as an object of facile perusal. In the remaining part of the paper, I will focus on two of the aspects which complicate the logic of 'seeing race' in the field of the spectacle: the function of labor and the encounter with death.

3. The Labor of Entertainment and the Gaze of Death

In an article from the popular journal *Die Gartenlaube*, commenting on the "first German colonial exhibition,"[19] inaugurated at the 1896 Berlin Trade Fair, a reporter declares: "Each display is a vivid, extremely useful book that reads itself, so to speak, to the visitor … the evident instruction contained is combined with a wealth of amusement."[20] The quote suggests some of the main interpretive frameworks that appear to configure the encounter with the exotic: on the one hand, the educational principle – the popularized Rousseauistic vision of the 'Book of Nature', 'written in a universal language, intelligible to all mankind', and, on the other, the entertainment-factor – the thrills derived from seeing the 'new', and the 'different' fully exposed. But that is not all. As the journalist points out, proper satisfaction is to be gained from the very sight of the Other's spectacle of self-production, the labor of the 'book that reads **itself**'. To put it differently, the exhibition is enjoyable because it appears to require no effort of interpretation. Producing 'meaning' is strictly the task of the Other and its 'work' becomes then what confirms the consumer's leisure – that which is, precisely, **not** labor.

A similar logic seems to operate in the case of the *Kaiserpanorama*. Fuhrmann's stereoscopic voyages are constantly advertised as "highly interesting", "instructive" and "comfortable"[21]. The fliers that accompany the shows give full details about the images which will be displayed. Numbered captions orient the public and suggest the correct reading of the scenes (e.g. "Chinese workers, toiling away at a quarry site in Tsingtao" or "On the run: Travelers in Boer-country"). The pleasures of armchair tourism and the voyeuristic thrills of perusing pictures from afar (often associated with the dangers of foreign places) at a safe distance may explain the appeal exercised by the encounter with the 'exotic' at the *Kaiserpanorama*. And yet, what remains 'hidden from view' in this mode of operation is precisely the manner in which the show depends upon the spectator's own corporeal engagement (the fixity of the body, the immobility of the gaze, the proper span and the reorientation of attention at the moment of transition between images). Jonathan Crary has shown how the *Kaiserpanorama* is "one of the numerous sites on which we can credibly locate an 'industrialization' of visual consumption" and has defined it as "a space in which the physical and temporal alignment of the body and machine correspond to the rhythms of factory production and to the way in which novelty and interruptions were introduced into assembly-line labor in order to prevent attention from veering into trance and daydream."[22] Entertainment becomes here indistinguishable from work and thus carries with it anxieties about the status of viewers as free consumers of leisure (the spectacle of the Other's employment).

Concerns with the 'labor of entertainment' come to haunt the scene of the *Völkerschauen* as well. The wealth of racial images circulated at the Arcades and several other commercial and museal institutions, also impact upon the transformation and diversification of Hagenbeck's and Castan's exotic shows. Consequently, the spectacles become increasingly elaborate, often importing strategies from other modes of presentation. Under these conditions, the act of properly reading racial signifiers and

decoding the meaning of the displays no longer offers the pleasures of total and unmediated consumption. An early caricature from the journal *Kladderadatsch* entitled "Cultural Progress on the Congo" prefigures the insecurities brought about by the relativization and instability of meaning. An African boy wearing an Oriental fez and smoking the pipe is shown in the process of looking at a poster-board. One of the ads reads: "Exhibition. 25 Aborigines from Rixdorf. Berlin Coach-Horses. Caravans with Shows on Asphalted Roads."[23] While Hagenbeck and the other promoters of the *Völkerschauen* insist that their native subjects are contracted and remunerated employees, it becomes gradually unclear exactly **whose** work is at stake in the encounter with the exotic. The display of racial difference turns ambiguous and gives way to doubts about the stability of positions codified as 'spectators' and 'objects under inspection'. The reassurance about who commands over the 'look' is dissolved, as the above-mentioned caricature suggests.

There is, however, yet another manner in which the logic of scopophilic mastery becomes disrupted. The norm of accelerated vision and the accumulation of 'fleeting sights' with quickened transitions between them are embedded within the broader structures of optical industrialization and technologization. Pre-cinematic establishments such as the *Kaiserpanorama* foreground a visual economy based upon the adjustment to a complex system of interruptions (the intervals between images) as well as editing practices (the effort of tracing narrative seams). But the principle of 'fractured vision' extends beyond the mechanics of the stereoscope. In fact, viewers are called upon to repeatedly accommodate gaps, omissions, and abrupt changes in the process of moving from one sight to the other. Seen in this light, the Arcades becomes a machine of cutting though and dissecting the center of ocular cohesion. This is how we may read a further passage from Hessel, in which the 'anatomical' attractions from the *Passage-Panoptikon* turn into objective correlatives for the scene of visual/corporeal dismemberment.

> "Man's Development" calls to me from the anatomical museum. … I shrink back before the grinning skulls, the fierce liqueur glasses of a white bone cocktail set. […] I want to linger at the consolingly yellow amber cigarette holders of the "'First and Oldest Amber Store in Germany" but the anatomical beauty of the museum keeps on casting furtive glances over at me. The skeleton shines through under her naked flesh like the corset of a martyr. Swimming in the emptiness inside are her painted organs, heart, liver, lungs. I turn away from her to the white-coated doctor who leans over the stomach-cavity of an extraordinary sleeping blond. Quickly, move on, before I have to experience the replacement of the nose with skin from the arm. […][24]

Instead of scopophilic mastery, the viewer may have encountered the gaze of death; or rather, the terror of his/her look being returned as decomposed, fractured, impossible to recuperate as whole. And it is precisely within the same 'lethal' space of the *Panoptikon* that the turn-of-the-century visitors of the Arcades are faced with the sight of the (live) *Völkerschauen*-exhibits. The tensions ensuing from the juxtaposition of anatomical corpses, plaster casts of human 'types' and the presence of living bodies can thus no longer be considered as 'resolved' through the workings of reification and nostalgia. Disrupting the fixity of the look and the pleasures of voyeuristic consumption, the stain of dismemberment pervades the whole scene and opens up unreadable gaps which

threaten to 'stare back'. In this manner, the spectacle of race becomes an excessive site, or, to put it differently, a sight which exceeds seeing. For what remains hidden from view is precisely the point at which the look may be undermined. Juxtaposed with images and figurations of material decomposition, the meaning attached to the sight of the native's body is itself fragmented and dispersed, leaving the viewers profoundly unsure about what it is that they actually see and raising anxieties about what, in fact, may forever escape the eye. In the realm of the Arcades, where the norm of accelerated vision allows for the constant accretion of spectacular sights, the place where racial difference may be located becomes unstable and elusive. Instead of containing and arresting meaning, the attractions ultimately follow a centrifugal trajectory and continuously point to other directions, frustrating thus the desire of the spectator to 'see it all'.

To be clear: the Gaze of death in the space of the Arcades is not the melancholy look that contemplates objects in decomposition; nor is it the stare that reifies and instrumentalizes the Other. Rather, it should be understood as the void that momentarily flashes across the screen in the process of rapid editing demanded by the flow of images and that threatens to dislocate the position of the viewer from his/her claim over 'presence' – the **present** of the act of seeing.

Could one begin to speculate about the Augsburg event as an effect of that process of spatio-temporal acceleration that we associate with the colonial turn-of-the-century and its representations in the domain of the Arcades? If the African Village Festival carries indeed, symptomatically, the stain of an unresolved past, how should we understand the problem of the 'blind spots' which have marked the discourse of its defenders within the context of ultimate accelerations – the temporal condition of globalization? These and other questions will hopefully constitute the basis for further discussion at the panel.

---

[1] Carl Hagenbeck quoted in in Nigel Rothfels, *Savages and Beasts: The Birth of the Modern Zoo* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 2002), p. 141

[2] While the Augsburg zoo website does not offer any information on the event, the promotional ad, as well as the letter of protest addressed by the African German Community to the organizers can be found at http://africavenir.com/news/2005/05/124/volkerschau-at-augsburg-zoo

[3] The document can be downloaded from the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology website at http://www.eth.mpg.de/dynamic-index.html?http://www.eth.mpg.de/events/current/1121338800.html

[4] At the time when Hagenbeck begins to add the human 'element' to his animal presentations, the official entry of Germany on the colonial map is still more than a decade away. But by 1871, African- and East Asian-based German trade is already thriving. See Rothfels, p. 49

[5] see the title of Rothfels' book

[6] In 1901, the National Bureau of Colonial Affairs banned further trade with natives from German colonies for exhibition purposes. The embargo, as has been suggested, signals an increasing anxiety over exposure to racial contact and the possibility of miscegenation. See Grosse in Ulrich van der Heyden, *Kolonialmetropole Berlin* (Berlin: Berlin Edition, 2002), p. 198
Still, Hagenbeck's shows continue long after that year with imported performers. See Arnold in Robert Debusmann, *Kolonialausstellungen – Begegnungen mit Afrika?* (Frankfurt: IKO, 1995), p. 18

[7] "[F]rom the first Lapland show, Hagenbeck made it a practice to 'donate' the collection of artifacts accompanying the caravan to important museums of ethnological study." See Rothfels, p. 93

[8] Mark Sandberg, "Effigy and Narrative: Looking into the Nineteenth-Century Folk Museum" in Leo Charney and Vanessa R. Schwartz, *Cinema and the Invention of Modern Life* (Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995), p. 321
[9] Franz Hessel, "Spazieren in Berlin" in J. F. Geist, *Passagen, ein Bautyp des 19. Jahrhunderts* (München: Prestel, 1978), p. 157-158
[10] see Gunning, The Exterior as Interieur: Benjamin's Optical Detective, boundary 2 30.1. (2003)
[11] Kraus in Geist 157
[12] Geist 148
[13] see Geist 148
[14] "Berlin is becoming a world-city", i.e. an urban center with equal status to other major occidental capitals
[15] see Der Katechismus zur Kolonialfrage. Februar 1879: Friedrich Fabri fragt: 'Bedarf Deutschland der Colonien?' p 51-57
[16] Glenn H. Penny, *Objects of Culture* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002), p. 213
[17] see Geist 153-156
[18] see http://www.kaiser-panorama.de/
[19] see Richter in Debusmann and Riesz, p. 25
[20] in Sierra A Bruckner, "Spectacles of (Human) Nature: Commercial Ethnography between Leisure, Learning, and Schaulust" in Glenn Penny and Matti Bunzl, *Woldly Provincialism:German Anthropology in the Age of Empire* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003), p. 127
[21] idem 19
[22] Jonathan Crary, *Suspensions of Perception: Attention, Spectacle and Modern Culture* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001), p. 138
[23] in Alexander Honold and Klaus Scherpe, *Mit Deutschland um die Welt: Eine Kulturgeschichte des Fremden in der Kolonialzeit* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 2004), p. 69
[24] Geist 157