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ABSTRACT

KARA GETROST: From Innocent Play to Imperial Survey: Adolescent Rites of Passage in the British and German Adventure Novels of Sub-Saharan Africa, 1870-1905
(Under the direction of Eric Downing and John McGowan)

This project explodes universalized notions of African adventure by contextualizing popular British texts by R.M. Ballantyne, H. Rider Haggard, G.A. Henty, and W.H.G. Kingston with rare German ones from lesser-known authors Eginhard von Barfus, Carl Falkenhorst, and Otto Felsing. I argue that the development, or “rites of passage,” of the figurative young adult in these texts is the crucial factor in the formation of the Anglo-European image of Africa. Adolescents perform the work of cultural interaction at the moment of engagement, which in turn questions the stability, and perhaps even the very existence, of the novel’s underlying binary constructions. This study challenges previous post-colonial and cultural studies analyses that present youth as a simple mouthpiece of adult and colonial pedagogy. The first chapter examines the relationship between humans and animals as revealed in hunting rituals. Learning how adults view animals in general and how they vary their interaction are two ways adolescents move from objectivity to subjectivity while learning to hunt. However, the training of the adolescent hunter also illustrates the limitations of representation in these texts. Chapter Two shifts to the training of the adolescent in the management of African natives, colonial subjects that, while also figured much of the time as animals, do have the capability to act and talk back in the narrative. Yet the process by which the young man seeks to distinguish himself from his African Other only reveals just how deeply he
is in fact reliant upon engagement with that Other. The final chapter centers on the epic “rite of passage” that occurs in the journey to the underworld represented through cave exploration. This final stage of adolescent training moves beyond managing external relations with animals and natives to developing personal characteristics that demonstrate individual and cultural progress. But a closer reading reveals that once again essential African guides not only make such development possible but also possess an understanding of time that undermines the need to rely on progressivist ways of thinking.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

No adolescent ever really appreciated, or even thoroughly liked, Shakespeare. That is reserved for full manhood. The kind of novel that is enjoyed is always a good test of mental and emotional development. The boy enjoys Ballantyne and Marryat; G.P.R. James begins to have a dim meaning to the youth; at puberty the adolescent takes to Scott, Dickens, and Miss Austin [sic]; while only the man enjoys and understands Shakespeare, George Eliot, and Thackeray. (13)

T.S. Clouston, physician and superintendent of the Edinburgh Asylum

With the increase in working class and lower middle class children attending school as a result of reform bills such as the Forster Education Act of 1870, Victorians began to re-envision how popular literature could become a viable educational tool, not just a source of entertainment. The number of weekly and monthly periodicals directed at boys had tripled between 1865 and 1895, and teachers and parents alike recognized the possibilities of this fertile field (Dunae, “New Grub Street for Boys,” 17). Writers and publishers tailored their books and magazines to capture more specific audiences, adapting content and style by age and gender. Even physicians and directors of mental institutions, such as T.S. Clouston above, had something to say about how to use literature in the proper upbringing of youth.

Technological printing advances surely contributed to the increase in literature and illustration production, but so did the imperial initiative. The exploration and colonization of sub-Saharan Africa, in full swing by the Berlin Conference of 1884-85,
popularized adventure even more and made young males the center of cultural attention. Encouraging young adult males to join the colonial fervor was particularly important in Britain and Germany: Britain, an “old” colonial power, needed to justify and rejuvenate its empire into the next century, while the latter, the newly imperialistic and industrial powerhouse, sought to establish home support for, and an international footing with, its first colonies.

Scientists and academics contributed to the colonial endeavor by studying the flora and fauna of newly explored lands. Anthropologists classified native peoples from around the world; zoologists and natural scientists grouped the animals and the environment into their respective categories. But the investigative gaze did not remain trained abroad—since early in the nineteenth century, physiologists had also examined the workings of the Anglo-European male body and pondered the significance of its growth and development. They noticed a period when physical growth began to be outstripped by mental and emotional development, just after the sexual organs reached maturity. Physicians like Clouston, physiologists, and psychologists at the end of the century were trying harder than ever to understand young adults’ behavior by recording the dramatic physical and mental changes once they hit puberty, mapping out a special period of human development they would classify as “adolescence.”

What unified all of these trends was an interest in and concern for young white males that spanned, among others, political, educational, literary, and scientific realms. And there was no more important agent of popularizing the image of youth and the coming of age process in an Anglo-European context than adventure novels. Yet analyses of adventure novels have for years downplayed the role of the young adult in
these texts, interpreting them as monolithic figures, as either simple mouthpieces of imperialistic discourse or passive victims of adult pedagogy. Even the studies of adventure novels that do foreground the development of the young protagonist and his implied reader, however, do not give an adequate historical picture of the young male in the late nineteenth century, because they ignore the prevalent scientific discourse on adolescence.

Many studies of adventure novels concentrate on one or a select few writers, and the vast majority of these analyses are of the British adventure novel tradition. Granted, the British adventure novel tradition dominated the popular literature genre for centuries and the classics of the field have been models of adventure tropes for popular fiction around the world. Yet a clearer picture of the nuances of the British tradition is not possible without providing some contrast to its dominating influence. This study will flush out the aspects of the adventure novel genre that are rooted in British circumstances by juxtaposing this tradition with a lesser-known German one. Because Britain’s relationship with Germany was close but contentious during the years of study, the German adventure novel tradition is a well-suited point of comparison for the British one. A consideration of both adventure novel traditions during these crucial years when Germany’s relationship with Britain changed from friendship in the 1870’s to hostility in the 1890’s opens up certain nuances of the texts that opens up these traditions, as well as gives a broader, unifying context to both.

The following project links historical conceptions of adolescence with colonization of Africa. By exploring the role of the young adult both within the text as character and without as implied reader in constructing, and at times disrupting, the
imperial discourse of the novel, this study opens up these texts to reveal Victorian and Wilhelmine culture’s unease with the colonization of sub-Saharan Africa. Reading the adolescent as a more nuanced, multi-faceted figure exposes the dynamics of imperial discourse in identity construction both at the moment of learning a ritual and through the development of the protagonist over time. By taking seriously the complexity of the coming of age process, this study historicizes the young adult at a time when counter narratives may have opened up the possibility for different attitudes towards Africa than imperialist hegemony.

**Critical Context of British and German Adventure Novel Research**

Recent explorations of adventure novels have focused primarily on the racial, sexual, political, and class-based underpinnings of these works. Martin Green’s *Dreams of Adventure, Deeds of Empire* (1979) was influential in shifting exclusive critical interest from the classics of literature to popular fiction and its influence on / reflection of imperialism in the late nineteenth century. Later cultural studies critics in Britain continued Green’s trend, most notably John MacKenzie, with his series *Studies in Imperialism*, where successive books focused on the ways in which various forms of popular culture (from juvenile fiction, magazines, textbooks, music, etc.) were attractive vehicles of propaganda for the British Empire. Several of the books in this series focused on materials produced for young adults, most specifically *Imperialism and Juvenile Literature* (ed. Jeffrey Richards, 1989), and *Britannia’s Children* (ed. Kathryn Castle, 1996) on children’s textbooks and magazines. The emphasis in all of these books was on ways in which young adult literature is a vehicle of imperialism. Jeffrey Richards
remarks in the introduction to Imperialism and Juvenile Literature, “Juvenile literature operates on the lower slopes of this Parnassus of adventure, steeped in every aspect of imperialism. It functions therefore not just as a mirror of the age but an active agency constructing and perpetuating a view of the world in which British imperialism was an integral part of the cultural and psychological formation of each new generation of readers” (3). No more crucial market for this propaganda were young adults, particularly males, who, with the recent expansion of voting rights, were seen as an increasingly important market for the transmission of imperialistic ideas. Cultural studies critics recognized and emphasized the reciprocal nature of this relationship between imperialism and the image of the boy: the one reinforced the other.

Yet in the concern to expose the deeply ingrained imperialist discourses and racist attitudes in the descriptions of the natives and landscapes, the role of the young adult can be unfairly minimized to that of simple lackey to the white adults of the novel, whether in the text as characters or the author himself. Cultural studies critics tended to focus primarily on how outside political and social forces impacted youth and children, making the typical assumption that they remain passive, non-acting beings. John MacKenzie writes in the Editor’s introduction to Kathryn Castle’s Britannia’s Children (1996): “It is indeed one of the notable characteristics of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries that many European countries, their imperial territories, and rapidly Europeanising imitators like Japan, established a powerful zone of intellectual, ideological and moral convergence in the projection of state power and collective objectives to children.” Such a framework suggests MacKenzie and Castle do not move beyond the consideration that the relationship between adults and children is a simple
transference of values from one to the other; instead, I propose that the figure of the child and young adult even in adult fiction is the product of an interaction between the two and develops over the course of the novel.

The study of German colonial literature as propaganda took off in the early 1980’s as critics began to reevaluate the impact of Germany’s thirty-year-long colonial period, perhaps in part out of reaction to Edward Said’s comments that downplayed the role of German Orientalists and colonialism (17-19). Joachim Warmbold’s “Ein Stückchen neudeutsche Erd’—“ Deutsche Kolonialliteratur (1982), Sibylle Benninghoff-Lühl’s Deutsche Kolonialromane 1884-1914 (1983), and Amadou Booker Sadji’s Das Bild des Negro-Afrikaners in der deutschen Kolonialliteratur (1884-1945) (1985) were some of the first comprehensive studies of German colonial literature and the role it played in garnering support for colonialism. Benninghoff-Lühl states the object of her study is “to illuminate the politico-educational roll of the colonial-novel genre” (1). However, these studies focus primarily on the interrelations between literature and the historical details of German colonization in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century to the detriment of exposing the unique characteristics and consequences of books written for a specific young adult audience. Benninghoff-Lühl even criticizes young adult literary critics for ignoring historical background:

This getting bogged down in formalistic assessment is also typical of a few studies of young people’s reading matter. For example, books for youth with a colonial theme are sorted according to scene-of-action (jungle, African savanna, etc.), or according to motif (the genre, adventure

---


2 „Ziel der Arbeit ist es, die politisch-erzieherische Rolle des Genre Kolonialroman zu erhellen“ (1).
Yet despite her attention to the political background of these novels, Benninghoff-Lühl only addresses the young adult figure for his relationship to these political influences.

Another simultaneous avenue of adventure novel research has come from the development of postcolonial studies in the 1980’s, as a result of which critics reexamined these works of fiction not just as vehicles of propaganda, but for how these novels suggested a certain ideological attitude towards exotic lands and native peoples that manifested in colonialism. Postcolonial studies tend to focus more on the role of the native and the colonized in the imperial context, recuperating acts of resistance as well as shifting the center of critical debate away from Europe and America to the former colonies. This trend was led by the efforts of Edward Said and later Homi Bhabha and Gayatri Spivak. Postcolonial critics such as Robert Young and Anne McClintock also moved attention to the intersections of race, gender, and class articulated as colonial desire. In the late 1990’s, Susanne Zantop led the initiative to reevaluate the imperialist leanings of Germany. Her book *Colonial Fantasies* (1997) opened up to consideration Germany’s long-held desire for colonies, revealing an imperialistic impulse in cultural discourse much earlier than colonialism proper. A subsequent work she edited along with Sara Lennox and Sara Friedrichsmeyer, *Imperial Imagination* (1998), expanded the parameters of German colonial texts for study. Most recently, Rosa B. Schneider’s *Um*
Scholle und Leben (2003) has used postcolonial perspectives on the nation, race, women, and mimicry in an analysis of twentieth-century German colonial literature.

The postcolonial analyses of colonial adventure texts have brought to light the ways in which the reproduction on a mass scale of racist stereotypes in adventure novels aimed at a young audience legitimized and glorified the colonial enterprise. Postcolonial analyses have also revealed a continued Eurocentric bias in critical circles of the analysis of colonization and colonial texts. By revealing the “ambivalence” of imperial discourse, Homi Bhabha in particular provided valuable insight into the workings of the underlying binary constructions of colonial texts. Understanding the ambivalent nature of the binary has helped critics to reveal places in colonial and postcolonial texts where resistance to the imperialistic discourses by the native and/or the colonized is possible, and in many cases, probable. But despite these fruitful insights, few critics have applied these theories extensively to the children and young adults of colonial adventure novels.

A third angle of exploration has come from those in the children’s literature field. Jacqueline Rose, although a Victorianist, brought the attention of postcolonial theorists to children’s literature with her now famous comment in 1984 that “literature for children is . . . a way of colonizing (or wrecking) the child” (26). Since then, critics of children’s literature and postcolonial studies alike have been fascinated with the ways in which literature written for this marginalized population reflects similar attitudes to colonialist fiction. Perry Nodelman in 1992 took these similarities to the extreme when he literally transmuted several words in an Edward Said passage from Orientalism (1978) to suggest that children’s literature and adults have power over the image of the child like colonialist writers had over the image of the colonist. Critics examining children’s literature from a
A postcolonial perspective tends to substitute the operations of imperialistic discourse on the figure of the native with the figure of the child in these imperialist texts. In the late 1990's and early 2000's, several studies of children’s literature that reveal the colonialist attitude towards children in the text were published, such as Roderick McGillis’s edited collection of essays, *Voices of the Other: Children’s Literature and the Postcolonial Context* (2000) and Daphne Kutzer’s *Empire’s Children* (2000). Kutzer explains in her introduction the importance of children’s texts as a part of the European imperialist imagination, “Children’s texts, often ignored by literary critics, form a crucial part of any such national allegory: children are the future of any society, and the literature adults write for them often is more obvious and insistent about appropriate dreams and desires than the texts they write for themselves” (xiii). Kutzer and other children’s literature critics like her appear to continue in the trend of cultural studies critics in analyzing children’s literature as a vehicle of socio-cultural values. While Kutzer and others are interested in the figure of the child and childhood in children’s texts, they are primarily interested in how this figure reflects society’s values.

Critics of German children’s literature, perhaps influenced by a post-World War II Vergangenheitsbewältigung (coming to terms with the past), produced early collections of essays on race in German young adult literature (*Bücher spiegeln die Welt* (1969) and *Das Gift der frühen Jahre: Rassismus in der Jugendliteratur*, eds. Regula Renschler and Roy Preiswerk (1981)) and the “Third World” in German children’s literature appeared as early as 1977 (*Die Menschen sind arm, weil sie arm sind*, eds. Jörg Becker and Charlotte Oberfeld and *Die Dritte Welt im Kinderbuch*, eds. Jörg Becker and Rosmarie...
Rauter); however, as already mentioned, Benninghoff-Lühl points out that many of these early studies do not contextualize the novels within the political and historical situation.

Interest in colonial children’s literature and images of Africa and race in children’s literature seems to have peaked in the mid 1980’s with an exhibition of rare German texts at the Oldenburg University Library in northern Germany. The resulting Der Afrikaner im deutschen Kinder- und Jugendbuch (1985) contained the first comprehensive catalogue of German colonial books for children and young adults as well as a collection of critical essays. In the forward to this work, the publishers write:

“Prevalent views and stereotypes are represented, consolidated, and propagated in children’s and young people’s books. That is why these are also good contemporary sources of social stereotypes and their mechanisms. In popular fiction socially produced stereotypes are bound up even more with popular longings and unfulfilled wishes.”

In this study, critics did combine attention to political and historical issues in relation to the close analysis of the text, but without extensive consideration of the young adult as anything other than a vehicle for the imperialistic propaganda.

Despite the enormous popularity of British adventure novels around the world and particularly in Germany, there have been few comparative studies of colonial adventure novels between the two cultural traditions, particularly in English. Kevin Carpenter and Bernd Steinbrink did produce in 1984 Ausbruch und Abenteuer (1984), a collection of essays on the most significant British and German adventure novels and writers; however, the focus remained on the influence the British tradition (and the American

---

4 „In den Kinder- und Jugendbüchern werden die vorherrschenden Ansichten und Stereotypen dargestellt, gefestigt und weiter vermittelt. Deswegen sind Kinder- und Jugendbücher auch zeitgeschichtliche Quellen für gesellschaftliche Stereotypisierungen und ihrer Wirkungsweisen. In der Trivialliteratur vereinigen sich – noch deutlicher – die gesellschaftlich hergestellten Stereotypen mit populären Sehnsüchten und unbefriedigten Wünschen.‘‘
James Fenimore Cooper) has had on German writers Joachim Heinrich Campe, Jens-Ulrich Davids, Fredrich Gerstäcker, Karl May, and others.

Children’s literature critics have most notably recognized how the figure of the child, childhood, and even children’s literature itself are excellent indicators of a society’s desires and fears about the future and the past. They have recognized that this was particularly true during periods of heightened imperialism when competition for colonies was particularly high. But the unfortunate byproduct of arguing for the cultural significance of the figure of the child has been the continued assumption that children are primarily passive victims of adult intentions within the text and without. Kutzer, in comparing children’s literature to colonial literature in the introduction to her book *Empire’s Children*, writes: “Just as colonial subjects were voiceless—their lives are described for us by Westerners, not by themselves—children are also voiceless, depending upon adults to describe their lives for them” (xvi). One of the purposes of this study is to suggest that children are perhaps not as voiceless in these texts as Kutzer believes, and that the figure of the child is not just, or not always, a passive figure that does not have an influence on the other actors of the fictional world.

Critics have also examined individually some of the adventure novel authors studied here; however, the vast majority of these focus on the more well-known British authors, and in particular H. Rider Haggard and G.A. Henty. The most notable of these are Wendy Katz’s *Rider Haggard and the Fiction of Empire* (1987) and Leonard Ashley’s *George Alfred Henty and the Victorian Mind* (1999). Of additional note are two studies that focus specifically on Africa, namely Mawuena Kossi Logan’s *Narrating Africa: George Henty and the Fiction of Empire* (1999) and Lindy Stiebel’s *Imagining Africa:...*
Landscape in H. Rider Haggard’s African Romances (2001). Only two biographies have been written on Robert Michael Ballantyne and William Henry Giles Kingston, respectively, although several of the collected essays published by the Studies in Imperialism series already noted examine these author’s works in several chapters. While a significant amount of attention has been paid to other German adventure novel writers not discussed in this project, particularly Karl May, the three central writers this project focuses on, Eginhard von Barfus, Carl Falkenhorst, and Otto Felsing, have been examined by critics minimally or not at all. These writers are virtually unheard-of outside the German colonial literature context.

Defining the “Boy” in Nineteenth-Century Victorian and Wilhelmine Culture

The boy, whether in the text or as implied reader, is clearly the most central figure of adventure novels in the mid- to late nineteenth century. The general interest in the maturation process of young white males spanned political, scientific, artistic, and popular culture circles. Critics have suggested factors such as industrialization; improvements in health, science and technology; rise of the middle class; reorganization of family structures; the extension of voting rights; urbanization; and nationalization all contributed to the increased cultural interest in youth.\(^5\)

In popular literature, particularly in Britain, young men encountered a plethora of youth magazines and so-called “boy’s books” both as a result of a rise in young adult readership due to educational and political reforms, and technological advances in printing. The number of magazines with the word “boy” in the title are too numerous to

count: In 1866, for instance, Boys of England released its first issue, followed by The Bad Boy’s Paper in 1875 and of course the most famous British boy’s magazine, Boy’s Own Paper in 1879, to name just a few. Joseph Bristow (1991) reminds us: “Everywhere the nation’s young hero encountered texts and illustrations that made him the subject of his reading. Here the boy was both the reader and the focus of what he read” (41).

Perhaps at no other point in the history of children’s and young adult literature was the mimetic nature of the novel so profoundly apparent than in the late nineteenth century.

But there was much more that was hidden in the figure of the implied young male reader that made him anything but a simple “boy.” F.J. Harvey Darton writes in 1932 that the creation of the category of “boy’s book,” a popular British term for books directed towards “boys,” one of which was the adventure novel, itself represented an apparent narrowing of focus from earlier books written for young males. Most importantly, “boy’s books” included entertainment with the usual instruction: “Hence the ‘boy’s book’,” Darton emphasizes, “[is] the boy’s tale, not the boy’s story-book nor the boyish book” (qtd in Rose 57). Thus the specification of the “boy’s book” was yet another attempt at defining the “boy” within the field of adventure fiction, which in turn became the model for much continental fiction including German young adult fiction.

Some have suggested that this limited conception of the boy during the late nineteenth century was due in large part to the increasing anxieties of the age as European cultures faced the turning of another century. The period is known for the rapid colonial expansion of the European countries, to a point where in 1936 the British Empire stretched over a quarter of the world’s land mass (Barton 1). The late nineteenth century was also the period when the newly unified Germany finally made its imperial
dreams a reality in Africa and the Pacific. The expanded competition for colonies signified by Germany’s and several other smaller European states’ entries into the colonial race caused old colonial powers Britain and France to question whether the hold it had on its empire would last into the next century. The future of the colonial endeavor was at no time more worrisome than at this moment, and thus the young white male became representative of the future hopes and aspirations of the imperial nations in general, but even more so for the old colonial powers. Jacqueline Rose (1984) suggests that the development of the boy’s book was the product of British imperialist discourse turned inward. She writes that the boy’s book is the result of a “fully colonialist concept of development, and a highly specific and limited conception of the child” (57). The success of the colonies was particularly a concern for Germany, because many believed colonialism acted as a “release valve” providing opportunity for the unprecedented numbers of people abandoning the countryside for the major cities, or for the colonies of other countries.

The successive numbers of educational and political reforms from the mid-into the late nineteenth century have also been blamed for causing a unique concern for the young adult population in the major European countries. The fact that voting rights were expanded in Britain to all males regardless of class has been cited by Joseph Bristow⁶ and others as an instigator of the upper and middle class’s concern for the education of males in the middle to lower middle classes. This concern, combined with educational reforms in Britain such as the Forster’s Act of 1870, which made education mandatory for children age five to twelve starting in 1880, and later reforms that made elementary

---

⁶ See Chapter 1 of his Empire Boys (1991) for a thorough discussion of the role of class and the notion of culture in the production of boy’s books during this time. Also see Patrick Dunae, “Penny Dreadfuls: Late Nineteenth Century Boy’s Literature and Crime.” Victorian Studies (22) 1979, 133-50.
education free in 1891, dramatically increased the literacy level of young males and thereby the boy’s book-reading population of Britain.

While France mirrored Britain in enacting similar legislative educational reforms, in Germany, educational reform did not center on mandatory universal suffrage, since schooling was already required across the board for young males with the Prussian reforms in the eighteenth century and in the post-Napoleonic period. Instead, in the post-unification period in the late nineteenth century, critics in Germany called out for a more flexible educational system for students that did not involve so much bureaucracy (Fishman 2). Educational reform began with art education and continued into the early twentieth century, focusing the German public’s attention on redefining the young man according to the prevalent concerns of the day. These included the physical and psychological fitness of young people, which was also sparked by the rise in suicide rates during this time that some suggested were caused by lengthy periods in school (Fishman 106-7).

In the early 1880’s, German educational reformers in particular called for more physical fitness and sport for young people in schools like the British public school system advocated, or through establishing city clubs where fitness would become a unifier of the people (völkish). Carl Falkenhorst, one of the adventure novel writers of this study, even published in 1890 an essay in Die Gartenlaube, the most popular family magazine in Germany at the time, in which he advocated for more youth games and described the success of a particular club in Görlitz. In the essay, he warns of the young adult’s tendency to illness and neurasthenia (Nervenschwäche) typical in the nineteenth century. “If we search for causes to these illnesses, we see that most of them are not only
acquired at a mature age, in a battle for existence; we see much more that the cause is
already laid in the time of youth, through a bad upbringing” („Das Jugendspiel” 217).7
Falkenhorst and others thus feared their outmoded, elitist education system was
producing sickly young men unfit for competing with British lads who were seasoned
both physically and mentally on the playing fields of Eton. By 1897, Hermann Lietz
advocated for the establishment of country boarding schools, similar to the British public
school. The back-to-nature trend culminated in the Wandervögel (Birds of Passage)
movement, a hiking club founded by Ludwig Gurlitt and several of his students of the
Lüderlitz Gymnasium (high school) where he taught (Fishman 123-6). This club in turn
inspired Sir Baden Powell’s Boy Scouting movement in Britain.

Germans and British alike also worried like never before about the occupational
choices their young people would make after schooling. A German advice book written
by A. von Fragstein and published in 1885 to help parents guide their young men to wise
career choices opened with the following scenario:

“What should become of the boy?” The caring father probably asks himself this every day, when his offspring, going on 14, who despite all sorts of warnings--often of the most sensitive sort--has barely made it past the third class, and will be ready to leave school in just a few weeks. A conscientious guardian asks himself the same question, and all one’s relations repeat it unprompted, but want to play a part as long as it doesn’t cost them. It’s true, we worry a good deal more about the rascal than the baker fusses over his hot rolls, and no one acts as if they’re already awaiting him. He’s known to the whole neighborhood as a good-for-nothing, who leads the pack in all the great pranks. Yes, the awkward age! Must it happen just now! But, dear reader, have a little patience; this

---

7 „Forschen wir nach Ursachen dieses Leidens, so sehen wir, daß es von den meisten nicht allein im reiferen Alter, im Kampfe ums Dasein erworben wird; wir sehen vielmehr, daß durch eine verkehrte Erziehung der Grund dazu schon in der Jugend gelegt wird“ (217).
foaming of the freshly-pressed young juices will subside in time; every
good wine must go through its period of fermentation. (9)

The prevailing theory suggested that the more attention was paid the boy during his
“formative years,” the more adults could control what happened to him. The fear of what he might turn into without careful guidance thus motivated countless studies performed on boy behavior. By 1916, H.W. Gibson had come up with the term “boyology,” in his book of the same name, to describe this type of study. He wrote of the boy in his preface: “He is the original sulphite, keeping everyone awake and interested when he appears on the scene. He will ever be a new subject for discussion and analysis, and in need of friendly interpreters” (ix).

But while it is acknowledged that general social, educational, and political reforms caused a heightened interest in the young adult during this time, it is not generally appreciated that the ways in which the cultural trends impacted the figure of the child and young adult during this time affected more than just interest in the young adult male, rather also the ways in which he was thought of and represented. Nancy Armstrong (1998) has demonstrated how domestic ideas of the child and the feminine in children’s literature such as Lewis Carroll’s Alice in Wonderland, that would seem to have nothing to do with Britain’s perspectives and policies regarding the colonies at the time, in fact also register a similar treatment as those of Sub-Saharan Africa are being

---

8 „Was soll der Junge werden?“ So fragt sich wohl täglich der sorgenvolle Hausvater, wenn der nun bald 14 jährige Sprößling in den nächsten Wochen der Schule wird entwachsen sein, in welcher er es trotz aller Vermahnungen—oft der empfindlichsten Art—kaum bis über die dritte Klasse hinausgebracht hat. Dieselbe Frage legt sich im gleichen Falle auch ein gewissenhafter Vormund vor, und ihm nach spricht es die ganze Verwandtschaft, ob berufen oder nicht; wollen sie doch alle gern mitreden, so lange es nichts kostet. Es ist wahr, man zerreißt sich um den Bengel nicht wie beim Bäcker um die warmen Semmel, und Keiner thut, als ob er schon auf ihn wartete. Kennt ihn doch die ganze Straße als einen Thunichtgut, der bei allen tollen Streichen den Anführer abgibt. Ja, die Flegeljahre! Daß die auch gerade in diese Zeit fallen müssen. Aber, lieber Leser, nur ein wenig Geduld; dieses Überschäumen des jungen Mostes legt sich schon, jeder gute Wein hat seinen Gährungsprozeß durchmachen müssen. (9)
treated by Europeans also at the time. She writes: “European intellectuals had to revise the logic and technologies of otherness in order to see such [African] peoples as childlike and feminine versions of themselves. It was through this revision of the categories of self and other at the popular level, I believe, that the colonial venture had the greatest impact on people back home and thus on who as middle-class people we still think we are today” (14). While the European’s perspective of the “bad and ugly” African woman in Sub-Saharan Africa may not have changed the European’s simultaneous perspective of children in a domestic setting as Armstrong suggests, her analysis does point to the fact that similar “ways of knowing” that shaped the European’s view of Africa certainly also shaped conceptions of domestic people. William Booth’s In Darkest England and the Way Out (1890), a treatise on the slums of London that was clearly patterned on Henry Morton Stanley’s In Darkest Africa, which appeared the same year, is another concrete example of the application of colonial ways of knowing to domestic concerns, and vice versa.

Consequently, the “boy” in the mid- to late nineteenth century is representative neither of a passive instruction in values by the adult, nor is he simply a mouthpiece of socially constructed imperialist rhetoric or adult pedagogy. The boy is instead a construction of the interaction between Europe and its Other—the boy is the site of engagement between European adulthood and the Other, and this interaction shifts as the narrative progresses and the relationships develop. Don Randall (2000) describes the boy as “a figure that mediates an ‘experience’ of British imperial actions and achievements, a figure forged to enable a coherent envisioning of the relationship between British subjectivity and the British imperial subject” (26). Historical conceptions of the young
adult, then, help to reveal European ways of knowing that affect both domestic and international concerns. More importantly, the construction of the young white male in these texts that concern an interaction with the European Other provide insight into that engagement. Examining the construction and the maturation process of the white young adult recognizes that he is not a static character in the novel and that, in fact, his development can reveal as much about Europe’s engagement with the Other as it can about European male adulthood, the construction of his identity, and sense of self.

To understand how the image of the specialized boy in the late nineteenth century was constructed, not just the fact that the boy was an important figure, we must examine the scientific discourse on adolescence. Yet, only Patrick Dunae (1979) has even mentioned the impact of the nineteenth century scientific “ways of knowing” had on British boy’s literature. Benefiting from the then recently published Youth and History (1974) by John Gillis, Dunae acknowledges the influence of the “Victorians’ discovery of adolescence” in the popularity of boy’s books (13). Citing Gillis as his source, Dunae acknowledges adolescence as a phenomenon that “also involved a realisation that children were, physiologically and psychologically, different from juveniles” (13-14). Likewise, in the German realm, Sterling Fishman (1976) does point to the educational reform movements, the publication of school stories, (Schülerromane) and psychological/identity problem dramas and short stories of the Jugendstil movement as evidence that Germans were becoming aware of the importance of adolescence decades before the popularization of the scientific discourse in America at the beginning of the twentieth century (136). Anneliese von Hermanni (1986) calls these school stories and Jugendstil novellas and plays “Adoleszenzromane,” but neither she nor Fishman examine
in depth the scientific discourse about adolescence at the time, despite its impact on perceptions of youth that filtered into these turn-of-the-century works. Hans-Heino Ewers (1991) dates Adoleszenzromane back to Goethe’s Die Leiden des jungen Werthers (1774) and defines the genre for its focus on the psychological realism of a typically young male protagonist, but he also does not recognize the simultaneous interest of scientists on the psychological development of adolescents. It does not factor into the analysis of any other critic until Don Randall takes up the notion of hybridity in Kipling’s Imperial Boy (2000).

**The Construction of Adolescence in the Nineteenth Century**

The contemporary meaning of “adolescence” is multi-faceted and complex, having accumulated layers of signification over successive generations. Today, adolescence could refer to the transition between childhood and adulthood, treated differently from culture to culture. This aspect considers adolescence as a transitory stage marked by rites of passage, the distinctions between which give adolescence its cultural markers. Or it could mean an individual’s coming to terms with his or her sexuality, with his or her parents, and his or her establishment of a career and a personal identity. Both of these aspects of adolescence are clearly variable according to cultural values and norms. But a third component of adolescence is biological, referring to the sexual maturing of both males and females. The biological component suggests that this part of adolescence may be universal and applicable to all bodies around the world. In fact, the relationship of puberty to adolescence has been contested by physicians and
physiologists ever since the term derived its scientific context over a century ago.

Edinburgh physician T.S. Clouston wrote to his fellow doctors and physiologists in 1880:

I would, if I could, distinguish between puberty and adolescence in this way—I should restrict puberty, as is now done when the term is used in a scientific and physiological sense, to the initial development of the function of reproduction, to its first appearance as an energy of the organism; while I should use adolescence to denote the whole period of twelve years from the first evolution up to the full perfection of the reproductive energy, when the bones are all finally consolidated, and the full growth of the beard and the sexual hair, and the perfect assumption of the manly form in the male sex, and the full development of the adipose tissue and the mammæ give the female form its perfect grace of contour. (12)

Although adolescence is usually defined by the onset of puberty, its definition is not limited, even by scientists, to a biological standard of the development of the reproductive organs. For instance, the assumed universal time of menses has been shown to vary significantly between Western countries, and has moved from an average age of 16 in the nineteenth century to 13 in the 1970s and 80s (Mitterauer 3). John Neubauer (1992) therefore suggests, “Whereas puberty depends on physiological changes that vary only slightly with climate, diet, and health, adolescence knows no physical determinants and depends on the way societies structure their families, education, and institutions of labor” (6). What will become clear in the next couple of pages is that even in terms of biology, “adolescence” is a more variable than fixed term, and is a cultural phenomenon in and of itself.

Linguistically, the term itself dates back to at least 1398. Neubauer suggests: “Though it descends from Latin, it [term adolescence] was rarely used in the Middle

---

9 The Oxford English Dictionary records the first use of “adolescence” in 1398 from the Latin “adolēscentia” and the first use of “adolescence” from the French “adolescence” in 1430. Both terms were used up until the mid 18th century, when “adolescence” seems to have disappeared in favor of “adolescent.” In 1865 Thomas Carlyle used “adolescence” in History of Frederick II and James Rogers in
Ages and Renaissance, and it was only occasionally included in the traditional ‘ages of man’” (5). As a consequence, the term did not begin to develop its current physiological and psychological meaning until around the beginning of the nineteenth century.

In the early part of the nineteenth century, physiologists began exploring the development and functions of the human body in greater detail than before. Three lines of investigation led to the specification of a special period of adolescence. First, physiologists noticed a particular period when the physical growth of the human body, which prior to this special period outweighed development of mental and social function, began to take a back seat to development in the early teens. They named this period “adolescence.” Secondly, research into the function of organs led scientists to consider the role the development of sexual organs played with behavior. And finally, scientists (and philosophers before them) who had always pondered the relationship between the mind and the body, began to investigate more closely the nervous system. The investigations of the physiological roots of psychological behavior later turned into a field of study on its own: psychology. The relationship between physiology and behavior remained the primary focus of adolescence studies in the mid- to late nineteenth century, and as a consequence meant that from early on the study of this “special period” was closely connected with social behavior. The “scientific” study of adolescence, therefore, was impacted as much by, and was in fact a part of, the general cultural interest in young

---

10 John Priestley, physiologist, writes in 1888: “there are two divisions into which this first period [infancy to manhood] naturally falls, viz., that in which growth preponderates over development—infancy to puberty ; and that in which development preponderates over growth—puberty and adolescence” (105).
adults as other non-scientific elements, such as political and educational reform, reflected these overall cultural trends.

The social connection and importance of the study of adolescence was clear by the 1880’s, when several physiologists stepped out of scientific circles to give public speeches and distribute pamphlets informing the general public on the nature of adolescence and its importance for the development of the child into the adult, and in fact for society in general. Typically, the physiologist warned of the dangers of ignoring this special period of life. In 1880, as part of The Physiologist in the Household series, J. Milner Fothergill, member of the College of Physicians of London, warned of the ignorance of the child regarding the “nature” and behavior of his own body.

There is none upon whom falls the responsibility of informing children on such subjects; in our present social arrangements we possess no one whose duty it is to tell the child about itself, --to explain to it what its nature is. Its parents are too commonly unequal to the task; and even those who do recognize the tremendous urgency for some such education, shrink from the difficulties inherent in the task. (5)

The stakes, according to these scientific men, were never higher for society in general. Clearly these men saw that many of the social ills prevalent at the time were the result of neglecting its youth. “Puberty is the first really dangerous period in the life of both sexes as regards the occurrence of insanity,” wrote Clouston, Superintendent of the Royal Edinburgh Asylum, “but it is not nearly so dangerous as the period of adolescence, a few years afterwards, when the body, as well as the functions of reproduction, has more fully developed” (10).

Physicians’ and physiologists’ observed perceptions of human development worked well with Charles Darwin’s theory of evolution and thus made it difficult to view youth in a social sense outside of this evolutionary mold. Consequently, John Priestley, a
lecturer on Physiology at the Owens College, writing on adolescence in 1888 as part of the Manchester Health Lectures for the People, could not help but suggest that mental and consequently behavioral patterns of young adults must follow a progressive path:

The evolution is just as marked in the mental and moral nature of the boy. Almost suddenly he puts off his boyish habits of thought and feeling; he begins to ‘ape the ways of men,’ as his astonished mother confesses, perhaps with regret. I have often been surprised at the comparative suddenness with which the mental docility of the boy is exchanged for the self-reliant habit of thought of the man. (106)

The behavior of the boy as he changes to a man during the adolescent period, suggests Priestley, will naturally shift according to evolutionary principles (emphasized by Priestley’s reference that the boy “begins to ape the ways of men”). Such a theory implies, however, that any unacceptable behavior must as a consequence result from inattention to the developmental process of evolution during this period.

Adolescence was therefore a category of some importance to physiologists and doctors alike even before the development of the new discipline of psychology. As the previous excerpts of Fothergill, Clouston, and Priestley\textsuperscript{11} demonstrate, this trend was even apparent several decades before the publication of G. Stanley Hall’s popular study of adolescence, earlier than what others claim who begin with Hall’s work.\textsuperscript{12} But in the 1880s, as physiological studies of psychological behavior increased with the opening of Wilhelm Wundt’s lab at the University of Leipzig in 1879 (at which Hall was the first

\textsuperscript{11} In addition to Fothergill, Clouston, and Priestley’s studies are the following: Keating, John M. and William A. Edwards. Diseases of the Heart and Circulation in Infancy and Adolescence. (1888); Fellows, James I. Some Conditions of Adolescence in Which Fellows’ Hypophosphites is Beneficial to the Medical Profession. (1889); Lancaster, Ellsworth Gage. The Psychology and Pedagogy of Adolescence. (1897); Brown, G.W. Launching from Adolescence to Adulthood: A Study of the Impact of Family Life. (1900).

American to study in 1883\textsuperscript{13} there developed increased support for examining a separate period of life that was neither child nor adult (nor youth) that would further illustrate the important connection between physiology and psychology. By the time G. Stanley Hall published his 1904 work, \textit{Adolescence; Its Psychology and Its Relations to Physiology, Anthropology, Sociology, Sex, Crime, Religion, and Education}, then, adolescence as a special category was well established in both Europe and America, although, as will be discussed a little later, the term “adolescence” did not figure into European discourse for some time. Hall’s popular study did, however, bring to general attention the term “adolescence,” which prior to his study remained almost exclusively a scientific term only. In addition, Hall managed to draw out in much more detail the physiological components of (male) adolescence and, most crucially, its relation to behavior and society in general. In such a way, Hall makes the connection between evolution and adolescence even stronger, using Ernst Haeckel’s recapitulation theory to conflate individual with cultural progress. He writes:

> Along with the sense of the immense importance of further coordinating childhood and youth with the development of the race, has grown the conviction that only here can we hope to find true norms against the tendencies to precocity in home, school, church, and civilization generally, and also to establish criteria by which to both diagnose and measure arrest and retardation in the individual and the race. (viii)

\textit{Adolescence} gives a comprehensive account of the then current physiological studies of Western youth, compiling and comparing the growth of the youth of different countries against each other according to height, weight, even size of bone growth, over time to make the general argument that adolescence is a unique period of biological development. He uses the following pictorial comparison to demonstrate this point:

The enlarged x-ray of the infant (original size is in the middle) juxtaposed with the x-ray of a full-grown adult skeleton demonstrates to Hall that there are substantial differences between the size and shape of the bones, and leads him to conclude that the progression of individual growth from infant to adult could neither be uniform nor proportional. According to Hall, then, the period between childhood and adulthood has to be a distinct stage separate from childhood and adulthood, and the characteristics of this stage can thus be established only through measuring physiological change.

The scientific definition of adolescence, based on physiology and psychology, thus relies in part on the same type of progressivist logic that was used to describe and understand colonial subjects. Whether it was the Great Chain of Being or later Darwin’s evolution theory, most scientists ranked civilizations and races on a linear scale proceeding from least civilized to most. Physiology and biology thus reinforced ethnology and anthropology, and vice versa, all based on what were considered at the time to be “obvious” and “observable” patterns in nature. E.B. Tylor writes in Primitive
Culture (1871): “among ethnographers there is no such question as to the possibility of species of implements or habits or beliefs being developed one out of another, for development in Culture is recognized by our most familiar knowledge” (14-15). A progressivist logic was defended not just because it seemed to mimic nature, but also because it structured time. Tylor continues: “Such examples of progression are known to us as direct history, but so thoroughly is this notion of development at home in our minds, that by means of it we reconstruct lost history without scruple, trusting to general knowledge of the principles of human thought and action as a guide in putting the facts in their proper order” (15). Anthropologists like Tylor combined a progressivist assumption with human developmental patterns to help them to rank cultures from “childlike” to adult.

For psychologists and physiologists like Hall, however, a progressivist theory of cultural development meant that the children of “adult” civilizations, such as Anglo-European civilization, must be more “adult-like” than the children of other regions. He intended that his special period of “adolescence” would illustrate this through physiological and psychological connections. But at the same time, he could not claim that all Anglo-European children are thus born “adults,” or with adult bodies and faculties. The special period of adolescence would therefore demonstrate the superiority of Anglo-Europeans by matching progressivist logic with a theory of stasis, or balance—establishing change through horizontal expansion, not linear progression. Anglo-European culture and its youth were superior because they spent more time developing at the adolescent stage, whereas non-European children jumped too quickly from childhood to adulthood. Hall writes, “Adolescence is a new birth, for the higher and more
completely human traits are now born. The qualities of body and soul that now emerge are far newer. The child comes from and harkens back to a remoter past; the adolescent is neo-atavistic, and in him the later acquisitions of the race become prepotent” (xiii). The white adolescent is “born” out of the lower races and represents the “higher and more completely human traits” that distinguish it from lower races. Whereas some civilizations had stagnated dangerously in their development, causing them to have halted in their evolutionary progress, the opposite was true for Anglo-European cultures. Here, Hall claimed that the cultures who drew out (stagnated in) the adolescent years—who made sure adolescents did not rush on to the next stage of development but rather worked on the non-physical aspects of development, mental, social, and moral development—were the more advanced cultures. The “presence” of a special stage of adolescence in the development of the individual was a sign of a highly developed civilization. This scientific explanation of adolescence joined linear evolution with stasis to support the superiority of the Anglo-European culture, something that was already accepted in popular culture circles for years and is apparent in the popularity of adventure novels marketed to a young adult audience.

**Adolescence in the German Context**

“That there is such an era in life physiologically is sufficiently proved by the existence in all languages of a word to signify the same thing as our ‘adolescence’” claimed T.S. Clouston in 1880 (12). But while Clouston may have been correct in suggesting all cultures use a term to describe an “era in life” similar to adolescence, it
was not always linguistically similar to the English word “adolescence.” This is particularly true for German.

In German, the term „Jugend” describes a stage of human development, much as “youth” does. „Jugend” also almost always refers to a group; whereas “youth” can equally refer to an individual and a group. But the terminology in German for a young individual has changed according to the preferences of historical cultures. Peter Dudek in Jugend als Objekt der Wissenschaften (1990) gives a quick summary: In the eighteenth century, the term for “youth” as an individual shifted from „jungen Herrn” to „hoffnungsvollen Jüngling,” according to the work of Walter Hornstein. Lutz Roth then claims that the term „Jüngling” changed to „Jugendlichen” in the nineteenth century, although most critics agree now that the term „Jugendlichen” instead evolved out of „Jüngling” around the 1870s, and „Jüngling” continued to be used through the end of the century. By 1880, both terms continued on a parallel course of use. Regardless, both terms have come to represent “ideals” of youth: „Jüngling” that of the Christian youth, a product of Evangelical and pedagogical movements of the 18th and 19th century who went to the Gymnasium (college preparatory high school), and „Jugendlichen” out of „Jüngling aus dem Volke,” who went to the Volkschule (technical/trades high school). The term began to gain a negative and criminal connotation by the turn of the century, when „Jugendlichen” became the preferential term of the courts (13).

Recently, the term „Adoleszenz” has gained currency in German discourse, but this term is a relatively recent import.14 Neubauer (1992) suggests several negative and ironic terms that occupied the position of the English “adolescence” in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries: “Lümmeljahre (“lubber years”), Flegeljahre (“cubhood”), and

14 „Adoleszenz” is not listed in Grimm’s nineteenth century dictionary (Neubauer 5).
Backfisch (‘bobby-soxer’) (5). The term became much more popular in the 1970s in the wake of the youth rebellion movements around the world in the 1960s, which brought new attention to the problems of youth in critical circles.¹⁵

Yet despite the lack of a linguistically equivalent term for ‘adolescence’ in German, the study of the young adult took a similar track in Germany in the nineteenth century as it did in Britain. German academics, scientists and thinkers alike, would have already played a significant role in developing general European attitudes towards young people as a whole: from Friedrich Froebel’s 1826 ‘Education of Man’ to the significant strides in physiology made at German universities¹⁶, including Wilhelm Wundt’s lab mentioned earlier, from which Hall developed many of his physiological interests in adolescence. Ludwig Gurlitt, German teacher, educational reformer, and popular author, argued by 1903 that educators needed to focus on the development and growth of German youth, and that this ‘relaxing education’ ‘would agree with the scientific knowledge of the soul’s whole development and growth, and with the new teaching that all ages in life have the same life-value and that adulthood is by no means the model of youth but relates it like fruit to flowering’ (qtd in Neubauer 3).

Critics also point to German literary movements that illustrate a developing fascination with “adolescents” at the time. As previously mentioned, young adult literature critic Anneliese von Hermanni (1979) describes the development of the “theme” of youth from the Bildungsroman to what she calls the Adoleszenzroman around 1900. She considers the Adoleszenzroman to include the “school story” (der


¹⁶ Over half of the studies Hall cites are German physiological studies such as L. Kotelmann’s Die Körperverhältnisse der Gelehrten Schüler des Johanneums in Hamburg (1879), “Die Grössenverhältnisse der Schulkinder im Schulinspektionbezirk” (1888), and M. Mühlmann’s Über die Ursache des Alters (1900).
Schülerroman), such as Frühlings Erwachen and Die Verwirrungen des Zöglings Törless, and other stories that focus on sickness and the psychological identity crisis of the protagonist, but, as opposed to books of the Decadence, still provide a stable heroic or antiheroic figure (22). An Adoleszenzroman, for von Hermanni, contains: 1) direct address of the narrator („Ich-Erzähler“); 2) adolescent hero or anti-hero; and 3) generational conflict (25-6). Hans-Heino Ewers (1991) has modified this definition of Adoleszenzroman to suggest instead that the genre, while coming to prominence through works such as Johann Wolfgang von Goethe’s Die Leiden des jungen Werthers (1774) and Karl Philipp Moritz’s Anton Reiser (1785), was overshadowed by the rise of the Bildungsroman. Ewers proposes that the psychological realism of the Adoleszenzroman became simply a chapter in the epic journey of the Bildungsroman, typified by Goethe’s later Wilhelm Meister’s Lehrjahre (1795). The psychological realism of the Adoleszenzroman would resurge at the turn-of-the-century mixed with a “mythical discourse” in Robert Strauß, Hermann Hesse, Robert Musil, and others, only to decline with the disappearance of the individual hero in the twentieth century (6). John Neubauer (1992) also focuses on the fin-de-siècle psychological novels written about “soul sickness” and identity crisis, but he, like Hermanni and Ewers, focuses on “high literature,” such as „Tonio Kröger,“ and ignores the adventure novel genre, as does Ortrud Gutjahr’s recent essay „Jugend also Epochenthema um 1900“ (“Youth as an Epochal Theme around 1900”) in a book of collected essays entitled Adoleszenz (1997).

Sterling Fishman (1976), in his review of German educational reform movements, suggests that a “discovery of the age of adolescence” in Germany at this time, “revealed truths to most Germans which they had concealed from themselves. In the pages of the
novels which they read and on the stages of theaters they attended, German middle-class audiences saw themselves and their own secret problems as young people for the first time. They became aware of adolescence” (117).

It appears that “adolescence” has been linked frequently to this time period in both cultures, although rarely is the term used in both a scientific and literary sense or to refer to colonial adventure novels. The cross-disciplinary interest in the fate of white male young adults must be inferred. John Neubauer (1992) writes:

adolescence “came of age” in the decades around 1900, not only because the term itself had little currency earlier, but [...] because interlocking discourses about adolescence emerged in psychoanalysis, psychology, criminal justice, pedagogy, sociology, as well as in literature. Adolescence may have been used sporadically earlier, but the appearance of the interlocking discourse testifies that human life was perceived in terms of a new category by the end of the nineteenth century. (6)

What is particularly interesting about the term “adolescence” is its historical resonance. It conveys better the connotation of staged development and connection to biology that are significant for a comparison to colonial discourse. The term “adolescence” most closely illustrates some common ideologies that are shared by both late nineteenth-century colonialism and the late nineteenth-century notion of youth. For this reason I focus more on the term “adolescence” than other terms, such as “youth,” “Jugend,” “Jüngling,” or “Jugendliche.”

This study will primarily be concerned with the psychic, social, and cultural definition of “adolescence,” which means this study will consider the “biological” definition of adolescence to be a cultural phenomenon associated with the mid- to late nineteenth century. In this case, Philippe Ariès (1962) might make more sense, when he states: “It is as if, to every period of history, there corresponded a privileged age and a
particular division of human life: ‘youth’ is the privileged age of the seventeenth century, childhood of the nineteenth, adolescence of the twentieth” (32). This study will show the process by which adolescence became the “privileged term” of the twentieth century.

Adolescence as a Rite of Passage

Understanding adolescence from a historical and scientific viewpoint provides us with another tool for understanding the fascination with the figure of the young male during this time. But we must look deeper than historical and scientific approaches to understand the role the adolescent played in these texts and in Victorian and Wilhelmine culture. Here the postcolonial theory of ambivalence helps to explain the unique role of the adolescent in this literature and how a reading of the text that invests the figure of the young adult with more possibilities than a passive, static character reveals the underlying significance of this figure. Homi Bhabha (1994) has demonstrated that the stereotype is the “major discursive strategy” of the “fixity” of the mode of representation of the Other. It is “a form of knowledge and identification that vacillates between what is always ‘in place,’ already known, and something that must be anxiously repeated” (66). It is the desire “to know for certain,” and the simultaneous fear that knowing with certainty isn’t possible, that drives the stereotype to seek and yet dismiss representation. Bhabha calls this the “ambivalence” of the stereotype. As a figure that mediates between and at times intervenes in the relationship between what is known and what is not known, whether it is between humans and animals, the colonizer and the colonized, the past and the future, the adolescent thus represents European culture’s desire “to know for certain,” its fear of the
unknown, and its ways of attempting to relate one to the other. The hybrid,\textsuperscript{17} liminal figure is European culture’s answer to this ambivalence—hybrids are either feared or desired because of what they can reveal about fundamental ways of knowing. The adolescent is just such an example of a nineteenth century hybrid. Don Randall (2000) explains:

Modern conceptions of hybridity and of adolescence manifest a notable affinity: both are marked by uncertain status, by the instability and unpredictability of the in-between; both, moreover, are elaborated in the course of the nineteenth century and most intensely in its later decades. In both instances the dialectics of fear and desire, of forecast national and racial progress or degeneration, are powerfully evident. (11)

The adolescent calls attention to the binary opposition, unsettles the binary at the moment when it is articulated, and thus reveals the problems inherent with binary thinking. By doing so, the liminal, or hybrid, figure of the adolescent can even become a way to resist the underlying imperial pedagogy when adolescents are read as more than static figures. Reading colonial texts from this modern postcolonial perspective thus reveals an important irony: the very figures that adults hold up as models of the best of Anglo-European culture in these texts are also figures that can undermine the Eurocentric colonial pedagogy on which that Anglo-European culture is based.

The adolescent, read as a hybrid, vacillating figure thus represents the reciprocal nature of the Anglo-European relationship to its Other. While some have criticized Said’s notion of Orientalism for suggesting the passivity of the native in constructing its own image in Western eyes, the hybrid adolescent demonstrates the engagement with the Other that the white adult may not permit himself to have. In fact, because the adolescent develops the skills necessary to become a colonizer through a learning process that often

\textsuperscript{17} When I refer to the white adolescent male as a “hybrid” in these texts, I am gesturing to modern conceptions of hybridity that extend outside of racial typology.
entails reliance on natives, the identity-construction of the young male throughout the course of the novel reveals the dependency the Western notion of self has on the interaction with the Other.

But imperial discourse does not just operate in a spatial realm. Edward Said has described Orientalist discourse as functioning at a “latent” (fantasy, desire, ideas) and a “manifest” (history) level. Bhabha has shown that these two work in conjunction with each other: “It becomes difficult, then, to conceive of the historical enunciations of colonial discourse without them being either functionally overdetermined or strategically elaborated or displaced by the unconscious scene of latent Orientalism” (72). Anne McClintock (1995) has argued similarly that “All too often, psychoanalysis has been relegated to the (conventionally universal) realm of private, domestic space, while politics and economics are relegated to the (conventionally historical) realm of the public market” (8). It is important to acknowledge, then, that imperial discourse operates not just at the moment when binaries are articulated, but also over time. We need to consider adolescence in a similar vein. Adolescence is, after all, a developmental period during which young adults undergo a learning process, or a training period, in the ways of the adult, or as is the case in adventure novels, in the ways of imperialism and colonialism.

The adventure novel, in fact most young adult novels, are, at heart, a form of the Entwicklungsroman or its follower the Bildungsroman. The former differs from the latter in terms of how complete a transition the adolescent achieves by the end of the novel. Roberta Sellinger Trites (2000) reminds us that in a Bildungsroman, the protagonist takes on all the power due a full-fledged adult, while the adolescent in an Entwicklungsroman is still transforming at the end and may remain in the same dubious power position.
While Trites warns “of collapsing all adolescent literature into the rubric of the *Bildungsroman*,” most colonial adventure novels do end with the adolescent taking over the full responsibilities of the adult colonizer, and thus can be considered closer to a *Bildungsroman* than the *Entwicklungsroman* (19). The primary function of this type of apprenticeship novel is the progression of the protagonist and of the narrative itself from beginning to end.

But the development that is a part of the *Bildungsroman* does not remain only with the protagonist. Rather, it is the development of the implied reader that is of primary importance, and while usually that development is assumed to occur through the mimetic process of the novel as the reader begins to identify with the protagonist, it may also occur through the repetition of descriptive elements as well. Jeffrey Richards (1989) reminds us: “Generic literature, relying as it does on the regular re-use of the same elements, characters and situations, functions as a *ritual*, cementing the ideas and beliefs of society, enforcing social norms and exposing, labeling and isolating social deviants” (italics mine, Introduction). The adventure novels thus provides its readers with repeated “rituals” of stereotypes that are a part of the imperial discourse that the reader must learn as he travels through the book, and presumably as the protagonist travels from one stage of life to another. But Don Randall (2000) suggests that analyzing adolescents as “hybrids” does not fit with an analysis of boy’s books according to the “model theory,” where “the boys represented in imperial fictions manifest certain characteristics – values, motivations, patterns of conduct – favorable to the imperial enterprise; characteristics that, in a spirit of emulation, are apprehended and adopted by the boy outside the text – the boy reader” (18). My reading of adventure novels as successive rituals performed
over the course of the novel, however, attempts to synthesize these two different approaches of the “model” theory and the “hybrid” theory.

The reading of an adventure book as well as participating (if vicariously) in the rituals of imperial discourse was thus one of the most popular *rites of passage* for young adults at this time. I choose this term in particular because of the anthropological connotation of the phrase. While anthropologists studied from a pseudo-scientific position non-European races and cultures as a means of establishing the superiority of the white European male during this time, adventure novels were performing a similar task through the repetition of stereotypes formed in large part from these “scientific” studies.

In 1909, Arnold van Gennep published *Rite de Passage*, in which he claimed that previous anthropologists’ “writings are collections of parallels taken out of context and divorced from ritual sequences rather than attempts at systemization” (5). Instead, Gennep proposed the study of natives should place ritual in the context of time, and particularly in the context of the stages of life of an individual. He wrote:

> The life of an individual in any society is a series of passages from one age to another and from one occupation to another. Wherever there are fine distinctions among age or occupational groups, progression from one group to the next is accompanied by special acts, like those which make up apprenticeship in our trades. Among semi-civilized peoples such acts are enveloped in ceremonies, since to the semi-civilized mind no act is entirely free of the sacred. In such societies every change in a person’s life involves actions and reactions between sacred and profane—actions and reactions to be regulated and guarded so that society as a whole will suffer no discomfort or injury. (3)

Thus, reading adventure novels as “rites of passage” both recognizes the dual spatial and longitudinal workings of imperial discourse as well as illustrates that adventure novels are a type of “rite of passage” in Anglo-European culture that anthropologists were typically interested in studying only in non-white cultures.
Choice of Region, Texts, and Methodology

What first comes to mind when one considers adolescence and imperialism in the late nineteenth century is usually Rudyard Kipling and his books about adolescent boyhood, such as *Stalky & Co* (1899) and *Kim* (1901). Certainly Kipling deserves the significant amount of attention his works have gotten for their subtle portrayal of coming of age in a colonial context. Randall (2000) writes of Kipling, “He provides the imaginative framework that confirms India as the core concern in the making and maintaining of Britain’s status as an imperial power; he confirms, that is to say, India’s importance as a key constituent of British imperial identity” (14). *Kim* is one of the most fascinating portraits of hybridity and the search for identity within a binary colonial system. However, I take exception to Randall’s claim that India was the “core concern in the making and maintaining of Britain’s status as an imperial power.”

With the exception of the 1857 Indian Mutiny, India was indeed a fairly well-established colony by the late nineteenth century. But since Britain’s dispute with France over Egypt in the 1880’s and most notably the Berlin Conference of the winter of 1884-85, Africa was where the last unknown regions were being explored by Europeans, where the establishment of colonial boundaries were being contested, and where the future of colonialism was most poignantly in play with the clash of the old colonial powers, Britain and France, with the new ones, Germany, Italy, and Belgium. Not only was the image of Africa still most definitely in flux, but so was Britain’s image of itself as a worldwide empire once other European powers began to vie for Africa. Africa, and more specifically sub-Saharan Africa, was therefore taking center stage in the theatre of the world.
Sub-Saharan Africa is also the regional focus of this study for practical reasons. Germans capitalized on their good relations with British trading posts to establish their first colonies in southwest Africa (now Namibia), Cameroon, Togo, and east Africa (now Tanzania), in that order. Thus, while in Britain the “Empire” was spread out between several continents, in the newly imperialized Germany, colonies meant primarily one place: Africa. Germany’s interest in Africa spread over into the fictional world. While British adventure novels took place all over the world, usually near a British colony, German adventure novels increasingly focused on the new colonies in Africa as in the late 1880’s and 90’s juvenile literature became more and more a tool of propaganda for the colonial supporters at home. Interestingly, although German East Africa was the last of Germany’s African colonies to be founded (1883/4 German Southwest Africa, July 1884 Togo and Cameroon, February 1885 German East Africa), it captured the majority of the adventure novel writer’s attention. The most prolific of the German writers on Africa, Carl Falkenhorst, for example, wrote fourteen books on the East African region (three of these of the Sudan), four books about Cameroon or Togo, and just one book about German Southwest Africa. It is possible that some of this regional imbalance was due perceived differences in the stability of the region as compared to the other German colonies, but most likely it was also due to the growing concern over slave trade and the influx of Arab traders from there into the interiors of Africa. The British novels, in contrast, were predominantly sailing adventures (understandable considering Britain’s maritime history) which included a greater or lesser component of land travel through a particular region, usually South Africa, the southern parts of East Africa (now Mozambique and Botswana), or coastal parts of West Africa, but few were about a
British colony in particular like the German texts were. Both German and British adventure novels also covered military campaigns. While some studies limit or organize the analysis of adventure novels according to type, for instance, maritime novels, colonization novels, or safari novels, battle novels, jungle novels, etc., I do not, since sometimes these distinctions are made for arbitrary reasons, and/or many novels will not fit into one separate category.

The fact that Germany’s colonies existed primarily in sub-Saharan Africa limits the choice of novels for this study. Based on this limitation, British novels were chosen that would best compliment the German ones and that would stay within the general region of sub-Saharan Africa, which is broadly defined as the region of Africa south of the Saharan desert and roughly north of what today is South Africa. Despite this broad region, few of the British and German texts actually overlap within the sub-Saharan region, due in large part to the fact that the British and German regions of interest, while often right next door to each other, typically did not overlap with one another in colonial times.

Although both young and old read all kinds of adventure and colonial literature, whether or not the author intended the work for one or the other particular readership, this project is limited to books that were written with at least a partial young adult audience in mind. Within these parameters, Haggard’s novels are included although his works rarely contain an adolescent character. Instead, it is Haggard’s clear awareness of a young adult readership that makes him suitable for this project, not just his popularity as an adventure novel writer. For a study that focuses on the role of the young adult both in and out of the text, it is important to focus not just on the figure of the adolescent in the text, but on
the overall vision of the adolescent (even as a reader) which these writers have at the time, and how that is simultaneously influenced by imperialism and the general discourse on youth. Most of the writers in this study actually have included adolescents as characters or if not, or in addition, dedicated their work to this readership at the opening of the narrative. The third chapter and conclusion of this study will go into more detail about the critical implication of the real versus implied adolescents of these texts.

This study does not cover all of the books that fit the scope of this project simply for reasons of accessibility and time limitations. For reference purposes, however, I have provided an index at the end of all the British and German texts that would fit into this category. Some books, for instance, *King Solomon’s Mines* (1885), were clearly first serialized in a magazine before they were published; thus, the focus of the study on novels (and not the plethora of short stories or magazine articles about sub-Saharan Africa serialized during this time) is a reflection solely of the practical constraints of the study. Works by Karl May and Gustav Frenssen’s *Peter Moors Fahrt nach Südwest* (1906) are noticeably lacking from this study although they were both major contributors to the field of German adventure novels during this period. In fact, the only Karl May text that takes place in Central Africa (East Africa) is *Die Sklavenkarawane* (1893). In the interests of time, I focused on the German writers who wrote the most about sub-Saharan Africa in my time period (1870-1905); but these two works will be included in future developments of this project.

The personal experience of the writers of these adventure novels contributes significantly to the quality of the image of Africa presented in the text, but it does not often dictate the nature of that image, which has developed over time in dialogue with
other writers in general popular culture discourse. In fact, many of these writers faced significant pressure from their publishers to adhere as closely as possible to the plot templates and stereotypes of previous adventure novels, which it was assumed would make these books sell. German publishers also encouraged the use of outside ethnographical material (Benninghoff-Lühl 54). A previously unpublished letter I came across in conducting research for this project illustrates well some of these tensions. Stanislaus von Jezewski, before he took on the pseudonym Carl Falkenhorst, wrote the following note, presumably in response to a letter from his publisher at J.G. Cotta’sche Buchhandlung:

Leipzig, the 7th of Nov. 1886

My Dear Sir:

I deeply regret that my literary activity has incurred your displeasure. I would like to call your attention, however, to the fact that I actually wrote the “Zugvogel” at your suggestion and moreover, out of consideration for my editorial activity was able to keep this youth story shorter by half than was planned. With regard to the novella, the drafting of it lay finished for some time and recently I actually managed the final copy in my spare time.

I am conscious only of having fulfilled my duties to the fullest extent as long as I have been with “Die Gartenlaube,” and therefore feel you missed the mark with the apprehensions expressed in your letter of the 5th of this month. However, if you have found something in the department assigned to me which does not meet with your sense of propriety or suitability, I implore you most respectfully and urgently to apprise me of it.

You have, my dear sir, left the question of the copy of the novella, “Die letzten [Webes?]” to my own sense of tact. I beg to inform you that the same will not be printed in any paper.

Respectfully,

Your devoted
St. v. Jezewski

18 Leipzig, d. 7. Nov. 1886

Hochgeehrter Herr!
The first story that Jezewski refers to here, “Zugvogel,” turned into his first novel, *In Kamerun*, published a year later despite the negative feedback he apparently received here. The second story did not, in fact, ever make it to publication.

The travel background of these adventure novel writers also impacted how much detail and authenticity these writers could bring to the setting of the novel. Some of the writers chosen for this study wrote on specific colonial conquests with direct correspondence to historical events, even though they were never present in the actual conquest, while other writers who traveled extensively write accounts of European and African interaction that are more fictional than historical on purpose, often claiming it was for the sake of the young adult reader’s entertainment. However, to discriminate or even differentiate between writers who are more or less fictional versus “factual” would be a difficult, even pointless task.

---

Daß Ihnen meine schriftstellerische Thätigkeit so mißliebig erscheint, bedaure ich sehr. Ich möchte Sie jedoch höflichst darauf aufmerksam machen, daß ich den „Zugvogel“ doch eigentlich auf Ihrem Vorschlag geschrieben habe und allerdings aus Rücksicht auf meine redaktionelle Tätigkeit diese Jugendschrift um die Hälfte kürzer, als es geplant war, halten konnte. Was nun die Novelle betrifft, so lag die Ausarbeitung derselben lange bei mir fertig und ich habe in letzter Zeit eigentlich nur die Reinschrift derselben in meinen Mußestunden besorgt.

Ich bin mir bewusst, solange ich in der „Gartenlaube“ bin, meine Pflichten im ausgedehnten Maße erfüllt zu haben, und darum kann ich mich auch durch die in Ihrem geehrten Schreiben vom 5.d.M. ausgesprochenen Befürchtungen keineswegs getroffen fühlen. Sollten Sie dennoch in dem mir zugewiesenen Ressort etwas gefunden haben, was Ihren Wünschen nicht [konvenirt?], so bitte ich ebenso höflich wie dringend, mir davon Mittheilung machen zu wollen.

Sie haben, hochgeehrter Herr, die Frage des Abdrucks der Novelle „Die letzten [Webes?]“ meinem Taktgefühl überlassen. Ich gestatte mir, Ihnen mitzuteilen, daß dieselbe in keinem Blatte gedruckt werden wird.

Mit hochachtungsvoller Begrüßung

Ihr ergebener
St. v. Jezewski

[Letter retrieved from the Cotta Archiv, Deutsches Literaturarchiv, Handschriftenabteilung, Marbach, Germany. I am grateful for the help of Klaus and Marianne Getrost in transcribing and translating this letter from the handwritten original.]
These differences should not be entirely ignored, however. Writers of adventure novels typically came from three kinds of backgrounds: They were often ex-military officers or had spent significant amounts of time abroad before writing (von Barfus, Felsing, Kingston, Haggard, Ballantyne, and Stanley) or they were journalists (Falkenhorst, Henty) who had minimal to no experience abroad. A few writers were also preachers (Burmann, Müller). Often the approach to colonialism advocated by the different authors can be distinguished politically by their occupations. For instance, although Falkenhorst and Felsing were one year apart in age, they had very different perspectives on colonialism and the native in their texts. Falkenhorst, the high school teacher, later career journalist and editor of Die Gartenlaube, adopted a liberal imperialist attitude. Felsing also was a journalist and even wrote occasionally for Die Gartenlaube, but, in contrast to Falkenhorst, he took a more conservative stance regarding colonialism and the African native. His conservative perspective may have been due to his extensive military service prior to becoming a journalist, or simply because he was writing later than Falkenhorst and in a much more conservative and militaristic climate of the late 1890’s and early 1900’s. Scholars such as Susanne Pellatz (2002) regarding German writers and Patrick Brantlinger (1988) for the British authors have pointed out in these adventure novels a shift in the attitude towards natives of Africa from the early paternalistic perspective fueled by abolition to an attitude that increasingly regarded black Africans as non-human during the militaristic “high phase” of colonization (Pellatz 8). I would suggest, however, that the occupations and educational background of these writers also played a significant role, particularly in writers who are virtually of the same age and time-period, in establishing their different attitudes toward natives.
The organization of this project revolves around the behavioral characteristics (or “rites of passage”) of the adolescents in these texts and the different types of elements that they typically encounter in a sub-Saharan African context. The first chapter examines hunting as a rite of passage and the ways in which the adolescent participates in the human/animal interaction in these texts to challenge the representation strategy of colonial discourse. In my next chapter, I outline the development of the image of the black African native as “childlike” and its opposite, the “white father.” This chapter illustrates first how the adolescent supports the power of the “white father” by maintaining the separation between the two images in the text. The second half of the chapter reveals how, concurrently, the training process of the adolescent as a colonizer also breaks down this separation to demonstrate that the black “childlike” native plays a foundational role in the construction of the white Anglo-European male’s sense of self. The third and final chapter considers cave exploration as an epic rite of passage in these adventure novels. The cave journey becomes a metaphor for a cultural journey the “spiritual adolescent” must undergo in Africa. Successful completion demonstrates not just the higher psychological and moral characteristics of the Anglo-Germans, but also how the colonial discourse of the narrative relies on a progressivist understanding of time.
CHAPTER II

Training the Beast: Animals and Adolescents

The main conclusion here arrived at, and now held by many naturalists who are well competent to form a sound judgment, is that man is descended from some less highly organised form. The grounds upon which this conclusion rests will never be shaken, for the close similarity between man and the lower animals in embryonic development, as well as in innumerable points of structure and constitution, both of high and of the most trifling importance,—the rudiments which he retains, and the abnormal reversions to which he is occasionally liable,—are facts which cannot be disputed.

From Charles Darwin’s Descent of Man (1871)

Charles Darwin’s 1871 publication of Descent of Man fueled a firestorm of controversy in Victorian and Wilhelmine culture over man’s relationship to animals. This chapter will focus on this relationship between humans and animals in these novels, as one aspect of the late nineteenth century Anglo-German relationship with Africa that helps to illustrate how adolescents are the site of contact, even mediation, of this concern. The training of the adolescent in natural science (zoology) and hunting practices represents an imposed area of interaction between human and animal. Adolescents identify with the animal world and yet are learning when to break away and to assert their presumed natural dominance as a human. Thus, adolescence itself becomes coded as the learned space of interaction between human and animal that attempts to resolve some troubling late nineteenth century Anglo-European questions, such as: how and when should humans interact with animals? With which animals should humans interact? Where and when does animal end and human begin? How and when should humans stop acting like “animals” and become civilized “adults”? 
The adolescent rite of passage in learning the adult system for interacting with animals means learning to evaluate animals according to layers of human signification. Coming of age in these novels is, at one level, learning what an exotic, or a “savage,” animal of sub-Saharan Africa is, and putting that animal in relation to the domestic animals at home. Adolescents must learn to appreciate wild nature, but not to get carried away with (or by) it. They learn most of all that they can, and should, physically dominate these creatures—even the wildest, biggest beasts out there—for practical or even commercial purposes. They undergo extensive training in how to kill animals (shoot elephants behind the ear, rhinos through the forehead, lions through the heart, etc.) and/or how to protect the weaker ones. And the adolescent, who might be many times outsized by the animal, need not fear if weapons and techniques alone do not help him: he has the mental and emotional advantage as well.

Thus, in the process of determining the relationship between the savage and the docile, the exotic and the domestic, thereby invoking, if not necessitating human interaction, the adolescent signifies himself to be human in his ability to determine that animal relationship, whether it is to dominate the savage, domesticate the docile, or anything in between. The very same ordering process that creates a hierarchy between docile and savage, domestic and exotic, at the same time elevates the adolescent as the being that has divided, or mediated, or controlled. An adolescent’s rite of passage in learning the animal classification system and hunting rituals of adults teaches him not only how to become an adult and how to dominate the environment, but, in turn, how to extend those practices to natives—in short, how to become a good colonizer. And so training the adolescent reveals not just what humans think of animals, but consequently
what it means to be human (according to adults) and how important it was for nineteenth-century Anglo-Europeans to separate themselves from belonging to the animal kingdom.

**Teaching the Creature: Animal Stories in Victorian and Wilhelmine Culture**

Animal representations in children’s and young adult literature have served two main purposes: to instruct the young person in how to behave toward others, and to instruct in what it means to be human, or “humane,” according to adult Anglo-European standards. Animal characters are thus another form of “other” with which children and young adults can practice social relations. In nineteenth-century animal books, young adult and child readers are able to begin to work out their relationship with foreigners of exotic locales through animal portrayals in the texts, because their limited representation restricts the extent of human-animal relations and offers a beginning level of interaction. Jopi Nyman (2003) reminds us: “Like peoples populating spaces previously uncharted and speaking languages incomprehensible to Westerners, the animals were also Othered as a result of their inability to speak” (13). Human relations with animals must therefore be based primarily on appearance and behavior only, since most animals in these texts lack the linguistic interface to communicate directly with humans. Harriet Ritvo (1987) explains that animals “never talk back,” so they have no other way to engage with the human outside of the physical level (5). And typically animals in these books have very few ways to express that they are sentient beings, let alone express feelings or opinions that are different than what humans want them to express, because they are not only physically dominated, but also rhetorically controlled. Animals do not undergo any transformation throughout the course of these novels—instead, it is the young adult who
journeys through the sub-Saharan terrain and who likewise adapts his behavior according to the static representation of animals with which he comes in contact.

The portrayal of animals itself is therefore manipulated to serve adult human ends—whether that manipulation means exaggerating the actions of the animal, or imposing human values and emotions, resulting in anthropomorphism. The fictional animal is a product of human sentiment, and therefore mimics the same representational strategies that humans use to classify other humans, whether that sentiment manifests as exoticizing the unfamiliar or romanticizing the familiar. Animal portrayals in adventure novels portray the same conflicting fear/desire relationship that humans have towards the non-European other. Nyman writes that “through [the study of animal narratives] new forms of making and defining human identities can be imagined and located in particular historical and social contexts, showing who is included and who excluded” (3). Animals, like humans, are divided according to location by those that are domestic and those that are exotic. They are simultaneously classified by behavior on a continuum between savage and docile. At another level, animals are valued according to their aesthetic beauty and their use value, which are commonly seen as opposite qualities.

Animal stories act as a training manual for how the child should grow into an adult, and how to act like an adult with others. They suggest that there is a link between behavior towards animals and later behavior towards adults—those who treat animals cruelly as a child will go on to treat humans cruelly as adults unless taught to do otherwise. The portrayals of human-animal relationships and the depictions of animals as either the sentimentalized domestic pet or the exotic savage beast are intended to control the actions of children and provide a strict guideline for behavior. Ritvo writes that
children’s literature is the only genre that expressed the “complex relationship between sympathetic concern for animals and manipulation of people” (131). Animal books invoke the need for both kindness to animals, particularly animals deemed smaller or weaker, and the need to discipline the “wild” animals. Those humans who can not, or will not, control animals, these books suggest, are thus morally weak or lacking. But those who treat animals with kindness, yet maintain firm control, simultaneously illustrate the physical as well as moral authority that is prized by the adult Anglo-German population.

The link between treatment of animals and future human behavior is particularly significant for boys. Common understanding of children at the time suggested that boys were “wilder” than girls and needed more training to become “civilized.” Romantic conceptions of the child and nature, spurred by J.J. Rousseau’s *Emile* (1762), fostered this typical perception of boys, but so also did widely publicized reports of real “feral” children—all boys—such as Peter the Wild Boy (found near Hannover in 1725 and brought to London for treatment/study), Victor of Aveyron (found near Toulouse in 1797), and Kaspar Hauser (found near Nuremberg in 1825). The public’s general fascination with “wild boys” continued beyond the early nineteenth century with the help of fictional characters such as Tom from Charles Kingsley’s *The Water Babies* (1863), Mowgli from Rudyard Kipling’s *The Jungle Book* (1894), and Tarzan from Edgar Rice Burrough’s *Tarzan of the Apes* (1914).

Animal stories directed at a primarily young male audience thus tend to portray more violent acts towards animals because these writers assume “wild boys” will be more interested in violence. The violence and action shift the emphasis of these books from the
observation and classification characteristic of simple “animal books” to the interaction of “adventure novels.” In Ballantyne the Brave (1967), the only biography written of Robert Michael Ballantyne, Eric Quayle suggests that a “boys will be boys” attitude towards animal cruelty pervaded much of these nineteenth-century adventure novels, including Ballantyne’s. Quayle writes:

An almost total disregard for the suffering of mild creatures is evidenced in many of the books he [Ballantyne] wrote in later life, and in this respect he is as guilty as the other children's authors of the period, whose heroes had a propensity to shoot on sight any animal or bird which happened to cross their paths. Bob Ballantyne was reared in an age in which the cruelty of children to animals, both domestic and wild, was tolerated with amusement by many of their elders, and the hanging of a cat, stoning of a cockerel, or an organised dog fight to the death, were some of the milder excesses practiced for fun by the youths of the district. (25)

Not only does he suggest that animal cruelty is the norm in Ballantyne’s books because boys themselves were violent towards animals, but he also suggests that this behavior was widespread and was “tolerated with amusement” by adults. Many of the British “big game” hunters of Africa attributed their zeal for hunting to childhood propensities. John MacKenzie (1989) reports that the diary of one such hunter, Denis Lyell, “suggested more than once that every boy's prime excitement in adolescence consisted of bagging his first blackbird with a catapult or taking potshots with a shotgun at local cats, imagining they were lions or tigers” (“Hunting and the Natural World” 46). Adventure novels catered to this supposedly innate aggressive nature of the boy by exaggerating the threat of animals and situations requiring drastic actions.

Behavior of both animals and children therefore dictated the nature of an animal book together. The behavior of the animal and the child worked inversely to each other: the “wilder” the animal, the more the child was called upon to act like an adult—to
master himself and the “beast.” And the more docile the animal, the more attractive and appropriate it was for little children. Animal depiction shifted to define the development of the boy from child into adult. Books about domestic and docile animals that demonstrated that these creatures could be the reader’s friend and/or worker if properly disciplined, trained, and respected were typically “children’s” books, whereas engagement with violent and savage animals was reserved for the older adolescent, who would be trained in the traditional adult ritual of animal interaction: hunting.

Whereas the animal book concentrated on introducing children to animals, the adventure novel was well-adapted (or catered) to a transitioning readership. In this way, hunting acted as the perfect metaphor for the coming of age journey—whether the boy could handle the “chase,” it was thought, would also dictate how well the boy would handle the pressures of the transition to adulthood. Hunting was also the central form of human-animal contact in many of the adventure novels directed at older adolescent males because it made very apparent the importance of learning adult ways—for without learning how to dominate and kill an animal, the adolescent might forfeit his own life or even the lives of others. In fact, hunting introduced an additional layer of decision-making in the human-animal interaction concerning the taking of life (either the animal’s or the human’s). It was a ritual that required advanced knowledge of human-animal interaction and it demanded the quick transition from passive learner to actor, easily mimicking the coming of age process from childhood to adulthood. Not all hunters-in-training were necessarily young adults in these adventure novels, but most were, because learning to hunt was one of the most important skills a young adult male in the nineteenth
century needed to know in order to be successful as an adult, at least in the fictional realm.

Hunting thus provided adventure novel writers with a justified means of portraying violence towards animals in books aimed at a supposedly “wild” young male audience. MacKenzie writes: “here was an opportunity to offer violence, gore and death in what seemed to be an acceptable context, the assertion of human will and power in the animal kingdom” (147). But portraying the violence of hunting was important not just because it depicted the “harshness” of adult life, but because it also was a metaphor for the act of colonization itself. If imperialism provided the reason for nature exploration (the search for “genuine wilderness”), then hunting was equivalent to a “civilizing” process. As a consequence, the hunter’s role, enhanced by perceived needs for hunting in emerging colonies (to provide food, safety, as well as products to barter for native compliance), emphasized the importance of hunting ritual and the hunter’s character in both a domestic realm and a foreign one.

Training in the ways of the hunter thus represented an early form of instruction in the colonization of other peoples. MacKenzie states: “Hunting was . . . a mark of the fitness of the dominant race, a route to health, strength, and wealth, an emblem of imperial rule, and an allegory of human affairs” (170). As hunting progressed overseas, hunting behavior and rituals were increasingly marked by class. Hunting according to accepted rules made the hunter a “gentleman.” In turn, Anglo-European hunting rituals abroad (use of the gun, etc.), coded according to imperialistic values, separated the “civilized” hunters from those who were not, even although natives had successfully depended on their own hunting rituals for generations before the arrival of colonizers.
Hunting rituals in late nineteenth-century adventure novels also reflected Victorian and Wilhelmine culture’s conflicted understanding of the relationship between humans and animals, which adolescents were supposed to work out as they learned hunting techniques. Unlike early forms of hunting, which were almost totally practical in nature, Victorian and Wilhelmine culture increasingly battled whether hunting was acceptable for purposes of sport when the need for game was declining. The resurgence of interest in nature brought about by the rise of science brought this conflict to a head. MacKenzie explains: “Science and nature became one, the former justifying the latter, the latter offering an agreeable route into the former” (147). While seeking to discover the “laws of nature,” or later, idealizing Nature, encouraged young men to leave the cities and return to the land, the purpose of hunting—for collecting specimens, or for demonstrating skill and imposing human will—was thrown further into doubt.

The increasing fascination with the study of nature also filtered into education. With the passing of the 1870 Forster Act, courses in natural history became a school requirement (MacKenzie (1988) The Empire of Nature 41). Countless young men began to venture out into fields and streams to observe, study, collect, and display. MacKenzie writes: “The study of natural history . . . [took] boys and men into nature: uncovering the infinite complexities of creation revealed to its practitioners the divine pattern of the moral as well as the physical universe” (42). Studying natural history encouraged students to seek order in the world by fitting chaos with a pattern. This pattern supposedly linked the physical with the moral and spiritual world. As much as humans studied nature in order to justify their presumed God-given uniqueness in the world, they also gradually realized their own integral part in that system. As a result, MacKenzie
explains, the “detached study of natural history had discredited many of the earlier man-centred perceptions. A closer sense of affinity with the animal creation had weakened old assumptions about human uniqueness” (26). The study of nature, while intended to confirm human superiority, instead put it further in question. As the humans most likely to be in training regarding the laws of nature, then, adolescents were at the center of this debate over man’s relationship with the animals and his place in Nature as a whole.

Consequent to changing understandings of man’s relationship to nature fueled by scientific developments, nineteenth-century adventure novels reflected a dual and at times competing interest between collecting and classifying animal specimens through the study of natural science and asserting one’s human superiority through hunting and killing beasts. The tension is apparent in the seemingly oppositional objectives of adventure novels to instruct the reader in how to classify animals, as children’s animal books emphasized, yet at the same time draw excitement from the action of pursuit in adventure novels. This tension exposes the very contradictions of the nineteenth century children’s and young adult literature genre—to educate and to entertain—at whose center remained the figure of the adolescent.

The Humane Movement and the Nineteenth-Century Culture of Animal Cruelty

But before examining just how the training of the adolescent in natural science and hunting opened up these fissures in Victorian and Wilhelmine culture’s conception of man’s relationship to the animals, we should examine critically the notion that these cultures viewed young males only as “wild boys,” or that they only advocated violence toward animals. Was cruelty towards animals in the nineteenth century as commonplace
and as generally accepted as critics such as Eric Quayle and hunters like Denis Lyell would have us believe? Did parents really “tolerate with amusement” their child’s violence towards animals “both domestic and wild” (25)? Were children incapable of living harmoniously with domestic pets? Did boys string up every animal in sight? Or is that, instead, the attitude regarding animals, boys, and parents that some adventure novels inculcate through their isolated fictional world? If we read the nineteenth-century figure of the adolescent in these adventure novels as coming out of the “animal book” tradition directed towards children and approaching adult understandings of animals advocated in these books, then we can read the adolescent as a way of resisting the violence in these texts that the writer would have us accept unquestioningly.

In truth, even though adventure novels in particular focus on the savage beasts, boys viewed them within a spectrum of depictions of animals in nineteenth-century children’s and young adult fiction in general. Boys grew up with animal stories that portrayed more than just the violent animals and violent behaviors. Even writers of adventure novels in exotic locales such as sub-Saharan Africa, whose books typically brought the reader face-to-face with wild, threatening animals like the lion, crocodile, elephant, rhinoceros, and hippopotamus, also wrote of the gentler animals, both in Africa (gazelles, antelope, etc.) and at home (cats, dogs, horses, etc); but rarely were the two types combined in one text unless the emphasis was on zoological instruction.

Ballantyne, in particular, although his biographer claims he always portrayed animals as the victims of violence, wrote The Dog Crusoe (1860), where a dog actually takes the lead in this book and heroically helps its human friends. He also wrote books about kittens and dogs that were directed towards younger children. G.A. Henty, known for his
boys’ adventure books, wrote The Cat of Bubastes, which centers around the death of a sacred cat in Egypt, and Those Other Animals, stories in which he likened human to animal characteristics. William Henry Giles Kingston co-wrote Stories of the Sagacity of Animals (1883), a collection of stories about cats, dogs, horses, and other animals.  

But perhaps the best example of an adventure writer who also writes about docile and domestic animals is Dr. Gordon Stables, who was also an amateur naturalist (MacKenzie (1989) “Hunting and the Natural World” 165). In his day, he gained notoriety as a breeder and show-judge, not just as a writer of boys’ adventure novels, and he also wrote and helped write countless instructional books, from The Domestic Cat (1876). “Cats:” Their points and classifications (1877), The Practical Kennel Guide (1877), Dogs in their relation to the public (social, sanitary, and legal) (1877), The Classic Encyclopedia of the Dog (1879), The Illustrated Book of the Dog (1881), Our Friend the Dog: A complete practical guide . . . (1884), The Dog: from puppyhood to age (1893), and The Ailments of Dogs (1897), among others. Most unusual is the fact that his love of docile and/or domesticated animals also found its way into his adventure stories. Many of the plots of his adventure stories featured a pet that performs heroic deeds for its owner, and pets even form the central plot interest in books such as Aileen Aroon: a memoir [of a dog] (1884), Our Humble Friends and Fellow Mortals (1892), Sable and White: the autobiography of a show dog (1893), Shireen and her friends: pages from the life of a persian cat (1895). The writers of adventure novels were equally as concerned about portraying the docile, “cute” animals as the unfamiliar, threatening ones,

19 German children were exposed to animal portrayals in folklore, such as in Wilhelm Grimm’s fairy tales (1812-58), particularly the Traveling Musicians (Bremer Stadtmusikanten), Wilhelm Heys’s (1833) Fünfzig Fabeln, and W. Lakowitz’s (1893) Buch der Tierwelt. Certainly many of the British books would have filtered into Germany, and most influential amongst these would have been Rudyard Kipling’s The Jungle Book (1894-5). The central German authors of this study did not write any animal-centered books.
and particularly about modeling for the reader the appropriate human behaviors towards both.

The tension between natural science and hunting in these novels also further puts into question the tendency towards animal violence in these adventure novels and the implication that Victorian and Wilhelmine culture advocated predominantly the mistreatment of animals. In fact, simultaneous to the spread of violence towards animals and justification of hunting brought on by the Anglo-European expansion into “virgin” lands around the world, a “humane movement” was also getting off the ground. The first animal cruelty legislation was passed in Britain in 1822, referred to as the “Martin’s Act.” Not surprisingly, many of the supporters of the anti-slavery movement in Britain (William Wilberforce and T.F. Buxton among others) were also founding members of the SPCA (Society for the Prevention of Cruelty towards Animals) in 1824 (Regenstein 124). Although Britain was the first to enact legislation, Charles Niven (1967) points out that several German states were not far behind: Saxony in 1830, Prussia in 1838, and Württemberg in 1839 (98). Cruelty was punished much earlier in the German states than in Britain (for instance a 1766 injunction against riding a horse to death in Leipzig) because of the autocratic remnants of the feudal system in Germany at the time, leading Niven to suggest that Germans were as much the “true pioneers” of the humane movement as the British (98). Interest in showing animals also bloomed in the mid to late nineteenth century, according to Harriet Ritvo (1987), after the first dog show held in Newcastle on June 28, 1859 (97). And in 1900 representatives in London from European colonies in sub-Saharan Africa even signed a protection order for animals not considered
a human threat, as part of the “Convention for the Preservation of Wild Animals, Birds and Fish in Africa” (284).

In fact, by the mid to late part of the century much of the game considered “savage” by Europeans was becoming scarcer or pushed further and further into the interior, making their threat more unrealistic than even the portrayal (282). Instead, it was the threat of animal extinction and hunting excesses that were reported in the news of the day. The ravages of hunting were particularly apparent in southern Africa, since Europeans had maintained their longest presence in Africa there. Reports of early explorers such as the eighteenth-century Frenchman Le Vaillant could be compared with the nineteenth-century big game hunters Oswell, Vardon, Baldwin, and Selous. It was clear that by the 1840s, both the lion and the eland had disappeared from the southern African region (Verney 151). The last wild quagga, a subspecies of the zebra, was believed to have been killed in 1858, followed by the sole remaining one in captivity at the Amsterdam Zoo in 1883 (150). By 1870, South African elephants had retreated north of the Zambezi River (151). Since many of the writers of adventure novels, both British and German, were also journalists at some point in their careers, many were most likely well aware of the dangers of animal extinction. They were also most likely aware of the public debates about cruelty towards and protection of animals, both domestic and international.

But although both the British and Germans were the pioneers of animal protection legislation, the awareness of animal rights did not necessarily filter down into the fictional world, particularly in British adventure novels. Reports of explorers known for hunting, such as Sir Richard Burton, and those who traveled to Africa only to hunt, such
as William Cornwallis Harris, George Cumming, Denis Lyell, and Fredrick Selous, romanticized the figure of the hunter in the eyes of the general public. Gordon Cumming’s 1850 book *Five Years of a Hunter’s Life in the Far Interior of South Africa* in particular sparked the idealization of the hunter’s life (95). Sir Ralph Payne-Gallway distilled a hunter’s code of conduct into book form by 1890 in his *Instructions to Young Sportsmen* (159). Ballantyne and adventure novel writers like him continued the mystique of the “big game hunter,” or the “great white hunter” on safari in Africa.

But in fact it was the German adventure novel writers who tended to portray more of an awareness of the fragile state of certain animal populations. Perhaps this was because Germans did not enter into the “Scramble for Africa” until later in the century, when sheer exploitation of Africa had begun to be disguised as interest in proper land management, or because the Germans were from the beginning more interested in land cultivation than the British, or both. The fact that the German novels are much more intentionally and conspicuously focused on particular regions (the German colonies) also might have brought more awareness to their animal portrayals. German colonialism was closely bound with German nationalism, and both arose in the context of a world-wide British empire, a fact which may have made Germans look more towards particularities, both domestic and international, to justify their nationalism and to disassociate themselves from the British. What better way to reveal the cracks in the British Empire than to demonstrate the apparent disjuncture between the animal and human rights movements, for which Britain was well-known, and the cult of hunting advocated in British adventure novels? The British Empire, in turn, because of its sheer size, perhaps inadvertently made adventure novel writers make assumptions in their texts because they
were so spread out in so many different continents, with so many different climates, and/or because they could afford to exaggerate, since their colonial power was already well-established.

But the particular backgrounds of some writers also made their work take on somewhat different shapes. Carl Falkenhorst, for example, studied the natural sciences and was a high school teacher in the subject. His knowledge of natural science meant his portrayals of animals were much more situated than the other writers, both German and British, who were typically either journalists, military officers, or both, and may have just been interested in writing or colonial propaganda alone. In Falkenhorst’s *Der Fürst des Mondlandes* (1895), the German protagonist recognizes the importance of regulating hunting according to nature’s ability to regenerate. Bilali, an educated native, urges caution in the killing of elephants:

> It grows ever easier to bag the elephant, but ever more difficult to spot him. And unfortunately he does not multiply too quickly, like hare in the field. Every few years an aging cow will drop a calf, and it takes many years till it cuts any usable teeth. One must migrate ever farther west to find the pachyderm, but sooner or later the world must end, or? One day there will be no elephants, and the day will come when the Makua will have to take up the hoe. (76)\(^{20}\)

While the European-educated Bilali is ultimately only a mouthpiece for Falkenhorst’s privileging of renewable resources (farming), such an understanding, let alone recognition, of the damage humans are doing to the population of elephants and the consequences thereof would rarely, if ever, be seen in a British book.

---

\(^{20}\) “Immer leichter wird es, den großen Elefanten zu töten, aber immer schwieriger, ihn zu sehen. Und er vermehrt sich leider nicht so rasch wie die Hasen im Felde. Alle paar Jahre wirft eine alte Mutter ein Junges, und dieses braucht viele Jahre, bis es brauchbare Zähne bekommt. Immer weiter muß man nach Westen ziehen, um die Dickhäuter zu finden, aber die Welt muß einmal ein Ende haben. Gelt, es wird einmal keine Elefanten geben, und kommen wird einst der Tag, da der Makua zur Hacke wird greifen müssen.” (76)
German colonists were not only aware of the British reputation for big-game hunting, but often expressed their disapproval in their own adventure novels. An experienced German colonist in Otto Felsing’s Der blaue Diamant (1902), named Rotbart, remarks that in British territory (nowadays Kenya) one “so-called sportsman” shot seven elephants in a half hour with an express flint (288). Rotbart’s young German companion, Cord, responds: “Seven at once? That was really an elephant slaughter! . . . and that was a sportsman? But if it had been an ivory hunter . . .!” (288) Rotbart cautions the youth from justifying the killing based on the perceived use of the animal (in this case, the value of the ivory tusks). He continues: “In English territory three years ago a society of hunting sportsmen decimated no less than 37 big animals in an afternoon’s hunt, including a dozen zebras—completely nonsensical!” (288) Ironically, though, while the German adult appears to be trying to instill good hunter ethics (at the expense of the British), his actions— in this instance-- do not follow his words. The group is, in fact, on its way to the British territory to go hunting so that they can both shoot multiple animals and also avoid the steep toll on hunting that the German colony has imposed!

The point is that although adventure novels about adventure in Africa, made popular by the predominant British tradition, focus on the wild, threatening animals of the region, they were neither the only animals these books portrayed, nor was violence towards them always the only option presented. Other European traditions, namely the

21 “Sieben auf einmal? Das ist ja eine wahre Elephantenschlächterei gewesen! . . . Und das war ein Sportsman? Ja wenn’s noch ein Elfenbeinjäger gewesen wäre!” (288)

22 “Auf englischem Gebiet hat vor drei Jahren eine Gesellschaft von Jagdsmenschen auf einer Vormittagsjagd nicht weniger als 37 große Tiere zusammengeschossen, darunter ein Dutzend Zebras—ganz unsinnigerweise!” (288)
Germans’, used the developing animal rights movement to set a different tone in their novels. It is also important to remember that these novelists were writing for a domestic audience that was simultaneously being fed books about kinder, gentler animals, many of which were written by the same authors of books about the dangerous crocodiles and lions of Africa. Consequently, readers were presented with portrayals that suggested animals were savage as well as docile, and usually animals were either savage or docile, with little variety in between. The white adolescent was expected to replicate and negotiate this implied binary as a part of his coming-of-age process in the narrative. Adolescents needed to learn how to manage animals like adults—adventure novels needed to make them into adolescents by telling them how to transition from being an animal to controlling one. In learning how to handle all animals, including savage and domestic, the training of the adolescent as a naturalist and a hunter thus became the site at which the nineteenth-century logic of animal representation was worked out and put into practice. How the adolescent handles animals in these books, then, says a lot about not only how these animals were viewed in nineteenth-century culture, but also how adolescents were signified by adults through their relationship with animals. By learning how to value animals, adolescents may become “humanized,” but they also make their first steps toward becoming adult colonizers.

**Grounding the Human/Animal Relationship: Savage Animals**

Exaggeration of animal portrayals in adventure novels reinforce the binary logic of Anglo-European thought processes, which adolescents are expected to learn while negotiating between these imposed definitions. One of the most important distinctions
among animals (and between humans and animals) is determined by observed behavior in relation to human interaction. Animals are classified on a spectrum between savage and docile according to where the animal originates (whether it was an exotic or domestic animal) as well as how well that animal behaves, not just towards other animals, but towards humans. In fact, the savage-docile continuum shifts according to human perception of threat: an animal that is most threatening to humans is savage, least is docile. The animal that has the most potential to be trained to succumb to humans is docile, the others savage. The designation of an animal as savage or docile, then, is determined by its behavior and trainability, and the more humans’ fear or desire an animal, the more extreme the classification system will become.

Humans become more fearful as animals become more savage, and vice versa. Adolescents are trained in their relationship with animals based upon this fear brought about by the savage animal’s representation, or lack of contextual representation, in these books. Carl Falkenhorst’s Unter den Palmen von Bagamojo (1894) uses this relationship between the characterization of animals as savage and its effect on youth as the set-up to his book. Just before docking on the island of Zanzibar to gather materials for a hunting expedition into the interior of Africa, Karl Werner reminisces to his servant and companion, Johann, about what brought them to Zanzibar:

Do you still remember those times when the rain wouldn’t cease, or all highways and byways were snowed over—how we rifled through all the magazines and books in the rooms of the old castle bedecked with all kinds of hunting trophies? And we devoured hunting adventure tales from all five continents of the earth. The elephant fascinated us; we longed for the powerful hippo to appear before the deadly barrel of our guns, with the fearsome cats, the tiger, the lion, the panther! Oh how we longed to engage with the beasts. If only we could! If only we might! We shouted and agonized then! Johann my comrade, now we’ve attained

---

23 The Oxford English Dictionary defines “savage” (with regard to animals) as: “Wild, undomesticated, untamed. Often, and in later use exclusively, with the contextual implication of ferocity.”
the goal! The distant fairyland which drew us like a magnet then, appeared to us in dreams—lies before us and we’re about to set foot in it. We’re entering the golden land of hunters. Doesn’t your heart beat tumultuously beneath the hunter-green cloth? (8)\textsuperscript{24}

Here Falkenhorst demonstrates the power these depictions have over the imagination of and actions of youth. Werner remembers the depictions of animals in the newspapers and books he read about hunting all around the world, and it is these depictions that influence him to start on his own hunting expedition to Africa. His motives for going to sub-Saharan Africa do not include the desire to explore new lands, civilize natives, or even to make money—he wants to go to the “golden land of hunters.” But Werner does not describe the animals as docile and gentle; rather, they are active—they promise to “engage” him. The elephant “fascinates” [reizen] him as much as the “fearsome” [grimm] cats and the “powerful” [gewaltig] hippo. The animals become savage—and become attractive—only in relation to how they engage the human. Therefore, when this young German of the nobility says he is attracted to Africa “like a magnet” by the promise of wild “beasts” [Bestien], he really means it: the depictions of animals as savage polarize his reactions and “draw” him to Africa. And it is not coincidental that he chooses Africa. True, the German colonies probably influence his decision, but also, and perhaps more importantly, all of these animals, with the exception of the tiger, make sub-Saharan Africa their home. These animals, then, represented as savage and also as

engaging the human, draw these protagonists to Sub-Saharan Africa with fear that justifies, yet promises, fast-paced, violent interaction.

The adolescent hunter-in-training, drawn to Central Africa to pursue the exotic and savage beasts, must learn to identify savage animals correctly once he arrives and also interpret the savage animal’s behavior in order to determine action. In the process of successfully identifying and taking care of savage animals, then, the adolescent becomes a full-fledged hunter. The process of hunting requires an active classification of animals based on observation of behavior and interpretation of the situation. In adventure novels where the situation and animal behaviors are exaggerated, however, the reliability of the details of the situation becomes suspect. The decision-making process of the adolescent, already put on trial in his training to become an animal-handling adult and colonizer, also puts into question the representation itself in these novels.

An egregious example of this comes from W. H. G. Kingston’s *In the Wilds of Africa* (1872). The young British adolescent, Andrew, describes an afternoon when he and his friends are at work making a canoe. Jack, also ship-wrecked somewhere on East African shores with Andrew, is singing a “sea-ditty,” while Chickango (their black servant) is “shouting” a native song: “Suddenly a loud, trumpeting sound saluted our ears; and looking round to ascertain whence it came, we saw far away in the forest a huge elephant, which we naturally concluded had been attracted by our voices. He stood whisking his ears and holding his trunk out in a somewhat threatening manner. Our guns stood against the trees at some little distance” (127). Andrew hears the trumpeting of an elephant, and “naturally concludes” that it must have been “attracted by our voices.” Not only does he assume the elephant’s attention is drawn by their singing, but he also
assumes that the elephant has hostile intentions. The “whisking” of the ears and “holding his trunk out” are seen as threatening, even though there are other reasons why the elephant might perform these actions. The point here is not to suggest the intentionality of the elephant, but to illustrate how the decision-making process of Andrew the protagonist reveals the pattern of suggestion by the narrators and authors of these books that certain animals are automatically a threat to humans. In scenes such as the previous one, the context and description of the situation becomes so stream-lined that it works against the representation. While the reader might have accepted the representation of the elephant as hostile had the writer described more of the actions, or context, of the scene, in these abbreviated circumstances, the representation becomes easy to pick apart by an active and perceptive readership.

The importance of animal representation in these texts and the way in which it works in relation to the adolescent’s actions also comes out in certain illustrations. Illustrations became a crucial aspect of the attraction and marketing strategy of adventure novels in the late nineteenth century. But while the number and quality of illustrations ensured the success of a book, increasing demand also reduced the quality. Illustrations were commonly traded between books, even between nations. There were teams of illustrators that worked together to increase output, which in turn increased the use of templates. Reliance on these shortcuts, however, reduced the quality and increased the number of mistakes. But these mistakes say a great deal about the underlying motivations of the illustrator and/or writer. They also can reveal pictorially the conflictual nature animal representation in the late nineteenth century, such as this illustration from Der blaue Diamant (Otto Felsing, 1902) does below:
This illustration of the young adult protagonist, Cord, coming across some monkeys as he pushes through some vines in the jungle, portrays the oppositional nature of human-animal contact in these adventure novels. The young man’s extended arms accentuate the horizontal polarity of Cord and the monkeys. Cord, in the middle of a dark jungle, is somehow drenched in sunlight, accentuating his white outfit and contrasting it to the dark fur of the monkey. The tangled vines seem to be the only element that stands between the human and the monkeys, who are clearly surprised at the young man’s advance. The monkey seems to fear Cord, shrinking away from him, perhaps protecting the younger monkey at its side. The human is portrayed as an aggressor here.

But notice the two mysterious, semi-clenched hands just below the monkeys in the bottom left-hand corner and behind the thorn branches. They seem to be unattached to any of the figures in the illustration, about to grasp at something in the direction of the
young human. They set a completely different tone than the shocked look of the monkey who shrinks back while clutching the young one. Are the mysterious hands remnants of an earlier draft? Are they supposed to be connected to the older monkey, but are positioned incorrectly? Regardless, it is clear that the illustrator was trying at some point to depict the lurking dangers of the forest. This “mistake,” or badly-drawn element, reveals the conflicting poles of animal representation in adventure novels. On the surface, some animals may appear to be passive and docile, even helpless. But at any given time, the clenched, hostile, mysterious hands may appear to signal the dangers of a hidden savage nature and justify Cord’s aggressive attack.

The depiction of certain animals of Central Africa as savage works to make the region attractive to Europeans. The designation of these animals as savage recognizes the Europeans’ fear and justifies discipline or killing, and savage animals provide a reason for training adolescents in human-animal, and ultimately colonizer-colonized, relations. The diaries of actual British game hunters such as Richard Meinertzhagen who were drawn to the interior regions of Africa in the early years of colonization reveal just how slippery the slopes were between killing animals and native relations. Meinertzhagen’s diary, according to John MacKenzie (1989), shows “the amount of violence inherent in the colonial situation and the manner in which the killing of game prepared Europeans for and insured them to the killing of Africans” (“Hunting and the Natural World” 159). Training in hunting animals set up the young colonizer for the standards by which he would later interact with the natives of Central Africa—he was trained to observe them at all times, to “not let down his guard,” and to in general mistrust any of their actions.
It should come as no surprise that Andrew of *In the Wilds of Africa* (1872) “felt not a little anxious lest some lurking wild beast might spring out on us—an event very likely to happen in an African forest at night” (Kingston 146). Projecting animals into vicious, savage beasts has brought this protagonist to the verge of paranoia, justified by the statement that this is “very likely to happen in an African forest at night.” Perhaps it is “very likely” only because the author and illustrator has controlled the perception of the animal (as it comes from their viewpoint and is connected to their past history of interaction with animals), and together they have controlled what is considered normative in the context of the book.

**Rising Above Borders: Migratory Birds**

The savagery of certain animals, and thereby the justification for humans to dominate and to kill animals, is enhanced in these texts through juxtaposition with docile animals. To a large extent, adventure novels omit the docile, domesticated animals of home from their texts in order to enhance the savagery of the exotic animals of Africa. But as discussed earlier, adventure novels are operating in a more general world of animal representation that includes books about domestic animals. When novels focus more on educating the young Anglo-German in the natural world in Africa and less on hunting, then docile African animals also become more important, not just as an aspect of the African wildlife, but as a means of accentuating the bad characteristics of savage animals when they become their prey. The differences in the portrayals of savage and docile animals in interaction with adolescents reflect a hierarchical classification system
that underpins much colonial discourse and that distinguishes Europe from Africa more than just geographically.

Docile and domestic animals in adventure novels help to accentuate the separation between animal and human by providing contrast to savage animals and by providing a reason for humans to intercede in the animal world. As much as savage animals are exaggerated to justify human fear, docile animals are reduced to passive victims in their portrayal. They become objects that humans must learn to protect from the savage beasts. For instance, in Harry Collingwood’s *The Congo Rovers* (1886), a group of sailors, exploring a region of the Congo to become familiar with the area, come across a young deer in the forest. They are immediately drawn to its beauty: “He was a superb creature, standing as high at the shoulders as a cow, with a smooth, glossy hide of a very light chocolate color . . . and long, sharp, gracefully curving horns. We were so close to him that we could even distinguish the greenish lambent gleam of his eyes” (60). The sailors, caught up in admiring the deer, make no move to kill it. In fact, their mission is not to find food for the ship. But all of a sudden, “before the startled creature had time to make so much as a single movement to save itself, an immense alligator had seized it by a foreleg and was tug-tugging at it in an endeavor to drag it into deep water” (61). The sailors move into action to save the deer from the “immense alligator.” They are drawn to protect the antelope (rather than let nature proceed on its course) only because the alligator has now attacked it before it “had time to make so much as a single movement to save itself.” They rescue the perceived weaker animal by succeeding in getting the alligator to let go of its leg. The young deer then “made a gallant dash for the shore” (62). It is interesting to note here that the antelope is considered virtually defenseless by
the sailors, when antelopes actually have horns. This antelope in fact “made lunge after lunge at his antagonist with the long, sharply pointed horns which had so excited my [the narrator’s] admiration” (61). These “long, sharp, gracefully curving horns” initially draw the sailors’ attention, but then they ultimately ignore them and the fact that the horns are an effective tool of the animal. Instead, all they see is the supposed “victimization” of the deer in this scenario.  

Birds, like deer, are animals that Anglo-Europeans are familiar with at home, and they therefore also help characterize the exotic “savage” animals as dangerous. But the fact that birds fly adds an additional dimension to the metaphor. Birds, according to the adventure novel writer’s classification system, have the freedom to separate themselves from potential predators and other risky situations on the ground. They are able to “float” above the land-based animals, and thereby play a special role in the fictional animal world. In Gordon Stables’s book, Kidnapped by Cannibals (1899), a swallow named “Chillie” actually saves the life of Willie, the main adolescent character. Chillie is Willie’s pet, kept in a cage (although the author intercedes to say: “Now I myself would never dream of caging a swallow”) (54). Willie takes Chillie to sea with him, and while Chillie normally stays by Willie when he lets the bird out of the cage, when Willie is kidnapped by cannibals, Chillie escapes and flies back to Scotland, where its presence warns Willie’s family to send out a rescue mission to save Willie. So it is the swallow’s

---

25 Ironically the sailors kill the antelope immediately after having rescued it from the alligator. It is not clear whether they do so as a “mercy killing,” or because they get caught up in the excitement of the fight.

26 This book actually takes place in the South Seas, not sub-Saharan Africa.

27 It is also interesting to note that Willie, in order to get the natives to stop their cannibalistic ways, tells them that Chillie is his “god,” who has ordered them to stop cannibalizing. The inference is that the natives would not understand abstract Christian concepts, nor would they quit without being told by a higher being, and a bird would make a better god than himself.
ability to fly and its chance return to Scotland (inferred as intuitive awareness that Willie
is in trouble, which demonstrates its love and concern for his human owner) that makes it
the hero of this story. Birds are rarely, if ever, considered savage. Instead, they point
out the instinctual nature of the savage beast by being capable of realizing that humans
mean them well, and reciprocating this feeling with their own love and loyalty.

The bird’s ability to fly also provides the perfect metaphor for the human
relationship with the animal kingdom that is taught in these adventure novels. The
adolescent must learn to rise above the animals and where they come from as he learns to
distinguish between them according to the adult classification system. While “animals”
remain grounded in their environment, civilized humans shift between locales, and make
the best of all environments, as a bird would who flies from destination to destination.
This is why adolescents are often metaphorically compared to birds, as a bird’s place in
the animal world best explains the civilized human’s ideal relationship with the animal
kingdom, at least according to these writers. Dr. Reinhold wishes to give this same
message to his young apprentice in Camero, nicknamed „Zugvogel“ (migratory bird).

After several months there, Dr. Reinhold takes the young man aside and tells him they
are not the only ones from Germany spending Christmas in the colony. Dr. Reinhold
introduces him to some of his “countrymen”: the Thrush Nightingale [Rohrdrossel],

---

28 Probably the only exception to this would be the vulture and eagle or hawk.

29 According to the Foreword of the book, “Zugvogel” was based on an actual student of Falkenhorst’s who
was given this nickname by him and fellow students because the young man was always making “travel
plans.” “The tidings of magnificent discoveries, which Stanley, Livingstone, Nachtigal, Schweinfurth, and
others made in the last few years awoke in him an uncontrollable desire to go out into the world and see
with his own eyes the wonderlands about which he read so much” (Foreword, In Kamerun). [ “Die Kunde
von den großartigen Entdeckungen, welche Stanley, Livingstone, Nachtigal, Schweinfurth, und andere in
den letzten Jahren gemacht hatten, erweckte in ihm eine unbezähmbares Verlangen, in die weite Welt
hinauszuziehen und jene Wunderländer, von denen er so viel gelesen, mit eigenen Augen zu schauen”
(Vorwart, In Kamerun).]
which migrates back and forth between Europe and Africa, the Swallow [Rauchschwalbe—but perhaps the Cameroon Mountain Saw-Wing or Rough-winged Swallow], and the Fish Eagle [Fischadler—perhaps the African Fish-eagle] all migratory birds, like Zugvogel\textsuperscript{30}. Dr. Reinhold exclaims, “Why are you standing there so astonished? One doesn’t get the name Migratory Bird for nothing!” (87)\textsuperscript{31} Here, the metaphor of the bird is used to represent the relationship between Europe and Africa that Zugvogel himself should embody as a youth. Like the bird, then, Zugvogel is expected to travel back and forth between Europe and Africa to improve relations between the two continents, and remain in motion between the two, observing and managing the business of both worlds below. Remaining in motion both defines his youthfulness and also defines the ideal relationship between Europe and Africa for civilized humans. One should not forget one’s homeland while away, but also not forget about the opportunities abroad that will benefit the homeland. In this case, the bird represents the mobile, surface relationship between Europe and Africa better than the savage animal, which instead is polarizing and grounding.

The depictions of animals in adventure novels mimic to a certain extent the same white/black, colonizer/colonized antinomies that are evident in general colonial discourse. Adolescents, in their interactions with animals, are thus supposed to identify

\textsuperscript{30} Ironically, though, the last bird that Dr. Reinhold mentions (the Fish-eagle) turns out to be a non-migratory bird and what he took to be a European example of this bird present in Cameroon was probably a kind indigenous to Africa, not a bird that traveled between the two continents. There are also indigenous swallows in Africa that do not migrate to Europe, such as the Cameroon Mountain Saw-Wing or Rough-Winged Swallow, that Dr. Reinhold could have observed, not the European swallow, which usually migrates to Southern Africa, anyway, not to Cameroon. Although the African Fish-eagle was named and classified in 1800 by Daudin, the Cameroon Mountain Saw-Wing or Rough-Winged Swallow was named and classified in 1887 by Shelley, the same year Falkenhorst’s \textit{In Kamerun} was published. Both of these animals are found in Cameroon and are listed as threatened, but of least concern, by the 2006 IUCN Red List (IUCN and Birdlife).

\textsuperscript{31} “Was stehen Sie so verwundert da? Man führt doch im Leben nicht umsonst den Namen Zugvogel!” (87)
this system and then make decisions regarding animals that also reflect on the colonial discourse of the novel. They must learn to separate themselves and dominate the savage animals, to which they are simultaneously attracted out of their own fear, while at the same time, they must learn to respect, protect, even *embbody* the “higher” animals—those that demonstrate some control over behavior and are not grounded by physical or moral limitations. By learning the classification system of savage-docile, the human places himself outside the system as decision-maker. He further justifies his human status as separate from that of the animals once he learns to classify. The adolescent coming-of-age process thus brings the humanization process to light and the way in which learning the separation of savage from docile provides the means for the human himself to separate from the other animals. By moving from boy to adult, then, the adolescent consequently establishes and verifies his own and the reader’s humanity.

**Animals Beyond Borders: the Elephant**

While exaggeration of animals in adventure novels is used to enhance the distinction between animals and between humans and the animal world in general to justify human values, fears, and desires, the vacillation in the depiction of some animals break down the classification of savage itself as a monolithic indicator. These animals prove not so easy to characterize as savage, and thus break down the normativity of the savage African animal stereotype. They further complicate and intensify the decision-making process that the adolescent undergoes when learning to hunt. Moments where humans hunt animals that defy easy classification open up the decision-making process of the human and reveal just how much the process is directed by human values.
Adolescents, as hunters-in-training, call further attention to the problems of the human classification system as they learn to apply it in each situation.

An elephant is a good example of a kind of animal that reveals the problems with the human value system, because while it is often considered dangerous, it is also just as often recognized as peaceful. Sometimes differences in animal nature may be simply the result of variation among breeds, a distinction that may have been lost on many adventure novel writers. Peter Verney (1979) suggests such a difference in temperaments of the African elephant. He reports that the forest elephant, mostly contained within the Congo area, is more docile than its South African relation (85). The southern bush elephant, Verney claims, is “a wholly intractable beast, unpredictable and unmanageable” (85). He cites the famous elephant Jumbo as an example of a bush elephant that resisted domestication (85). Considering other reports that the southern African elephant had retreated north by the 1870s, its no wonder, then, that the generic “Central African elephant” in these texts might refer to either one of these breeds.

The bifurcated characterization of elephants as savage and peaceful also enhances the dual focus of the adventure novel: to entertain and to instruct. If the author were to stop and give instructive, contextualized information on the peaceful nature of the elephant, it would interrupt, even work against, the fast-paced, exaggerated action that makes the book entertaining. The lack of integration of these two elements is most apparent when, in a typical adventure novel, the elephant is first introduced to the reader. Either the entrance of the elephant surprises the reader with the approach of its enormous mass or the loud sound of its trumpet (as already described above in the section from In the Wilds of Africa), or the elephant is introduced as a factual topic. For instance, in Karl
Burmann’s *Im Herzen von Afrika* (1878), the narrator “suddenly” comes across a path in the middle of the forest that leads to a river. Although the scene does not follow with the introduction of a wild animal and a scene of action, there is an anticipation of such because of the use of the adverb “suddenly” [plötzlich]. The narrator hides in wait for elephants, who he assumes were the ones who made the path. While he could be hiding because he thinks he might scare the elephants away, it is more likely that he is hiding because he assumes they will be hostile. Instead of wild animals on a rampage, however, he witnesses a peaceful family of elephants approach the river to drink. While the narrator has prepared us for an action scene, he undercuts that anticipation when he introduces the elephants, not as savage, but as peaceful. Ultimately the narrator will leave the reader with the impression that elephants are gentle, as he clearly states when he begins his educational description of the animal: “The elephant, the giant among existing animals, is a peaceful creature; and what is told of his fights with other animals, of his attacks on people, belongs in the realm of fable” (96). Thus, the problematic characterization of the elephant that comes out through its introduction and description (whether to initiate the action of a hunt or to learn about the animal) reveals that the dual purpose of most adventure novels, to entertain and instruct, are often at cross-purposes. More likely than not, it is how the adolescent ultimately treats the animal (whether he observes and simply classifies, or chases and kills), or what the author wants the adolescent to learn, that determines the characterization of the animal as either savage or peaceful, not necessarily vice versa.

---

32 “Der Elefant, der Riese unter den noch bestehenden Thieren, ist ein friedfertiges Geschöpf; und was von seinen Kämpfen mit anderen Thieren, von seinen Angriffen auf Menschen erzählt wird, gehört meist ins Reich der Fabel” (96).
Even H. Rider Haggard’s central character, Allan Quatermain, known as a hunter of African game and patterned off of real big-game hunter Frederick Selous, recognizes at times that elephants are not necessarily the savage beasts he often makes them out to be to justify his hunt. In *Allan Quatermain* (1887), he and his companions come across some elephants somewhere in the interior of what would be today Kenya or Tanzania. While typically coming across animals in “virgin” territories would make the European hunter *more* fearful of the animals rather than less (as, for instance, from the protagonist of *In the Wilds of Africa*’s paranoid perspective), here Quatermain reduces, even reverses the signification of the animal as “savage” and as a human threat: “In this district, the elephants, being unacquainted with the hunter and his tender mercies, would allow one to walk up to within twenty yards of them in the open, while they stood, with their great ears cocked for all the world like puzzled and gigantic puppy-dogs” (493). The difference in Haggard’s portrayal of the behavior of elephants results from his different conception of nature as “unspoiled,” rather than “uncivilized.” If the exotic animal is not “savage,” then it must be as harmless as a domestic “puppy-dog.” The determining factor here is whether or not elephants have had contact with humans (and the “wrong” type of humans). Elephants, in fact, can be docile and perhaps even as “loveable,” or at least as approachable, as a puppy-dog. Elephants are perceived by Quatermain as *either* savage, *or* domestic, although there is a wide gradient of difference in between those two poles. A second important factor to pick up on here is that it is the human that is placed between the poles as designator of whether the elephant is savage or docile. The elephant would only allow a human to approach it if it has not been introduced to the “tender
mercies”\textsuperscript{33} of humans. If the elephant has not been acquainted with the hunter’s desire to kill animals, the elephant would allow the human to approach. Thus, it is the behavior of the human that determines how the elephant will react and consequently how the animal will then be characterized. This emphasis on the behavior of the human in the human-animal interaction then, in turn, raises the importance of learning this behavior in books that are aimed at the formation of the young adult. The adolescent is formed in the emphasis on this behavior: the coming of age period is the time when the boy starts to understand his obligation and learns to control his behavior towards animals, like a mature hunter.

We see this actually occurring throughout the narrative of Der blaue Diamant (Otto Felsing, 1902). Cord, introduced to stories of the horrors of British elephant slaughter by his adult companion, Rotbart, actually begins to reconsider the actions of his fellow hunters while on a hunting trip. He first witnesses a group of natives taking down a large elephant, and then his fellow Germans finishing off another with a well-placed shot: “‘A pity for such an animal!’, Cord was unable to keep himself from blurting out”

\textsuperscript{33} Haggard’s nineteenth century readers would have immediately recognized this phrase, “tender mercies,” as a phrase that comes from the King James Version of the Bible. It appears ten times in Psalms (25:6; 40:11; 51:1; 69:16; 77:9; 79:8; 103:4; 119:77; 119:156; 145:9), each refers to God’s tender mercies. But the eleventh reference in Proverbs refers to the “tender mercies” of the wicked in relation to animals, and would therefore be most applicable here. The proverb reads: “A righteous man regardeth the life of his beast; but the tender mercies of the wicked are cruel” (Proverbs 12:10). It is interesting to note here that, because the words “wicked” and “cruel” are juxtaposed with “tender mercies,” it is difficult to assign a value judgment to either the “wicked” or the “tender mercies.” The value judgment, and the meaning, if any, must come from the interpretation of the relationship of these words. The New International Version of the Bible leaves a lot less open in the translation of this proverb. Its version reads: “A righteous man cares for the needs of his animal, but the kindest acts of the wicked are cruel.” This version leaves no doubt both that the “tender mercies” are positive and that the acts are being acted upon all animals. But because Haggard uses the King James word “tender mercies” to describe the actions of the “hunter,” the value judgment of the actions of the hunter is left open. Whether the hunter’s intention towards elephants, or whether the hunter himself, is good, bad, or somewhere in between must be determined by the reader. Only the determination of the intentions of the humans, though, will then determine whether the elephant’s actions are justifiable, which then determines how the human will depict the elephant to other humans.
Later his young friend Hinnerck asks him why he didn’t shoot a single time during the elephant hunt. “Cord went on a few steps further behind his torchbearer through the dripping rain forest, before he answered. ‘I couldn't,’ he said then in an undertone, ‘I felt too sorry for the marvelous beasts’” (419). Here, Cord has learned the lesson against excessive violence towards peaceful and “marvelous” animals so well that the adolescent even begins to rebel against the adults that taught him this lesson in the first place. In fact, Cord takes his German companions’ injunction against the British wholesale slaughter of many elephants to the extreme by refusing to kill even one elephant. It is important to note that Cord’s refusal is possible within a German context, whereby his distain for elephant killing not only distinguishes him from the British, but raises him even above the German adults. In fact, Cord’s lack of participation in the hunt goes unpunished, not only by the German adults in the text, by Hinnerck with comments about his lack of skill or nerve, but also by the author, with other derogatory comments suggesting that he is instead childish. Cord therefore succeeds, if only meekly, in suggesting that perhaps the adults are wrong. Here the German adolescent, in a rare moment, is held up as perhaps better and wiser than both British and German adults—because Cord has taken to heart and to practice what the adults have not. If adults are unable to resist the hunt, perhaps, suggests the author, it must be left to adolescents like Cord to set the new standard of relations between human and elephant for both the British and the Germans.

34 “Es ist doch schade um solch Tier!” konnte Cord sich nicht enthalten zu sagen” (414).

35 „Ein paar Schritte ging Cord hinter seinem Fackelträger durch den triefenden Regenwald weiter, ehe er Antwort gab. ‘Ich konnte nicht,’ sagte er dann halblaut; ‘die herrlichen Tiere theten mir zu leid!’” (419)
Putting Pretty Animals to Work: Zebras and Animal Instinct

Another animal that puts in question the binary nature of the animal classification system and complicates the human’s decision-making process is the zebra. The zebra introduces secondary classification elements of aesthetic appeal and practical use that work against the savage-docile binary. Zebras are admired too much for their unusual stripe pattern to fall into the ‘‘savage’’ category. The stripes make zebras ‘‘exotic,’’ but they are herbivores, and their resemblance to horses suggests the possibility that they can be domesticated for human use. As herbivores, zebras are not animal predators, but their ‘‘instinct’’ puts their use value in question, unlike horses that, for the most part, can be domesticated. Zebras are one of the typical animals that Anglo-Europeans try to train in adventure novels about sub-Saharan Africa. Otto Felsing, in Der blaue Diamant (1902), explains the situational reasons why domestication of certain animals like the zebra is an important task for colonizers:

In a land where horses do not survive long—thus are not readily bred, because of the tsetse flies and the horse plague; where oxen can hardly be used for anything, neither as breed animals nor as draught animals (what with frequently recurring bouts of cattle pest and the current lack of paved roads)—the most powerful native animal resembling the horse—the zebra—had to be pressed into the service of man, difficult as that might be. (252-3)

Domesticating animals for work is an essential part of the colonizing mission. And this perceived need is in turn the impetus for finding animals that are both accessible in the region but also trainable. The need for animals to help the Europeans colonize requires

36 “In einem Lande, wo Pferde wegen der Tsetse-Fliege und der ‘Pferdesterbe’ nicht lange existieren, geschweige denn gezüchtet werden können, wo Ochsen als Zugvieh sowohl wegen der häufig wiederkehrenden Rinderseuche, als auch wegen des Fehlens gebahnter Wege vorläufig so gut wie gänzlich zu verwenden sind, da müsse das im Lande einheimische kraftvollste der pferdeähnlichen Tiere, das Zebra, in den Dienst des Menschen gestellt warden, so schwer es auch sei.” (252-3)
that Europeans to come to grips with their perceptions of some African animals as uncontrollable and attempt instead to train their “savage” instincts.

In German East Africa, the protagonists of Der blaue Diamant visit one of the local administrators supervising the taming of zebras for human use. This activity attracts the young adolescent protagonists, who look on with interest at the administrator and the natives who are performing the training. Yet despite its attraction, it is apparent that the training in this case is difficult, if not futile. Cord, the young midshipman, remarks: “despite their [the zebras’] well-known wildness and their until now well-established untameability,”37 the zebra in the ring is being saddled to be ridden by the native (249). The zebra behaves itself while walking, but, sure enough, when the native tries to get the zebra to trot, he is bucked off the animal (250). The administrator explains to the visitors that zebra-training works much better on zebra foals, not the half-grown zebra he is trying to tame here. But despite this qualification, Cord decides not to take advantage of the opportunity, attractive as it once seemed.38 Rotbart, the experienced adult German who is accompanying the visitors, remarks that if ever any of them should want to try to tame the administrator’s zebra foals, “I would like to advise you to carefully number your prized bones ahead of time, so that we can get them back in

37 “trotz ihrer bekannten Wildheit und der bisher als feststehende Thatsache geltenden Unbezähmbarkeit” (249).

38 Hinnerck, the other youthful, but lower class, protagonist of the novel, does try to tame the young zebra when the adults and Cord are not looking. He is subsequently thrown from the zebra and injures himself so badly that he delays the group’s planned outing until he recovers. Cord, the wiser, more dutiful youth, must save Hinnerck and return him to the camp (253-8). The inference here is that rash young people like Hinnerck who cannot control their desire to engage with untamed animals (who also cannot control their natures), even when warned not to, are not much better than these animals, and thus remain lower class citizens—and animals.
order if we have to carry them home in a handkerchief” (252). Thus, the tension here of attraction to the adventure of domesticating the zebra is checked by the awareness that the zebra has an “uncontrollable” nature.

Because zebras are shaped like horses, but have unique markings, they are perhaps more aesthetically interesting to the humans in the boys book. They are an “exotic” variation on a familiar shape and thereby are creatures that can be used to train the adolescent to maintain his rationalization faculties, and to not succumb to feelings that might derive from the aesthetic beauty of the animal. In Henry Stanley’s My Kalulu (1874), a young Arab from Zanzibar, Selim, and an East African native (probably from the Tanzanian region), Kalulu, come across a herd of zebras. Selim, after aiming, firing, and wounding one, approaches the zebra to inspect it more closely. Selim, who, in the eyes of his author, Henry Stanley (and contrary to popular Anglo-European opinion of Arabs at the time), is similar to other Anglo-Europeans in adventure novels as a newcomer on African soil and as an adolescent new to hunting, welcomes the opportunity to approach the wounded animal so that he can get a better look at it: “The wounded zebra lay still, and Selim, thinking it dead, could not help laying down his rifle, quite forgetful of the Moslem’s duty of severing its throat and letting out the blood, to survey the beautiful beast. It was so beautiful he could not help going to it, and striding the back, taking hold of the mane” (354). Here, led by his aesthetic appreciation of the animal (“he could not help going to it”), and with child-like innocence, he lets his weapon fall as he sits atop the zebra—much as a child would get on a rocking horse. But then the zebra turns from a beautiful, passive play-object to a “wild” animal. Up rears the

39 “so möchte ich Ihnen raten, sich Ihre wertgeschätzten Knochen vorher sorgfältig zu nummerieren, damit wir sie wieder ordnungsmäßig zusammenkriegen, wenn wir sie im Taschentuch heimtragen haben!” (252)
animal and takes off running, with Selim captive on its back. To rescue Selim, Kalulu, his young African prince companion, must shoot the running zebra (355). Thus, again, the lesson here is to be wary of the zebra’s “animal nature.” The zebra may appear to be a beautiful, animate object, and may resemble animals that are some of the human’s best of friends, yet the zebra comes from Africa and still retains its wildness. It does not fit easily into either savage, exotic, domestic, or the docile categories, nor will it easily remain in a stable position amongst these categories.

In the case of Selim, it is his very human-like ability to appreciate the zebra’s beauty, and possibly to empathize with its suffering, that, while distinguishing him from the animal, also makes him susceptible to its wild nature. Although the qualities of aesthetic appreciation and empathy are qualities that emphasize a boy’s humanity, when it comes to the interaction with animals, they are coded as childish, and down-right dangerous. Selim is caught in a bind, because to adopt adult behaviors (never approach an animal without your gun, never trust a wild animal) also makes him less human (able to empathize and appreciate beauty). To move from the boy stage to the adult stage, then, the boy must begin to recognize when aesthetic appreciation and empathy are possible, and when they are not. As an adolescent, he is working out this tension between aesthetic appreciation and empathy and the need for quick, objective thinking when interacting with animals. He is working out whether or not the animal he is encountering is savage, docile, exotic, domestic, or some of each.

---

40 This distinction also appears to imply a simultaneous separation of Muslim from Christian, as Selim’s passive appreciation seems to make him forget a significant aspect of his religious upbringing—does Stanley imply that this barbaric Muslim custom is so silly that it would be thus easily forgotten? Does he imply that Selim is thus developing empathy and compassion, key Christian traits?
In the following passage from *In the Wilds of Africa* (W. H. G. Kingston, 1872) the reasoning pattern of the protagonist when registering the killing of a gazelle shows the juggling of these factors: A “beautiful little gazelle came bounding across our path. It put me in mind of an Italian greyhound, only it had a longer neck and was somewhat larger. I was quite sorry when Chickango knocked it over. It was, however, a welcome addition to our game bag. He called it Ncheri. It was the most elegant little creature I met with in Africa” (147). The protagonist is initially attracted by the gazelle’s beauty. Then he likens the African animal to a domestic, docile animal in Europe: an Italian greyhound. Even in the “wilds of Africa” the protagonist has not forgotten his memory of the domestic animals back home. Both of these positive attributes (beauty and domesticity) contribute to the protagonist’s resistance in accepting the death of the animal. But then he swings the other way, because he recognizes his adult responsibility to procure food for the group, which includes women and children. His ultimate decision to accept the death, though, erodes quickly with the announcement of the native’s name for the animal. Now the gazelle has ceased being “game” in the “game bag” and becomes a representation of a species, and a learning moment about native culture. The naming of the gazelle returns the protagonist again to the aesthetic realm, where he began—appreciating the beauty of the gazelle.

**The Animal Fight**

The savage-docile classification system that adolescents must learn in order to both value animals appropriately as well as to determine their own humanness is put to the ultimate test during the animal fight. Animal fights are particularly exciting because
they place additional limits on the decision-making of the human—now not just the life of the human hangs in the balance, but the life of one, if not both, of the animals. In addition, an animal fight puts the decision-making ability of humans to test by applying the pressure time—the human must first determine the value of each of the animals in relation to each other in order to determine how to act (which is expressed as predator-prey), and that estimation must be made in a timely manner. Animal fights thus put not only the human animal classification system on trial, but also the human himself in the application of this system. They are therefore one of the most advanced skills that the adolescent must learn in becoming a full-fledged hunter/colonizer.

In fact, while the animal fight assumes a supposedly “natural” binary between predator and prey, hunter and hunted, because of an animal’s “instinct,” the types of fights that tend to interest Anglo-Europeans even more are the types of fights that bend, move, or reverse, this so-called natural binary or animal hierarchy. The flipping of the binary calls into question the natural order while at the same time it draws attention to the anomalies of the animal world. It puts the animal classification system further into question and thus makes the decision-making of the hunter even more important.

Animals with horns are one way in which the “natural” opposition based on body weight or agility is displaced, because animals with horns are certainly not defenseless. Horns, to humans, are a type of natural weapon—the great equalizer in a fight with another animal that is bigger, stronger, more agile, or all of the above. This characteristic of antelopes, gazelles, gemsboks, etc both reminds the hunter of his own “great equalizer,” the gun, as well as fascinates, because it is a factor that is able to change the course of a fight within seconds. In fact, if the attraction of animal fights is that they are
violent, physical, and fast-paced, horns call attention to these elements by putting them all to an immediate stop. Allan Quatermain describes this as being “transfixed” by horns. In describing the aftermath of an antelope-lion exchange in *King Solomon’s Mines* (H. Rider Haggard, 1885), he explains: “On the grass lay a sable antelope bull—the most beautiful of all the African antelopes—quite dead, and transfixed by its great curved horns was a magnificent black-maned lion, also dead. . . . While the antelope was drinking the lion had sprung upon him, but was received upon the sharp, curved horns and transfixed” (270-1). When Haggard uses the word “transfixed” here, he means that the lion has been literally pierced by the horn of the antelope. But to be “transfixed” also means to be rendered motionless (*fixed in transit*). The word “transfixed” is used twice here, like the word “dead,” for emphasis. Together, “transfix” and “death” fixes the image of death (something that also stops motion) into the mind of the reader in a three-dimensional fashion. The reader imagines the powerful, active lion literally frozen in time, perhaps frozen in mid-leap, and splayed out amongst the horns, “transfixed.” The image of the powerful lion predator being brought down by the normally docile antelope is a study in contrast. The lion, a predator, becomes unusually weak (although he did manage to kill the antelope, too), and the antelope, never a predator (an herbivore), unusually powerful (albeit dead). The reader is “transfixed” by this unusual reversal of fortune, and reversal of what a “lion” and an “antelope” would mean (carnivore hunter and herbivore hunted) outside of the fight context.

Horned animals, then, are not predators (in fact, they are usually herbivores), but they possess a weapon that can make them turn the tables, if they decide to use them. David, the naturalist of *In the Wilds of Africa* (W. H. G. Kingston, 1872) tells his young
companions of a gemsbok, or onyx, they have captured to domesticate: “I am afraid . . .
when he gets his horns he will prove rather a dangerous companion. . . . It will fearlessly
encounter the most savage animals of the desert, and instances have occurred where it has
succeeded in killing even a lion or tiger which had incautiously sprung on its dagger-like
weapon of defence” (221). Interestingly here, David thinks that the addition of the horns
will make the gemsbok more aggressive (“fearlessly encounter the most savage of
animals”), although the gemsbok in the novel does not end up attacking any person or
animal, nor are there very many scenes in general of attacking horned animals (with the
possible exception of the African buffalo) portrayed in the adventure novels about Africa.
The horned animal, whether the antelope, gemsbok, or the gazelle, makes the distinction
between savage and docile less clear, but it also makes the horned animal even more
fascinating when it engages with other animals.

Like the lion and the antelope, the lion and the giraffe fight is a popular image of
an animal fight, because the lion’s status as “savage” predator becomes questionable
when contrasted this time with the giraffe, and the giraffe, normally considered only for
its aesthetic appeal, is grounded by the practical necessity to defend itself from the lion.
The beauty, docility, and size of the giraffe (another herbivore) are pitted against the
exaggerated agility and power of the carnivore lion.

But this exotic image of the lion and giraffe fight garnered the attention of the
Anglo-Europeans long before it entered adventure novels typed as an African experience.

Ferdinand Freiligrath, influenced by the exotic poems in Victor Hugo’s Les Orientales

---

François Le Vaillant was one of the first Anglo-European explorers to give a detailed account of the
giraffe. In his Travels into the interior parts of Africa, by the way of the Cape of Good Hope (1790), he
observes the defensive capabilities of the giraffe in regards to the lion: “I know past all doubt, that, by its
kick, it wearies, discourages, and distances the lion” (464). It is perhaps these observations that sparked the
general Anglo-European fascination with the lion and giraffe fight.
(1829), wrote his own collection in 1838, one of which immortalized this image of the lion and giraffe fight in a poem called “Der Löwenritt” (“The Lion’s Ride”). The poem was illustrated by Heinrich Zwecker in 1845, and thus the image of the fight crystallized in the imagination of the European public in both a literary and visual form. By 1856, the image appeared in French naturalist Arthur Mangin’s *Le désert et le monde sauvage* and the 1869 English translation (which, incidentally, removed the word “sauvage” from the title), both of which contained an illustration of a lion “riding” a giraffe by W.H. Freeman.

By the time the image of the lion’s ride appears in adventure novels in the 1870’s, it has had a long history in the European adult public. For Germans, this image (both visual and textual) definitely had more than exotic interest—for, although Freiligrath was anti-colonial in 1838, political repression and censorship in the then German states turned him gradually into a nationalist. After returning from his second forced exile away from Germany (during which he spent time in England), he became political, and wrote several poems with German nationalist themes, such as “Hurra, Germania!” and “Schwarz, Rot, Gold,” in which he explained the symbolism behind what was to become the current German national colors. By the 1870s (the decade that brought German nationhood and the death of Freiligrath in 1876) any reference to Freiligrath had strong nationalist and patriotic connotations for German readers. In fact, it is possible that the lion might have come to symbolize England for German readers, or at least the other European countries, who Germans believed they just needed to get off their backs in order to prosper as a newly unified nation. Far-fetched as such an explanation might seem, it is clear in these books that the lion and giraffe fight represents more than just an observation of nature.
Often these lion-giraffe scenes are introduced without any attempt to integrate the event into the plot of the book. For example, the protagonists of *Im Herzen von Afrika* (Karl Burmann, 1878) “happen” to come across a herd of giraffes, and [the cousin] suddenly remarks, “Look, Franz . . . a living illustration of Freiligrath’s Lion’s Ride” (50-1). The narrator of *Der Zauberer vom Kilima-Ndjaro* (Carl Falkenhorst, 1888) remarks: “He also had never had the rare luck of seeing a lion’s ride like Freiligrath portrayed in his wonderful poem” (95). Mentioning Freiligrath in both of these books is clearly more important than the scene itself—to experience firsthand what a German nationalist so poetically puts into words is to recreate the feeling of nationalism that Freiligrath embodied at that time.

Karl Burmann in *Im Herzen von Afrika* (1878) makes it clear how the lion and giraffe engagement has more significance than a typical fight by the abrupt way in which he calls the reader’s attention to it. He does not describe the stalking of the lion or the nervousness of the giraffe. Instead, he jumps right to the actual ride. Also, he describes the scene in past tense:

> In fact a giraffe hurried through the desert. On its back a lion had firmly perched, his nails were deeply imbedded in the speckled coat of the hounded animal, and with his teeth he had a firm grip at the base of his throat. The giraffe hurried away as fast as he could with his head always turned upward so that he couldn’t look at the ground and didn’t see where his feet were taking them. While we looked on shocked and speechless at the unusual chase, and grabbed our flints, fervently wishing that the pair would come into shooting range, the unlucky animal in fact swerved toward us, unfortunately by only a few hundred paces. Then it turned back and soon disappeared from our view. So effortlessly does the lion hunt its meal. (53)

---

42 “Schau, Franz . . . eine lebendige Illustration zu Freiligrath’s Löwenritt” (50-1).

43 “Er hatte auch niemals das seltene Glück gehabt einen Löwenritt zu schauen, wie ihn Freiligrath in seinem herrlichen Gedicht schilderte” (95).

44 In der That eilte eine Giraffe durch die Wüste. Auf ihrem Rücken hatte sich ein Löwe fest gesetzt, seine Krallen waren tief eingehauen in das gefleckte Fell des gehetzten Thieres, mit den Zähnen hatte er sich
What is interesting to the narrator, then, is the tension between the lion and the giraffe as hunter and hunted. The static image of the lion’s claws in the throat of the giraffe contrasts with the speed of the giraffe as it rapidly gallops in terror, but in no specific direction because it cannot see straight (literally). The narrator is not interested in how this scene developed, or how it ends (the giraffe gallops out of sight). Yet he seems to have taken sides in favor of the “unlucky” animal, the giraffe, thereby making the lion, by default, more savage. They grab their flints, but because the giraffe veers away from them, they cannot test their skill in shooting the lion off the giraffe, and it appears that this is what the protagonists intend to do. They have coded the lion as the aggressor—it is the lion who they believe is “effortlessly” winning the battle, even though he appears to be no closer to killing the giraffe as the pair gallops wildly away.

So why does the lion become the aggressor in this situation? Because it was the lion that jumped on the giraffe’s back? Or is it because the protagonists have decided according to their evaluation of the lion in relation to the giraffe? Either scenario may be true. And yet the giraffe, like the antelope, is not defenseless. It has its size and legs (and tiny, ineffectual horns!). In Falkenhorst’s example of the lion’s ride, he changes the scenario a bit to illustrate better the complexity of the situation. First Falkenhorst again references the Freiligrath poem, but he substitutes the lion for another predator, the leopard. Second, and most importantly, Falkenhorst describes the event leading up to the “ride”—only he never gets to describe an actual “ride,” because the giraffe takes care of unten am Hals festgebissen. Die Giraffe eilte, so schnell sie konnte, dahin, den Kopf stets nach oben gewandt, so daß sie keinen Blick auf die Erde wandte und nicht sah, wohin ihre Füße sie trugen. Während wir noch starr und stumm uns die sonderbare Jagd aufahen, nach den Flinten griffen und nur wünschten, das Pärchen möchte uns in Schußweite kommen, schwenkte das unglückliche Thier in der That nach uns zu, leider aber nur auf einige Hundert Schritte, dann wandte es sich wieder ab und war bald unseren Blicken entschwunden. So also erjagt sich mühelos der hungrige Löwe seine Mahlzeit. (53)
the leopard before it can spring on its back. “The predator [leopard] had set its sights on
the young of the giraffe and ventured in blind greed out onto the plain. But he paid for
his boldness with his life. A single blow of the giraffe’s hoof and it died there on the
spot” (95). This time the narrator leaves no doubt that he sees the leopard as the
aggressor by calling it a “Raubtier,” literally a “robber animal,” more loosely translated
as a “predator.” But even though the leopard is the “predator,” it dies by the hoof of the
giraffe. The “hunted” has switched roles and uncharacteristically hunted its hunter,
armed both by the fact that the giraffe had warning of the leopard before it leaped on its
back (the leopard was stalking the giraffe’s young, not the giraffe), and by the fact that it
is a mother (mothers supposedly protect their young more fiercely than animals without
young). Thus, by giving context to the scenario, Falkenhorst shows that predators do not
always kill, and the docile are not always defenseless. There is a wide gradient between
the two, determined both by the characteristics of each animal, and the context in which
they are placed. It is because of this grey area that the behavior and the decisions of
humans become so vital, and it is the area where instruction and formation of the
adolescent into a hunter occurs.

In the Wilds of Africa (W.H. G. Kingston, 1872) makes it clear that the lion and
giraffe fight is also an important pedagogical moment. Kingston gives a very brief
introduction to the scene. The narrator observes a group of giraffes pass by, and one in
particular that lags behind the others, past a grouping of trees. (This also suggests that
the giraffe is sickly, younger, or otherwise weaker than the others and thus more

45 “Einmal war er aber Zeuge eines Kampfes zwischen der Giraffe und dem Leoparden. Das Raubtier hatte
es auf die Jungen der Giraffe abgesehen und wagte sich in blinder Gier auf die Ebene hinaus. Es mußte
aber die Kühnheit mit seinem Leben büßen; ein einziger Schlag mit dem Hufe der Giraffe tötete es auf der
Stelle” (95).
susceptible to attack.) Out from the trees springs a lion and jumps on the back of the
giraffe (191). But instead of being frightened, or becoming engrossed in the scene of
nature, it is the thought of rescuing the giraffe that first comes to the mind of the
characters. Stanley, the hunter, remarks: “It is too far off for a bullet to reach him . . . or I
would try to rescue the giraffe by killing the lion” (191). The giraffe is immediately
placed into the “victim” category, although if the giraffe were, indeed, weaker or
wounded, then its death might seem less the fault of the lion’s as the circumstances of
nature and/or part of the cycle of life. But Stanley’s perspective is seconded by Senhor
Silva, who also remarks that the lion’s claws are too deep into the skin of the giraffe,
anyway, to save it (191). The lion, on the back of the giraffe, is now literally seen as a
“murderer” to the narrator, and the “terrified,” “unfortunate” giraffe “struggled on in spite
of the immense weight of the creature on his back and the agony he must have been
suffering” (192). The giraffe becomes a helpless victim in contrast to its predator, even
though, as Falkenhorst points out, giraffes are also completely capable of defending
themselves.

But here, the intent is not just to draw the sympathy of the reader, or characterize
the animals, but also to justify the need for action and the decision to kill the lion. In fact,
the entire discussion that ensues over the lion and the giraffe, determining the proper
strategy to approach and kill the lion, is witnessed by two of the youngest members of the
group. The emphasis here is more on the “teaching moment,” both to the implied young
adult reader and also to these boy characters. The human adults really do not have any
reason to kill the lion—in fact, they come across the scene moments before the lion
actually finishes killing the giraffe. (This time we see the completion of the act.) The
lion has food now, and would not be interested in its human spectators. But Stanley and the group decide to approach the lion anyway as he tears into the giraffe’s flesh, perhaps to show the boys how to stalk and kill “savage” beasts. Senhor Silva even cautions: “we must not approach too near, for if we attempt to dispute his prey with the lion, it will make him more savage than ever” (192). However, they make the lion more “savage” anyway by moving towards it. In fact, it is precisely because the lion is “savage” that they approach him—making the lion more savage only further justifies their actions, regardless of the context. And in fact the lion becomes more “savage,” and also moves towards the humans, not just because he thinks they contest his prey, but because they also contest his role as top predator. Now that they have made the decision to intercede, time is of the essence—the narrator shoots and misses. Stanley aims and pulls the trigger, but his gun jams. The boys, passive observers of the unfolding of the scene, now are called to action by the convenience of circumstances and necessity to kill the “savage” lion, made savage by its relation to the giraffe and by the antagonism of the adult humans. They shoot and both hit the lion, killing it in an instant, and just as it bounds within a dozen paces of the group.

The boys here have been forced to move from observer to participant in the interaction with animals by the circumstances of the scene as it is laid out by adults. Drawn into the interaction with the lion by the adults’ sense of moral obligation to the giraffe, whom they classify as “victim” even though the giraffe might be naturally predisposed to die early and/or might even be able to defend itself, it is also this adult moral obligation that sends them into further trouble by pursuing the lion, even though the lion did not pursue them and already had food. Thus, the boys are called in to save
the adults. But while they indeed showcase their bravery and their skill as they move into the adult role, they also highlight the shortcomings of the adults. After all, it is their antagonism of the lion and victimization of the giraffe that put them into such a situation. They highlight to the perceptive reader the dangers of both over-victimizing and oversavaging animals. While highlighting polarities creates action, excitement, and even the apparent need or desire for intercession, all exaggeration does is succeed in flipping the reader ever more rapidly between one pole and the other. The adolescent, while called upon by the adults in the book as well as out of it to intercede, only succeeds in drawing more attention to the problem of the polarities themselves.

Figuring the adolescent as a hybrid individual, then, a figure that breaks down polarities, illustrates the limitations of the representations in these texts. Instead of achieving depth of character and plot through context (the grey areas), exaggeration keeps the reader moving back and forth between one pole and the other. Like Haggard’s lion that is “transfixed” by the horns of the antelope—both in motion and static, the reader moves through the narrative of adventure novels, but remains “fixed” within the ever-repeating flipping of the binaries.

Perhaps this is why the lion and giraffe fight is so appealing, and why it works so well visually. Several illustrations were made of the lion and giraffe engagement (see next page) that were so attractive, they were reprinted over and over again. As seen below, the visual image of the animal fight keeps the hunter and the hunted eternally suspended in relation to each other—but also suspended with the possibility of inversion, when the predator may just as easily become prey. Burmann’s and Kingston’s depiction of the lion and giraffe fight even show how the visual begins to dominate over the verbal
Illustration 3: The “Lion’s Ride”

Above: Lion attacking a giraffe by W.H. Freeman from the Rare Book Collection at the Wilson Library, UNC Libraries (photo taken by Thomas Nixon) appeared:

(1856) Le désert et le monde sauvage by Arthur Mangin
(1869) Desert World, trans of Le désert et le monde sauvage (1856) by Arthur Mangin
(1872) In the Wilds of Africa by W.H.G. Kingston

Above: Lion attacking a giraffe by W.H. Freeman from the Rare Book Collection at the Wilson Library, UNC Libraries (photo taken by Thomas Nixon) appeared:

Below: a leopard attacking a buffalo from Mangin’s Le désert et le monde sauvage (1856) from Davis Library, UNC Libraries

Right: lion attacking a camel in Gordon Stables’s In the Land of the Lion (1897) from the British Library

Above: Lion’s Ride (illustration of Freiligrath poem) by Heinrich Zwecker (1845) [publication information unknown]

Below: a leopard attacking a buffalo from Mangin’s Le désert et le monde sauvage (1856) from Davis Library, UNC Libraries

Right: lion attacking a camel in Gordon Stables’s In the Land of the Lion (1897) from the British Library
in these books, because the lion and giraffe fight is treated in the narrative as if it were only the visual image of the contact between the two animals that constituted the fight. While a textual image of the animal fight might instead give a description of the background and history of the two animals, the visual image of the fight remains transfixed at the moment when the viewer least knows who will win.

**Patrolling the Boundary between Human and Animal**

Behavior is the essential factor in classifying an animal on the spectrum between savage and docile, for determining the aesthetic or practical value of an animal, and ultimately for distinguishing the human from the animal. It is the animal’s ability to control its behavior that will ultimately identify it as an animal, and the human as distinct from the animal. Distinguishing between savage and civilized behaviors as well as embodying good human behavior determines whether the adolescent has successfully migrated from “wild boy” status to civilized, colonizing adult.

Very often it does not matter whether the animal does, indeed, control its behavior as long as its behavior is appropriately recognized and controlled by the human. Some animals must be portrayed as inherently uncontrollable by humans in order to justify human superiority and domination. By presenting to the young reader uncontrollable animals with an “animal instinct” that is both inherent and that can rise up at any moment, the narrative then seeks to imply and justify adult human interaction. If control of animal instinct separates human from animal, then not only must adult humans control their behaviors (and particularly adolescents), but some animals must undermine the
stability of the human classification system in order to warrant their observation and control.

For instance, in Gordon Stables’s *Stanley Grahame* (1886), Ida has a pet tiger. This tiger (a “real Bengalese”), raised by Ida’s father from a cub, was given to her by her father as a present. The pet tiger appears to have overcome its “instinctual” savage tendencies with proper love and discipline from the father and daughter. But neither the father (nor author) is completely convinced of the tiger’s transformation. The narrator notes, “her father often trembled when he saw the freedom his daughter made with the monster” (302). And the author uses the grey area between savage and domesticated to “prey” upon the worst fears of the readership: “Then father and daughter turned away down another pathway, where an immense tiger came bounding towards them—nay, not to kill and eat them, but to be fondled and to be made much of, then go off on the bound again, making terrible pretence to catch and slay an ingoloo-loo” (301). The passage implies that the tiger could at any moment return to its baser savage instincts. The reader and the males in the text are responsible for watching the in between space to make sure the daughter is saved when necessary (if necessary!). It is the instability of animal nature that keeps an animal an animal and a human a human. Instability heightens the need for human intervention and justifies intervention at any time under any circumstances.

The distinction between savage and docile, exotic and domestic, must be patrolled, then, to save humans from the threat of the resurgence of the “savage” animal, which can arise at any point, and even after years of domestication. By being automatically designated in these books as the human that patrols this distinction, the

---

46 An “ingoloo-loo” is most likely Stables’ affectionate term for an imaginary animal. There is no context in the narrative to suggest this refers to an actual animal, and considering Stables’ tendency to insert a playful narrator in his texts, it is most likely just an element he added for humor.
Anglo-European male can simultaneously place himself in a position of authority over other humans (and subsequently designate the others, i.e. females and children, as weak and passive) as he is the one who determines whether or not the animal is a threat to the human. In fact, it is he who will ultimately determine who is human and who is animal—this is the final lesson the adolescent must learn before he can become a full-fledged adult hunter.

The ability to distinguish animal from human by behavior becomes particularly significant when the hunter is faced with creatures that resist easy classification as one or the other, at least in the minds of late nineteenth-century anthropologists and scientists. And when the physiological measures of these anthropologists and scientists no longer support the separation of human from animal, behavior becomes even more so the critical factor of separation. Early explorers’ reports of apes and gorillas in sub-Saharan Africa during the first years of Anglo-European colonization fueled this mystery of man’s physiological and biological relationship with the animals. French explorer Paul du Chaillu’s Explorations and Adventures in Equatorial Africa (1861) reported his interaction with several gorillas, in particular, bringing the human-like animal for the first time to the attention of the Anglo-European general public and the scrutiny of scientists. In such a way, then, the task of the young naturalist or the hunter-in-training simply adopted the anxiety of the general public over these new creatures, and the new lines being drawn between man and animal. By learning the code of human-animal interaction, adolescents would therefore put to test Victorian and Wilhelmine culture’s shifting definitions of human and animal and the distinctions made between the two on the basis of behavior.
The following example from W.H.G. Kingston’s Two Supercargoes (1878) depicts rather graphically this important defining moment in the development of the adolescent into a full adult. A young clerk on his first voyage at sea, Westerton, is shipwrecked on African shores. While there, he and his companions indulge in some hunting with the local village kings along their journey back to “civilization.” Westerton has no difficulties hunting all the other types of animals in this region of sub-Saharan Africa— that is, until he is introduced to what he thinks is a large “ape” family. The ape family appears at first glance to be a portrait of domesticity. Yet these “large apes,” Westerton informs us retrospectively as narrator, are in fact “terrible gorillas.” Westerton, scared off by the creature’s large size, exclaims: “Never did a thief creep away more carefully out of a house than I did from the bower of those terrific apes. I had not believed that such enormous creatures existed” (191). But it is hardly the gorilla’s size that scares away Westerton, the veteran of several elephant and lion shootings. Instead, it is the gorilla’s uncanny resemblance to humans that unnerves him and turns this picture of domesticity into a frightening scene. “I was only too soon to become in a terrible way better acquainted with the creature” he remarks (191).

Indeed, the experience preys on Westerton’s conscience, the “large apes” becoming “monster apes” in his mind. At a campfire days later, he remarks: “Before sitting down, I looked carefully around to ascertain that no monster ape was near, likely to invite himself to the repast” (196). But Westerton does encounter gorillas again. Journeying alone through the forest to reunite with his British friends at the nearby “town” of King Sanga Tanga, he comes across a group of young native African females from the village, picking fruit. He keeps himself from their view, he says, to avoid
alarming them, but his intent is to follow them back to the village. All at once, one of the females shrieks. Sure enough, Westerton “saw one of those dreadful monsters which had for days haunted my imagination” approach two of the females (199). Westerton, a male voyeur hiding in the bushes not far from this scene, is confronted with the simultaneous passivity of the female victim and the aggressiveness of the “monster ape” that is near the two women. He decides to intercede by approaching the group. Yet these actions “provoke” the savage ape, and the “animal” grasps one of the young women and attempts to carry her away into the forest, as illustrated below:

![Illustration 4: W.H.G. Kingston, Two Supercargoes (1878), opposite page 199](image)

From Davis Library, UNC Libraries

This illustration makes apparent instantaneously the dual pressures/pleasures placed on the protagonist/viewer. He is drawn by her sexuality, which is enhanced by her exposed breasts, but is repulsed by the half-man/half-ape that is pulling her away. These
tensions, working in opposition to each other, create the scenario by which the young male protagonist can come in and resolve the anxieties involved in the rescue of the native woman. The illustrator has in fact made the anxiety created by the “animal” more apparent, by leaving the human or animal status of the creature ambiguous. The illustration thus depicts Westerton’s dilemma—at that moment, he must decide whether to go after the creature or not. Ultimately, he makes that decision based upon the behavior of the “monster ape,” who decides to respond aggressively to Westerton’s approach. It is at that moment, when the protagonist decides to intercede more actively in the drama set before him, that he finalizes his transition to a full-fledged adult by making the decision that the “monster ape” is indeed an animal and not human, thereby asserting his dominance, but at the same time asserting his humanness, in the face of the ape-man. The adolescent, in order to show that he is not merely animal, thereby separates himself from animal by both accentuating behaviors that are representative of reason, patience, and empathy, and by highlighting the creature’s behaviors as animalistic and as instinctual in contrast.

“But Roast Monkey!” Adolescents and the Killing of Human-like Baby Animals

Through the actions of characters like Westerton, adventure novels introduce the readership to an implied separation between humans and animals as well as a code of interaction based on this separation. Adolescents, however, are both viewers and participants in that code: they learn the code from a relatively outside position in which they see themselves as objects, yet they also see themselves as an integral part in upholding that code. Thus, young adults are simultaneously objects and subjects, and
while they are transitioning towards subjectivity, they are also able to act as mediators between objects and subjects. Learning the ethical code of interaction between humans and animals is one way young adults move from objectivity to subjectivity. They bring attention to the code, while the fact that they are learning the code identifies them as being in a transitory state. But because they are positioned in a transitory state of both object and becoming subject, they can also reflect on the value of the code itself. They could manifestly resist the code, or not pick up aspects of the code, and thereby passively resist or question the appropriateness of that code. Young adults play perhaps their most significant role as mediator between object and subject when it comes to the relationship between humans and animals, because with the opportunity to question the moral code comes the opportunity to call attention to the objectification of animals at the rhetorical level, and perhaps even to release the animal from its rhetorical status as object also, if only, in the perceptive eyes of the young adult reader. One of the best areas to observe where the logic of the adult imperial pedagogy breaks down is in the killing of young animals, particularly animals that look similar to humans. While killing animals in and of itself may be justified as a necessary task when living in a “wilderness,” the killing of young animals and creatures that question the divide between human and animal put the moral decision-making of the adult in jeopardy.

Inspired by reports that had recently been published in Britain of the discovery of gorillas in sub-Saharan Africa, Robert Michael Ballantyne’s The Gorilla Hunters (1861) was one of the first of many adventure novels to make hunting animals the central plot feature of a book directed towards a young male audience. In this book, the three young male protagonists of Ballantyne’s highly successful The Coral Island (1857), Peterkin,
Jack, and the narrator, Ralph, are reunited in an adventure to sub-Saharan Africa to hunt gorillas:

“It seems to me,” said Jack, breaking silence at the end of a long pause, which had succeeded an animated discussion as to whether it were better to spend one’s life in the civilized world, or among the wilds of Africa—in which discussion, Peterkin, who advocated the wild life, was utterly, though not admittedly, beaten—“it seems to me that, notwithstanding the short time we stayed in the gorilla country, we have been pretty successful. Haven’t we bagged thirty-three altogether?”

“Thirty-six, if you count the babies in arms,” responded Peterkin.

“Of course we are entitled to count these.”

“I think you are both out in your reckoning,” said I, drawing out my note book; “the last baby that I shot was our thirty-seventh.”

“What!” cried Peterkin, “the one with the desperately black face and the horrible squint, that nearly tore all the hair out of Jack’s head before he managed to strangle him? That wasn’t a baby; it was a big boy, and I have no doubt a big rascal besides.”

“That may be so,” I rejoined; “but whatever he was, I have put him down as number thirty-seven in my list.”

“Pity we didn’t make up the forty,” observed Jack. (217-8)

It is very clear in this passage that the group’s objective up front is to kill (to “bag”) as many gorillas as possible, both for “sport” and for “science.” The protagonists, particularly Peterkin and Jack, boast about their conquests with the clear opinion that animals are only objects to be conquered by humans and then be celebrated in the form of trophies (i.e. scientific “specimens”) as reminders of their shooting and/or athletic prowess.

But the ability of the reader to consider the animals, like the protagonists, as mere objects is put into question by the nature of some of the “objects:” they are baby animals. In addition, these are baby gorillas—animals who physically resemble humans. Thus, the hunters’ attempt to garner accolades by trying to increase the evidence of their prowess by adding the babies to their count is simultaneously undercut by the fact that what they
have killed are the most defenseless of creatures—creatures that also put into question the divide between human and animal.

Perhaps most egregious is the fact that Peterkin chooses to dispute the age of one of the victims, arguing the young gorilla should have been classified as a “big boy,” not a baby, because he was “the one . . . that nearly tore all the hair out of Jack’s head before he managed to strangle him” (217). Thus, Peterkin suggests here that the killing of the “big boy” was perhaps more justified to be counted because the gorilla’s behavior demonstrated it was a little older than a baby—old enough to be a “rascal” and to fight back. Peterkin’s “big boy” comment implies that he agrees the age of the victim and its ability to defend itself has a bearing on whether or not a hunter is justified in killing it. In fact, all the protagonists acknowledge a code of ethics based on age in the first place, or the topic of whether or not the babies should be counted as trophies would not have come up at all.

But this entire discussion is taking place after the babies and “big boy” have been killed. Both the reader and all the characters are aware that the babies, and “big boy,” are already dead. Discussing the justification for their deaths will not bring them back to life. Thus, the juxtaposition of counting hunting trophies as if the trophies are inanimate objects, yet knowing that the “objects” are symbols of life, must have a chilling effect on the reader. First, it sends a message regarding the personality of the characters: If the adult hunters have no problem with killing babies or “big boys,” then the reader can infer that they value hunting and killing regardless of the age of the victim or its ability to defend itself. But it is clear that the protagonists at least acknowledge an awareness of a hunter’s code of ethics when it comes to the age of the animal. Therefore, by not
conceding that they were wrong to kill either the babies or the “baby boy” according to this code, they send a message that they disregard it—and perhaps other rules of society. The context provided for this scenario further justifies this reading: the protagonists had just got done with discussing whether or not it was better to “spend one’s life in the civilized world, or among the wilds of Africa”, and Peterkin, at least, confirmed his preference for the latter (217).

The message that it is ok to kill animals is one that is commonplace in adventure novels such as this one, particularly ones that discuss hunting and exploring in exotic lands. But because Ballantyne goes further—by making the animal victims here also young and human-like, he pushes what would normally be simply questionable, i.e. the killing of animal life, into the dubious: killing human-like babies. By being extreme, Ballantyne also opens the door of interpretation even further. Can, or should, this scenario be read seriously—that is, without humor or irony? Is the assumption made here that the young male audience would want to emulate the protagonists, and/or would want to kill gorilla babies and count them as trophies? Or, by placing the ethics of hunting in such an extreme scenario, is Ballantyne encouraging the young male population to laugh at or with the protagonists in such a manner that actually goes against the literal message? Or, in the final analysis, is Ballantyne encouraging his readers to read against the grain, to perhaps use this extreme scenario to actually question the ethics of killing babies and reconsider the ethics of hunting in general?

A simple answer to these questions is not possible, particularly because the narrative is working at many levels. But it is precisely because this narrative is working at multiple levels that the figure of the young adult is so important here. Here we see that
the intended young male reader is not a monolithic figure— not just regurgitating adult rhetoric; rather, the young adult is presented with, and is expected to solve, complex issues. Here, these issues involve determining the threat level of an animal and then deciding when hunting is justified. Not only must young adults determine this, but their very position as learner highlights and represents this problem to the reader.

The following passage from *In Kamerun* (1887) by Carl Falkenhorst also shows how the dilemma on whether to kill baby or human-like animals falls primarily on the adolescent and is in fact a central component of his coming-of-age process. The protagonist, Zugvogel, is intently watching monkeys playing in the trees near him:

The tree bristles with the little devils [the monkeys]. Heads, paws, tails are everywhere; a cunning fellow swings from the tail of an opponent he chanced to grab. With devilish pleasure he lets go his hands and hangs onto it with his clamped teeth; a shriek and the combatants plummet to earth,--oh no! They perch firmly on two lower branches, yapping at each other and balling their fists. Gradually an orderly scene forms, as children and women withdraw ever farther from the fray; knights and cavaliers form the front lines.

But what was that? A shot rings out nearby—a feisty monkey plunges from a branch. With impetuous haste, in a minute, no, in a second, the hostile participants have disappeared with their clans into the bush.

“Roast monkey!” rang out the loud, lusty voice of Dr. Reinhold throughout the jungle. He had appeared in the clearing with lowered weapon. “But hitting your mark is easier than retrieving the spoils,” he called to Zugvogel, and disappeared into the thicket beneath the palm tree.

“Good shot!” he said after a moment, returning with a dead monkey. . . . . “Why are you making such a face?” “He who lives in the jungle can’t be choosy!”

“But roast monkey!” Zugvogel responded. (74-5)\(^47\)

\(^47\) Sie weichen nicht, eine regelrechte Balgerei beginnt unter Zähnefletschen und Keifen; der Baum wimmelt von den kleinen Teufeln, überall sieht man ihre Köpfe, Hände, Schwänze; hier schaukelt sich ein hinterlistiger Bursche an dem glücklich erhaschten Schwanz seines Gegners; in teuflischer Lust läßt er die Hände los und halt sich fest zubeißend mit den Zähnen an demselben fest; ein Schrei und die Kämpfer stürzen zusammen in die Tiefe bis auf den Erdboden; o nein! da stehen sie schon fest auf zwei tieferliegenden Ästen, keifen einander an und ballen die Fäuste zusammen. Allmählich tritt Ordnung in dem wilden Getümmel ein, Kinder und Weber ziehen sich immer weiter zurück; die Kavaliere und Ritter bilden die vorderen Reihen.
Zugvogel’s attachment to the monkeys seems to grow as he watches their antics. He names them “little devils,” and cries out (“o no!”) when two of them tumble and fall. Again, there is an automatic association of activity with gender: the fighters must be males, the women and children recede when it suddenly gets quiet. Certainly, he has gotten absorbed in their play, but as much as Zugvogel’s absorption calls attention to the cute antics of the monkeys, it also calls attention to his perceptiveness. Clearly he is new to Cameroon and he is perceptive, qualities that immediately peg him as youthful. Zugvogel, the Forward to *In Kamerun* tells us, was a former student of the author’s, and is depicted as 19 years old in this novel. But even without this background information, it is automatically clear that the ability to be more interested in, even perhaps identify more closely with, animals is the providence of young adulthood. Dr. Reinhold, his father-figure mentor, even encourages his close observation of nature.

While in the midst of close observation, absorption in nature, perhaps even identification with the boyish antics of the monkeys, Zugvogel and the young reader are introduced to the killing of young animals. “What is that?” Zugvogel exclaims, and before anyone can answer him, he sees a monkey fall from the trees. Thus, much like Ballantyne, Falkenhorst has the young adult come face-to-face with the dilemma of killing animals in a rather abrupt and dramatic fashion. By shocking us by literally having monkeys falling from the sky while quietly observing them, full of life,

---

Doch was ist das? Da kracht ein Schuß aus der Nähe, ein feister Affe stürzt vom Zweig herunter. Mit wilder Hast, in einer Minute, nein! in einer Sekunde sind beide feindliche Parteien mit Kind und Kegel im benachbarten Gebüschen verschwunden.


“Ein guter Schuß!” sagte er nach einer Minute mit einem erlegten Affen wiederkehrend. . . . ‘Was machen Sie für ein Gesicht? Wer im Urwalde lebt, der darf nicht so wählerisch sein!’

“Aber Affenbraten!” rief Zugvogel. (74-5)
Falkenhorst calls our attention immediately away from the animals themselves to the justice, or injustice, of the killing.

That the burden of this moral decision rests on the young adult is clear, not just because it is Zugvogel who is shocked, but because the adult, Dr. Reinhold, acts surprised that Zugvogel would have a problem with killing monkeys. Dr. Reinhold asks him: “Why are you making such a face? . . . He who lives in the jungle can’t be choosy!” The adult shows no concern for having shot the monkey, and instead suggests that it is the young man at fault for being surprised. But the way in which the narrative presented the killing at this point resists Dr. Reinhold’s perspective. In fact, because Dr. Reinhold kills and appears to expect Zugvogel to accept that adults kill, then killing becomes attributed as an adult behavior, and by default, observation and appreciation childish. Zugvogel must decide if he accepts such a characterization as well as where he will position himself under those terms.

It is unclear in the passage if Zugvogel makes a face at Dr. Reinhold when he returns with the dead monkey because he is shocked at the killing, shocked that Dr. Reinhold wants to eat the monkey, or both, because Zugvogel’s reaction here is mediated through Dr. Reinhold and the narration. While the burden of the moral decision is placed on the young adult, his struggles are hidden from the reader. The adult narrator and the adult figure, Dr. Reinhold, want the reader to think that Zugvogel, when presented with such an extreme situation, immediately accepts it and moves on. It is possible that they succeed when it comes to considering the morality of shooting the monkey, as Zugvogel says nothing against the killing. But Zugvogel does and says nothing to suggest he approves of it. The narration between the monkey falling and Dr. Reinhold remarking
about Zugvogel’s face is taken up exclusively with Dr. Reinhold’s actions, not Zugvogel’s. So this does not mean that Zugvogel, or someone like him, would not have had a reaction, only that it is not reported by the narrator and Dr. Reinhold. In fact, if the reader is to conclude that the narration is still taking the perspective of Zugvogel, then clearly Zugvogel is watching Dr. Reinhold’s actions in the bush for at least a minute and does not go to help him find the monkey. His silence might suggest more than shock. It might suggest disapproval. But it is the reader who must infer the mental processing of Zugvogel, even his possible rejection of the actions of Dr. Reinhold, because Dr. Reinhold and the narrator simply do not report that part of the scene.

The selections from The Gorilla Hunter and In Kamerun, then, show how the figure of the young adult both represents, and is responsible for addressing, the very important moral dilemma of when it is justified for humans to take animal life. That this moral dilemma was even more pronounced in books addressed to young readers is most apparent in another German adventure novel by Karl Müller, called The Gorilla Hunter, and written in 1881. Müller writes of Heinrich, the young protagonist’s, first gorilla hunt, that “the sight alone of the humanlike corpse of the gorilla aroused in him instead an uncomfortable feeling and a kind of remorse – he seemed like a murderer” (130). The reporting of Heinrich’s reaction, as someone new to hunting, this time seems to awaken in the narrator some feelings of regret. He writes just a few lines later: “We also believe that it is not good for our young readers to describe and to imagine romantically so much useless bloodshed in detail, because this only serves to make the young disposition go

---

48 „allein der Anblick der so menschenähnlichen Leichname derselben erregte in ihm stets eine unangenehme Empfindung und eine Art Reue – er kam sich beinahe wie ein Mörder vor“ (130).
wild” (130-1). The narrator’s comments here reveal the deep-seated conflict of the narrator/author regarding the killing of animals that has only come about through the awareness of the rhetorical situation of the novel. It is the fact that Müller’s protagonist, Heinrich, is young and that his implied audience are “young readers,” (combined with the fact that Müller himself is a preacher) that causes him to virtually repeal his previous sentiments on killing. The author’s awareness of the text-reader interaction thus causes him to break down assumptions about his very own pedagogy—perhaps, Müller thinks to himself, his young audience might resist his depictions of such aggressive actions. He therefore attempts to control the impression he thinks young adults might pull from the description of bloodlust by suggesting that too much of this kind of action would make the young adult “wild.” His own backtracking within the text reveals the flaws of the adult decision-making modeled in this scenario, brought out, in turn, by his awareness of adolescents as both outsiders and insiders to the adult code of hunting.

Darwin’s *Descent of Man* (1871) brought man closer to animals, but it did not solve how man should relate to animals. Ritvo remarks:

> Although it [Darwin’s theory] eliminated both the divine sanction for human domination and the separation between man and beast, it did not diminish human superiority. On the contrary, it described the very process by which that superiority had been established. Clearly, if people were animals, they were the top animals; and with God out of the picture, the source of human preeminence lay within” (40).

As the late nineteenth century Anglo-European man looked within, he found the figure of the adolescent and based his confidence in human superiority on him. He trained him in his engagement with the animal in adventure novels that suggest the man is superior

---

49 „Auch glauben wir, daß es nicht gut ist, unsern jungen Lesern so viel unnützes Blutvergießen im Einzelnen zu schildern und romantisch auszumalen, denn dies dient nur dazu, das jugendliche Gemüth zu verwildern“ (130-31).
because he can reason, appreciate beauty, and empathize. But, as is clear in these books, it turns out that for the adolescent to dominate the animal, he still needs the instinct to act quickly and the instinct to kill—“baser” animal instincts. Thus, in the course of setting up the adolescent as superior to the animal, the Anglo-European man can not get away from the fact that the adolescent, too, is an animal.
CHAPTER III

“Brother” or “Other”? The Adolescent Apprenticeship in Native Relations

Illustration 5: Frontispiece from J. Evelyn, A Warrior King (1890)
From Penn Libraries

As Adrian and his companions of J. Evelyn’s A Warrior King (1890) announce their departure from Central Africa, the newly crowned Krakeloto king Moryosi tells the British travelers: “It is not in a land like mine that such as you must dwell . . . . The sun
cannot mate with the stars; the lion cannot lie down with the antelope” (182). But, speaking alone with Adrian, Moryosi reveals deeper feelings for the young adolescent. “Have I and mine no claim upon thee?” he pleads. “Come back to us, my beloved—thou must—thou wilt return!” Adrian, likewise overcome at their parting, promises to return (184). Yet the young men’s special bond, symbolized in their heart-felt exchange of vows documented in the illustration on the previous page, is simultaneously undercut by the adults of the narrative. The British captain is skeptical of letting Adrian meet the African king alone, under the trees, and when his father lets him go anyway, Adrian must swear to them that he does not, in fact, expect to ever see Moryosi again. Later, despite Adrian’s private promise to the young king to visit “here” (meaning Africa), in public he shifts this to a promise of visiting him in the “Hereafter” (188). Adrian’s father, when he learns of this promise, quickly reassures the captain that he will, of course, accompany his son on any future African outing. Thus, even though just prior to this Adrian’s father has claimed that his son could do as he pleased when he came of age, he and the adults of the narrative instead work to assert their influence on him by both denying his close relationship with Moryosi, which has dangerous homoerotic undertones, and also by keeping these two separated and in constant public view until the final departure. The narrator then ends the novel with the typical fantasy of the hero’s return to his original state: “though thin, brown, and ragged, none of us were outwardly any the worse for our sojourn among Central Africans” (190).

50 Moryosi’s words to Adrian are uncannily similar to those of Foulata to Good on her deathbed in King Solomon’s Mines (1885). Foulata tells Good (translated by Quatermain) “I am glad to die because I know that he cannot cumber his life with such as me, for the sun cannot mate with the darkness nor the white with the black” (Haggard 394). Referencing these famous words issued by heterosexual “star-crossed lovers,” words that Evelyn’s readership would have been quite familiar with in the 1890’s, adds a definite, but unspoken, homosexual undertone to Moryosi and Adrian’s relationship.
It is tempting to read this fantasy ending as a complete denial of Moryosi’s impact on Adrian and of Adrian’s capitulation to the wishes of the adults. It is tempting to read Adrian as a pawn of the adults and the pedagogy of the novel. Or, we might read Adrian as a mouthpiece of imperialism. In fact, Adrian’s actions, his feelings, and even his own maturing body provide the backdrop of colonial interactions. His adolescence is the site where the British adults, and Moryosi himself, work out their relationship with the Other throughout the course of the novel. Dan Randall (2000) writes: “these imperial boys represent sites of contingency, subject positions in between opposed categories, in between formations of the subject encoded as ‘European, imperial’ and ‘non-European, colonial’” (3). Adolescents are markers of not just the colonizer/colonized, white/black interaction, but represent the shift from what it means to be a “child” to what it means to be an “adult.” They are figures that in fact intercede in the coupling of the white/black dynamic with the adult/child dynamic in colonial discourse. Because adolescents are neither adults nor children, their position as liminal figures disrupts the assumed racial fixity between white and black by challenging the adult status of the white and the child status of the black.

As figures that transition from one category to another, adolescents call our attention to the underlying colonial discourse of the adventure novel and its reliance on binary oppositions. The very development of the adolescent is the testing of the possibility whether each side of this binary can maintain a separate existence. And although the separation and fixation of the binary may be resumed at the end of these texts, I argue that the questioning of it throughout the course of the young adult’s education reveals the fundamental dependence of each element of the binary on the
Other. Without recognizing the importance, indeed the complexity, of Adrian’s role in the narrative, we continue to ignore the full extent of Moryosi’s and of Central Africa’s influence in shaping the European adolescent’s identity. Without recognizing the developing and changing nature of adolescents, the reciprocity of the colonizer-colonized relationship can continue to be ignored by narrators such as the one of _A Warrior King_, and even by the reader.

Broadly conceived, this chapter examines two ways in which the figure of the Anglo-German adolescent participates in the colonial discourse of Victorian and Wilhelmine adventure novels through native relations. First, we will consider how the white adolescent intersects with both the white/black and the adult/child dynamic to enhance the colonial power of the “white father.” Adolescents provide the means by which the binary constructions of the underlying colonial discourse are maintained by keeping intact the separation of the “white father” from the “black child.” By learning how to assess the qualities and usefulness of natives and by acting as a scout or a spy amongst the natives and returning unscathed, the adolescent performs the work of cultural interaction, leaving the “white father” to maintain his omnipotent and omnipresent authority.

The second half of this chapter explores several junctures in the development of the Anglo-German adolescent, however, that reveal that the separation of colonizer from colonized and white from black are not as easily achieved as the authors of these novels would have us believe. These moments, which through repetition have become tropes of the adolescent’s education in an African context south of the Sahara, are moments when the young European learns important skills such as climbing trees, killing crocodiles, and
managing native relations that are crucial to their success as future colonizers. Adolescents again perform the work of cultural interaction at these moments of engagement, which in turn challenge the stability, and perhaps even the very existence, of the binary constructions that form the underlying colonial discourse of the novel. While British and German adolescents will usually confirm the binary construction by the end of the novel, the slippage of the binary at the point of contact proves crucial in revealing what the text ultimately wants to deny—that the African Other has a significant and foundational impact on the construction of the European youth’s identity, an impact that can never again be separated from that youth, despite the attempts of author, narrator, or character alike.

**Constructing Black African Natives as Savages and Children**

White adolescents in adventure novels inhabit a unique textual space that reveals the operation of binaries in colonial discourse. But they owe their position in large part to the centuries-long construction of the black Central African in Anglo-European discourse as “savage” and “childlike.” Before examining the figure and function of adolescence, then, we must begin by outlining the history of this Anglo-European image of the black Central African as “savage” and “childlike,” and the corresponding image of the “white father.”

The image of the African native as “child” stems in part from the simultaneous development of the notion of the “savage” in Anglo-European discourse. Savages prior to the eighteenth century were considered to originate, like “barbarians,” from multiple regions: North America, India, and Africa. All of the peoples of these lands were savages
until Montesquieu’s 1748 *Spirit of the Laws*, when the word “savage” took on a negative connotation as the designation of the lowest of the barbarians in the development of man through the three stages of civilization (political, feudal, and commercial) (Samson 2005 27). At the same time, Jean-Jacques Rousseau revitalized an older concept of the savage from Spanish and Portuguese colonization, namely the “noble savage.” This notion of the idealized savage instead criticized the European dependence on institutions by glorifying the natural, or noble, non-European (27). Thus, the notion of the savage splintered into two virtually opposite, value-laden images: a demoted and demonized “savage” created by Enlightenment rationalization, and later the ennobled savage, which is most associated with Rousseau’s *Emile* (1762). This “noble savage” concept transitioned from Enlightenment rationalism to Romanticism by emphasizing nature, the individual, and consequently the child. Rousseau’s concept of the non-European as “childlike,” innocent, and uncorrupted by the negative influences of the city and civilization was in part a reaction against the image of the “savage” that early European colonizers encountered and used to justify their imperialism.

The dual-natured aspect of the savage was further complicated by slavery and the abolitionist movement. The British Evangelicals based the anti-slavery movement in the New Testament, which stated (in the translation they would have read): God “hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth” (Acts 17: 25-6) (qtd in Samson 31). Such a statement made skin color irrelevant, and the subsequent onslaught of missions to Africa had the retribution of slavery in the name of Christian brotherhood in mind, not racial distinctions. Slavery made Africans into children and thus called upon Europeans to justify their interaction with Africans by masking it in the
guise of paternalism. African savages were either savage in the negative sense if corrupted by the slavery trade, or “noble savages” if at risk for corruption by slavery.

The growing numbers of reports from African missionaries and explorers of cannibalism and fetishism, however, caused Europeans to begin to distance themselves from their Christian “brother.” They established universal moral rules that gave European qualities preferential treatment from the depravity of these “savages.” Patrick Brantlinger (1988) explains: “Blame for the slave trade, which the first abolitionists had placed mainly on Europeans, had by mid-century been displaced onto Africans. This displacement fused with sensational reports about cannibalism, witchcraft, and apparently shameless sexual customs to drape Victorian Africa in that pall of darkness which the Victorians themselves accepted as reality” (195-6). Since most slaves were from Africa (by 1810, almost one million blacks lived in British territories and 1.4 million lived in America), both climate and race began to “color” the previous notion of savagery (Samson 31). The stories of slaves in America and in British territories were further used as evidence of what was now African “savagery:” voodoo, witchcraft, and sorcery (32).

Later nineteenth century developments in the social sciences and biology were also used to justify what were seen as fundamental differences between Anglo-Europeans and their “Other.” Disputes regarding the origin of species (whether the races spring from one human species, called monogenesis, or separate and distinct species, called polygenesis) and the separation between man and animal brought on by Darwin’s theories caused Anglo-Europeans to continue to question their relationship with Africans: were they “brothers,” or simply “others”? 
No wonder, then, in 1860, British explorer Richard Burton wrote of the East African, “He seems to belong to one of those childish races which, never rising to man’s estate, fall like worn-out links from the great chain of animated nature” (489). Burton, like many of his time, turned the blame for the slave trade onto the slaves themselves. If Africans had allowed themselves to be enslaved by the Arabs, and even their own people, then they were incapable of handling the ardors of cultural progression. Burton continues: “[The East African] unites the incapacity of infancy with the unpliancy of age; the futility of childhood, and the credulity of youth, with the skepticism of the adult and the stubbornness and bigotry of the old” (489). This East African was no noble Adam of Paradise (although, ironically, twenty-first century science points the origins of the human race to East Africa); rather, he inhabited all the “bad” characteristics of each age of man. He was not just developmentally at level of the child, if not below, but also destitute of any of the good qualities that could be associated with childhood, if he was allowed to assume that role.

Some philosophers also extrapolated from perceived laws of nature to imply that Central Africa as a culture and its people were “childlike.” J.G. Herder, working off of Montesquieu, argued that the differences in human thought that Enlightenment thinkers perceived in cultures around the world resulted from their interactions with the environment. Each nationality, Herder argued, possessed a Volksgeist, or a particular spirit of the people, that separated nations from one another based on geographical differences (Smith 25). G.W.F. Hegel furthered this cultural distinction by proposing in the Philosophies of History (1837) that a distinction could be made between “adult” civilizations and “childlike” civilizations based upon the rotation of the earth. The
“substantial” (objective) versus “subjective” freedom of the individuals within a society, claimed Hegel, were determined by the placement of the society in relation to the path of the sun. “The History of the World travels from East to West, for Europe is absolutely the end of History, Asia the beginning” (qtd in Macfie 14). The path of civilization, according to Hegel, traveled from East to West in the direction of the movement of the sun across the sky.

The adult civilizations (“subjective” civilizations) were those in which the persons maintained a separate, individual, identity from the State recognized in the presence of a personal conscience. At the “end” of the sun’s movement from Asia West across the globe, Europe was therefore the most adult of the world’s civilizations. In contrast, in the East, where persons did not have individuality, they also did not have a consciousness, or freedom, of the mind: “Where there is merely substantial freedom, commands and laws are regarded as something fixed and abstract, to which the subject holds himself in absolute servitude. These laws need not concur with the desire of the individual, and the subjects are consequently like children, who obey their parents without will or insight of their own” (14). And thus the characteristic of a childlike civilization was the absence of free will. They were, in a sense, “sun worshipers,” not “self worshipers.”

Africa’s climate and inaccessibility contributed to Hegel’s general theory of world history. About Africa, Hegel wrote: “The real Africa (south of the Sahara) is the part which characterizes this continent as such. . . . It has no specific historical interest except this, that we see the human beings there as barbaric, savage, wild, where man shows no integral ingredient opening him up to education [Bildung]. . . .[It] is that land of gold, remaining turned in upon itself, a land of children, lying beyond the day of self-conscious
history shrouded in the black of night” (qtd in Wild 214). The inaccessibility of the continent to Europeans because of malaria and the lack of technology such as the gunboat, which would allow Europeans to travel further into the interior, meant that Europeans simultaneously assumed Central Africans could not exit the continent and therefore remained isolated within the interior, stagnating in their own lack of self-awareness, “in the dark” from lack of cultural interaction.

Nineteenth-century anthropologists, writers, and explorers alike thus employed a metaphorical parallel between “savages” and “children” in order to suggest that the moral, emotional, and mental abilities of savages were developmentally inferior to those of the Europeans. E.B. Tylor wrote in *Primitive Culture* (1871):

> Savage moral standards are real enough, but they are far looser and weaker than ours. We may, I think, apply the often-repeated comparison of savages to children as fairly to their moral as to their intellectual condition. The better savage social life seems in but unstable equilibrium, liable to be easily upset by a touch of distress, temptation, or violence, and then it becomes the worse savage life, which we know by so many dismal and hideous examples. (31)

Tylor acknowledged that savages had an ethical system, but he suggested that it was unstable and subject to disruption, which would cause the inevitable degenerative slide away from the civilized state. Savages and savage cultures are thus as temperamental as children who get upset at variations in rules and conditions of living. British anthropologist John Lubbock in *The Origin of Civilization and Primitive Condition of Man* (1874), parallels the mental capacity of children with that of the savage: “The mind

---

51. „*Das eigentliche Afrika* (südlich der Sahara) ist der diesen Kontinent als solchen charakteristierende Teil . . . Er hat kein eigenes geschichtliches Interesse, sondern dies, daß wir den Menschen dort in der Barbarei, in der Wildheit sehen, wo er noch kein integrierendes Ingredienz zur Bildung abgibt. . . . [Er] ist das in sich gedrungen bleibende Goldland, das Kinderland, das jenseits des Tages des selbstbewußten Geschicht e in die schwarze Farbe der Nacht gehüllt ist“ (qtd in Wild 214).
of the savage, like that of a child, is easily fatigued, and he will then give random answers, to spare himself the trouble of thought” (9).

The difference between a child in Europe versus a “child” in Africa was that the African child was left to the forces of Nature, and the European child was “cultivated” to master Nature around him as well as his own “nature.” The developmental process of human growth that was simultaneously a model for cultural growth required the tutelage of older and wiser white males. Brian Street (1975) explains:

If, as anthropological theory held, the primitive races represented a previous stage in the development towards ‘civilised’ man, then the model of a child growing into a man could be applied to human evolution, with the European races as the mature and fully developed men and the primitive races as ‘children’. Thus the ‘parent’ races are obliged to treat their child-like charges with the care and control of a Victorian father. Paternalism and trusteeship are validated by anthropological theory and literary tradition. (68)

The developmental model of both humans and civilizations thus emphasized the role of the white male as a “father” and a “farmer.” Neither proper adulthood nor a higher state of civilization could be achieved by allowing Nature to take its course—the seeds of civilization must be planted and cultivated properly. Tylor admits that: “Civilization is a plant much oftener propagated than developed” (53). Consequently, neither Africa, nor its wild children, would sustain their developmental progress unless they were “cultivated” to do so by the white father/farmer.

**Divide and Rule: Maintaining the Presence and the Power of the White Father**

The wise and just rule of the white father in Victorian and Wilhelmine adventure novels is as universally acknowledged by the Anglo-German adolescents in the narrative as it is by most of the native African characters. The white father’s presence infuses the
text throughout as character, editor, and as author of the text. The white father must remain an omnipotent as well as a stable character throughout, in order to maintain his authority amongst all of his “children” and thereby justify the underlying colonial discourse of the text. To do so, he often withholds his input, delegates various tasks, and generally remains omnipresent during the operation of the narrative.

Perhaps the most well-known father figures established in adventure novels are those that are famous military leaders or explorers. Both Victorian and Wilhelmine writers took advantage of the celebrity status of these figures in the news and used them as the central heroic characters of their colonial narratives. Yet, in their transmutation into young adult adventure novels, these men were sanitized and made larger than life. Sibylle Benninghoff-Lühl (1983) writes of these explorers and military heroes:

They were the epitome of restraint and integrity; their moral qualities seemed above all lower, material motivations. They embodied an ideal role model for young people with their boldness and masterful coping mechanisms, the transmittal of which occurred in a framework of the formation of ‘individual destinies’, as exemplified in “Race to the Nile’s Source” or “The Search for Livingstone.” (66-7)

Many of G.A. Henty’s texts are named after important British military leaders. With Clive in India (1884), With Lee in Virginia (1890), With Roberts to Pretoria (1901), and With Buller in Natal (1903) are just a few of Henty’s most well-known books that set up the military hero of the title as the central power figure of the novel. And yet, these figures appear infrequently, if not rarely, in the action of the novel itself. In With Kitchner in the Soudan (1902), General Kitchner, known as the Sirdar, or leader of the

---

Anglo-Egyptian army, has a commanding presence in the novel, but appears only at crucial moments to push the narrative forward. Kitchner sets the stage for the entire action of the narrative by allowing Gregory, the young protagonist, to bypass the normal recruitment process and enlist as an officer solely by virtue of his crucial knowledge of native languages (Henty 56-7). Then, after returning to the camp after his first adventure, Gregory happens on Kitchner just in time to be chastised by him for having “let himself” be captured by the Mahdis (189). Gregory’s unspoken humiliation further drives him to commit additional acts of bravery to redeem himself in Kitchner’s eyes. When that moment finally comes, it is with a general recognition of the awe and respect that Kitchner garners from those around him: “The Sirdar’s force of will seemed to communicate itself to every officer under him. A brief word of commendation to those working under him cheered them through long days of toil—an equally curt reproof depressed them to the depths” (203). Henty’s white father-figures virtually become “spirits” in their ability to motivate the scores of men under them.

In Falkenhorst’s novels, in particular, the colonizer/colonized relationship is expressed as a father/child relationship because most of his narratives establish a type of “colony” that is supposed to act as a pseudo-home for Europeans and Africans alike. Whether in Cameroon, Togo, German East Africa, or German Southwest Africa, the German settlers are planning a long-term relationship with the locals. In Der Kaffepflanzer von Mrogoro (1895), Otto Braun, a German colonist who has relocated to East Africa and established a coffee bean farm, tells his Arab neighbors: “I am like a father to my people, and they love me like children” (123).53 Kurt Nurke in Pioniere der

53 „Meinen Leuten bin ich wie ein Vater, und sie haben mich lieb wie die Kinder“ (123).
Kultur in Deutsch-Südwestafrika (1900) also recognizes the personal relationship Mr. Waterman has established with the locals on his growing farm and in fact admires him for it:

He was not only a just master to them, but he treated them like his children, whom he endeavored to bring up to goodness. What this Waterman conducted here was no hunt after riches, no gratification of a love of adventure; it was, for the large part, a selfless, sacrificial struggle. Kurt bowed his head before him. (106)\textsuperscript{34}

The white father’s authority is as automatic as it is unquestioned within the novels. Kurt thinks to himself: “If he had come into this country as a young immigrant, he would have said to the man [Mr. Waterman]: “I will follow you, be my teacher and master!” But he was a fleeting guest on Africa’s shore” (106).\textsuperscript{55} The power and authority of the white father is to a large extent dependent on the stability of the colony and the region, however. The mentoring of Kurt comes to an end at the conclusion of Pioniere der Kultur in Deutsch-Südwestafrika (1900) because of an impending native uprising. The white father received his power from keeping the natives at bay and under his command earlier in the novel, while likewise the colonizing mission received support through the strength and stability of the white father’s position. When the uprising occurs, the father must leave, and so must the stability of the region.

The need for the “white father/planter” is therefore predicated on maintaining the separation of white from black, colonizer from colonized, and adult from child; keeping the Africans undeveloped and “childlike,” the white father justifies and maintains his

\textsuperscript{34}”Er war ihnen nicht nur ein gerechter Herr, sondern er behandelte sie wie seine Kinder, die er zum Guten zu erziehen strebte. Was dieser Wassermann hier trieb, das war keine Jagd nach Reichtum, keine Befriedigung einer Abenteuerlust, das war ein zum großen Teil selbstloses, aufopferendes Streben. Kurt neigte vor ihm sein Haupt” (106).

\textsuperscript{55} „Wenn er als junger Auswanderer in dieses Land gekommen wäre, dann hätte er zu dem Manne gesagt: „Ich will dir folgen, sei mein Lehrer und Meister!” Aber er war ja nur ein flüchtiger Gast auf Afrikas Boden” (106).
power through his separate and at times elusive image. Wendy Katz (1987) reminds us: “White rulers cannot afford to be exposed; their image is their defence” (129).

Referencing William Thornton and his *Doctrines of Imperialism*, Katz explains “that such barriers prevented any genuine understanding between ruler and ruled. Built to ensure British inviolability, they also prevented the attainment of even the purported ‘civilizing’ goals of the imperialists” (129-30). While the separation of white father from those he ruled, both the native and the young man, maintained his authority and the stability of the land, it was to the detriment of deeper, more authentic relations between them both. Joseph Bristow (1991) even suggests that the white fathers’ larger-than-life personalities in adventure novels put into question the status and power of “real” men in the colonial endeavor. “British culture invested so much energy in glamorizing male heroes because they represented . . . a tremendous lack: they were not to be found in the empire. . . . So where had these men been all along? They were located in the pages of story books which pieced together a myth that could absorb boy readers for hours” (226). The adolescent reader did not just maintain the separation between the white father and the native, but also kept the “myth” of the male father-figure hero alive through the imaginative realm of the book.

**The Father Farmer in Carl Falkenhorst’s Novels**

In Carl Falkenhorst’s novels, the father takes on added importance as a dual cultivator, of black Africans and of the land. While British adventure novels emphasize traveling through Central Africa and finding treasure while hunting, Falkenhorst’s novels take advantage of Germany’s recent acquisition of colonies (as well as Falkenhorst’s own
background in natural science) to focus instead on the possibility for sustained development of sub-Saharan Africa, both of its people and of the land. The German colonizers, at least at this juncture, distinguished themselves from their European counterparts in their adventure fantasies by being the stable, consistent, and dependable cultivator of Africa.

The added emphasis Falkenhorst places on “cultivating” Africans does not just stem from his liberal imperialist views, but from an insistence on a positive monogenesist conception of cultures that differs from the polygenesist and Darwinist theories gaining popularity with the British. For while British race theorists remained divided on whether races stemmed from one species (monogenesist) or several (polygenesist), German social scientists remained committed to ethnologist Adolf Bastian’s belief in the essential “psychic unity of mankind,” which was further supported in anthropological circles through the mid 1890’s by the leading German anthropologist Rudolf Virchow (Stocking 86-8). This commitment to seeking the sameness of mankind cut across cultures and thus reacted against the linear, progressivist linking of them. This at times oppositional view of culture remained deeply ingrained within the German social science community for decades in the late nineteenth century, despite the impact of Darwin. Woodruff Smith writes: “there remained through midcentury in German liberal social science an unresolved tension between models of social change that focused on *equilibrium* and others that were built on the concept of *progress*” (29).

While British anthropologists like E.B. Tylor also looked for general patterns among the cultures they studied, seeking elements that would reveal similarities among civilizations, the stronger influence of Darwin in Britain caused anthropologists to
consider the differences between savages and Anglo-Europeans more negatively, questioning the savage’s ability to progress in light of “survival of the fittest” (Stocking 98). British anthropologists were thus divided on whether or not savages would be able to culturally progress, whether with help or not. On the one hand, a polygenesist conception of species might mean savages were completely separate from “higher” civilizations and thus might never evolve, and on the other, from a monogenesist perspective, savages might not progress because the “survival of the fittest” rule meant they were clearly not “fit” enough to have progressed farther than their current state. If, according to Darwin’s theories, savages might also be the “missing link” between apes and man, then they might not even be humans at all, let alone capable of higher civilization.

Both British and German anthropologists continued to believe in the cultural superiority of Anglo-Europeans and ranked cultures on a progressive, stepped scale from least civilized (savages) to most civilized (Anglo-Europeans), but Virchow’s insistence on an inductive and positivistic approach to research through physical anthropology, craniometry, etc., (rather than speculating about what there was no absolute physical evidence of to date) kept a second wave of Darwin’s theories (after the initial positive reception) from spreading in German anthropological circles (Stocking 96-8). The concept of the “psychic unity of mankind” sat better with early German anthropologists, most of whom were still devoted to liberalism and Romantic ideas of the individual and Nature. Without the stronger Darwinist and polygenesist influence, then, German anthropologists continued to romanticize about the savage as Naturvölker (natural peoples, as opposed to Kulturvölker, or cultured peoples) who, if at a currently low state
of civilization, were most likely put there by the cruel influences of both environment and the Arab slave traders (97). It was therefore one of the liberal German’s most solemn duties as a civilized person to help the African savage by planting the seeds of civilization and letting them grow.

As a consequence, the white fathers in Carl Falkenhorst’s novels are more than just fathers and colonialists--they advocate a “cultivation” of Africans through working the land and maintaining crops. From the perspective of these white fathers, it is only the capacity of the Africans for work and their choice of the right kind of work that distinguishes them from their German neighbors, not racial or physiological distinctions. Hence the German colonist’s duty according to Falkenhorst is to cultivate Africans much as if they were plants themselves. Treekiller, the adult protagonist of Falkenhorst’s 1894 novel of the same name (Der Baumtötter), describes the work of the colonists (traders and planters) in Cameroon to his young adult apprentice, Hans Ruhl, as follows: “Your undertaking, however, will be like to that of a young tree, for which the short-sighted multitude will have little esteem. But you will know that this small tree will one day strengthen, give shade, and bear fruit. In this knowledge you must look for the reward for your work, and believe me, it will be delightful!” (11)

The importance of cultivation is doubly enforced by not only “working” Africans, but by instilling in them the value of farming as the most important kind of work. Ruhl finally recognizes this purpose of the German presence in Africa when he reflects: “The aversion of the Negro to regular cultivation of the fields--which would produce more than just the present

56 „Ihr Werk wird allerdings einem jungen Bäumchen gleichen, das die kurzsichtige Menge gering achtet; Sie aber werden wissen, daß dieses Bäumchen einst erstarken, Schatten spenden und Früchte tragen wird. In diesem Bewußtsein werden Sie den Lohn Ihres Wirkens suchen müssen, und glauben Sie mir, er wird köstlich sein!“ (11).
minimum needed to avoid starvation—was evident to Hans Ruhl at every step, yet agriculture is the basis of all culture, a firm bulwark for all education; upon it alone is industry able to thrive and commerce to unfold its beautiful flowers (22). German colonialism, according to Falkenhorst, should focus on providing Africans with better work alternatives by teaching them how to cultivate land, and at the same time instill in them a recognition of the importance of work and a desire for the fruits of one’s own labor.

The liberal imperialist Germans obviously had a higher faith in the African, at least initially, and so more readily trusted them to continue on the progressive model once they had been introduced to the value of work and the benefits of a land-based economic system. At the end of Weißbart, Weichherz (Carl Falkenhorst, 1888), Leo is given Whitebeard’s farm to tend with his new wife Suleika, while Whitebeard leaves to cultivate another part of the Sudan. The narrative of Der Kaffeepflanzer von Mrogoro (Carl Falkenhorst, 1895) centers on establishing Uledi as a coffee farmer with his wife Koko and son. While Uledi initially becomes corrupted by a local Swahili Muslim to raid for slaves, he ultimately returns to take up the farm his wife has patiently been tending for him and the reunited couple become the heirs to Otto Braun’s coffee plantation and consequently the roots of civilization in the region. There are many examples in Falkenhorst’s work of the colonists’ duty to “plant” the roots of civilization in various regions of sub-Saharan Africa and then step back and allow the roots to take hold.

57 „Die Abneigung des Negers gegen einen regelrechten Ackerbau, der mehr einbringen würde, als der Mensch gerade braucht, um nicht Hungers zu sterben, fiel hier Hans Ruhl auf Schritt und Tritt auf, und doch ist der Ackerbau die Grundlage aller Kultur, das feste Bollwerk aller Bildung; erst auf ihm vermag sich die Industrie zu entwickeln und der Handel seine schönen Blüten zu entfalten“ (22).
Assessing Natives for the White Father

The adolescent plays perhaps the most crucial role in helping establish or maintain the authority of the “white father” by learning how to distinguish between and select the appropriate native helper. Interaction with the native is essential to the success of the colonial project as well as to the training of the adolescent in becoming a colonizer. Learning to interact with natives thus reveals the Anglo-European’s underlying perception of natives. Whereas the white father must maintain his separation from the native, the adolescent by virtue of the fact that he is an apprentice is allowed to get closer to the native but is consequently tested in his close interactions. The interactions of adolescents with natives takes on even more importance than the white father’s, since success or failure of the apprenticeship will reflect on the colonial doctrine and its approach to natives.

Perhaps the most important skill that the adolescent must learn is the ability to accurately and quickly size up the native for his “type.” Upon arriving in Woga (now Vogan), a village in Togo, for the first time, in Carl Falkenhorst’s *Im Togoland* (1897), Paul Sturm is warned by a long-time older German planter named Father Klaus to pay close attention to the differences among the natives. He warns: “It is by no means easy. I don’t believe that you will be threatened in any way with acts of violence, for that the local natives are too timid; but they are cunning beyond measure, and the local merchants will know how to set all kinds of traps for you (23).”

58 „Es ist aber keineswegs leicht. Ich glaube nicht, daß man Sie in irgend welcher Weise mit Gewaltthaten bedrohen wird, dazu sind die heisigen Eingeborenen doch zu feig, aber schlau sind sie über alle Maßen, und die hiesigen Kaufleute werden Ihnen allerlei Fallen zu stellen wissen“ (23).
negro is everywhere the same”, he replies (23). But Sturm finds himself immediately in trouble when he orders the skeleton of a native be buried, unknowingly taking on the dead native’s debts by doing so, according to a local custom. He must find a trustworthy native to act as his intermediary between himself and the family of the dead native to settle the matter of his debts, and then in the future to avoid falling prey so easily to unusual and varied local customs. Adjaï Paulin Oloukpona-Yinnon (1998) suggests that the dispute over the debt of the native constitutes a “conflict between the young German merchant Sturm and the native King Gansu. It concerns the basic principal: Who shall rule here? The black potentate or the white man? (131) The stakes are pretty high. Sturm needs to find a native to rely on in order to conduct business and to reassert the control of the whites in the territory, and his choice for a native helper will have a dramatic impact both on the outcome of his business and on white/black relations within the town.

Colorado, a local businessman of mixed race, approaches Sturm early after his arrival in the town and suggests a partnership between the two of them. Sturm is immediately skeptical, citing the young man’s brashness as one reason: “Paul Sturm was unpleasantly affected by the importunity of the negro” (Falkenhorst, Im Togoland, 24). Yet it is clear that Colorado’s mixed parentage plays an even bigger role in causing the young German to be prejudiced against him. As a preventive measure, Colorado insists to the young German: “But I am a Portuguese, European blood flows in my veins. That


60 „Im zweiten Kapitel erhöht sich die Spannung durch den Konflikt zwischen dem jungen deutschen Kaufmann Sturm und dem einheimischen König Gansu. Es geht um die grundsätzliche Frage: Wer soll hier herrschen? Der schwarze Potentat oder der weiße Mann?“ (131)

61 „Paul Sturm war durch die Zudringlichkeit des Negers unangenehm berührt“ (24).
you must believe! And I belong to the flower of society in Togo. I understand several languages. I can read and write Portuguese and English. What more do you want? I’m a European!” (41). Yet Colorado’s pleading falls on deaf ears. Sturm apparently already considers Colorado’s Portuguese blood too diluted for the Germans to count him as a proper “European,” because he remarks (filtered by the narrator): “With Colorado he’d been face-to-face with one of those mongrels, numerous along the coast of West Africa, and who probably have acquired some outward appearance of civilization; but as for morals and attitudes, are probably stuck in Negro barbarism” (41). Despite Colorado’s attempts at convincing Sturm otherwise, then, his mixed race status will play an important role in his relationship with Sturm.

But despite the narrator’s warning of the dubiousness of Colorado’s mixed race status, Sturm is not completely discouraged from developing relations with the young man. When Sturm seeks Father Klaus for advice, all the older man tells him is as follows:

I won’t say that you should refrain from any connection with the Portuguese; you need an agent, a middleman, and probably all black merchants are scoundrels in these parts. The connection requires great precaution, however. The wily fellow can be of good use to you yet, and I would advise you to accept his services for the impending palaver; no doubt he will prove himself as your lawyer. (52)


63 „In Colorado hatte er einen jener Mischlinge vor sich, die an der westafrikanischen Küste häufig sind, die wohl von der Civilization einige Äußerlichkeiten sich angeeignet haben, im Grunde aber, was ihre Sitten und Anschauungen anbelangt, in der Negerbarbarei stecken” (41).

64 “Ich will nicht sagen, daß Sie auf jede Verbindung mit dem Portugiesen verzichten sollen; Sie brauchen einen Agenten, einen Zwischenhändler, und Schurken sind wohl alle schwarzen Händler hier zu Lande. Die Verbindung erheischt aber große Vorsicht. Nützlich kann sich Ihnen der geriebene Junge schon erweisen, und ich würde Ihnen raten, seine Dienste bei dem bevorstehenden Palaver anzunehmen; er wird sich als Ihr Rechtsanwalt zweifellos bewähren“ (52).
Sturm, too far away from his other older white business partner on the coast (Ferdinand Rothe) and wanting to impress his elders by “going it alone,” decides to engage Colorado anyway. “Without black go-betweens and middlemen no deal can be made here, and among the dark-shaded agents who conducted their business here, probably none was better than this Colorado,” he tells himself” (42). He sets up a trial period in which Colorado can prove himself a wise trader/businessman and also worthy of Sturm’s trust by handling the matter of the debt he owes to the creditors of the native he buried. Having proved himself capable of handling Sturm’s interests at the Palaver, Colorado then becomes Sturm’s partner in collecting palm oil from the natives for sale back in Europe.

As Sturm and Colorado’s business venture becomes more and more successful, however, Sturm decides to trust Colorado with more of his capital. He agrees to fund Colorado to take a caravan inland to find more oil (71-2). In fact, Sturm gets so wrapped up in his profit-making, that he neglects to rescue his faithful full-blood native captain, Tschagga, from capture by his newlywed’s family’s creditors for the same local custom that Sturm fell prey to earlier (66). He also refuses to believe Tschagga when he tells him that Colorado is planning to run off with Sturm’s workers and all of his possessions (65). Sure enough, with the loyal captain gone, all of Sturm’s native soldiers and workers desert to Colorado’s caravan, who, it turns out, is seeking slaves, not oil (81-4). Sturm’s white business partner from the coast, Rothe, turns up just in time to chastise Sturm for not trusting his loyal native captain and for losing all his capital with the mischievous Colorado (83).

65 „Ohne schwarze Vermittler und Zwischenhändler war hier kein Geschäft zu machen, und von den dunkelfarbenen Agenten, die hier Wesen trieben, war wohl keiner besser als dieser Colorado“ (42).
Im Togoland thus puts front and center the importance of judging native character based on bloodline when getting involved in tribal relations. Sturm learns that not all natives are indeed the same, as Father Klaus had told him. Yet instead of working with Sturm in his interaction with the natives, both Rothe and Father Klaus let the burden of the interaction rest with the adolescent. Leaving the tribal negotiations to the adolescent, whether to fail or to succeed, leaves both Rothe and Father Klaus out of the mix and not responsible if/when relations fail. This hands-off approach to Sturm’s training thus provides the opportunity for the reestablishment of the superiority of the “white father.” When Rothe returns to correct the situation, Sturm “stood there as though thunderstruck. Like a culprit he had now to bow his head before the elder, more experienced man, deeply ashamed because the latter was indeed better and nobler than himself” (83). Rothe chastises Sturm for letting his greed blind him from rescuing the loyal Tschagga and choosing instead to risk becoming a participant in Colorado’s misdeeds. He angrily tells Sturm: “The truth is not nice; learn to face it. You’ll learn a horrible lesson. May God grant that it works to your benefit” (84). In fact, it works more to the benefit of Rothe and Father Klaus’s benefit than it does that of the adolescent.

Sturm’s mistakes, however, do more than just reestablish the superiority of the “white father.” Sturm learns the hierarchical valuation of the native population, which is so important in colonial discourse. The lesson learned here is to seek and trust the full-blood natives and to suspect those of mixed race. By the end of the novel, Sturm does finally concede that not all natives are alike. Father Klaus suggests to Sturm that the

---


67 „Die Wahrheit ist nicht schön – lernen Sie ihr ins Gesicht schauen! Sie erhalten da eine furchtbare Lehre. Gott gebe es, daß Sie zu Ihrem Nutzen ausschlägt!” (84)
German colonizer’s role is to “secure the freedom” of the native and simultaneously educate him, implying that those who will not receive instruction, such as Colorado, also do not deserve freedom (107). Oloukpona-Yinnon further points out that the colonizer justifies his occupation of Togo by promising the freedom through education of the native, two simultaneous objectives that appear to oppose one another. Through this inherently contradictory colonial policy, “racial hierarchies and roll-distribution are fixed in the colonial society. The whites’ claim to power is unambiguously formulated and established. The reader is trained, so to speak, in colonial thinking, in that he gets the colonial discourse served up in guiding principles” (136). The classification of natives, the central premise of the novel, is revealed, we see, through the education of the adolescent. In turn, it is the adolescent’s mistakes that help to justify the reasons for the hierarchy of races as well as the separation of native and white father (the “colonial thinking”). At the beginning of the novel, Colorado nicknames Sturm „junger Greis“ (literally translated as young old man) after Father Klaus, who is known to the African natives as „Greis“ (old man). By the end of the novel, Sturm finds out for himself how difficult it is to be simultaneously “young” and “old”. By the end of the novel, he has successfully moved to the thinking of the “old man.”

Correctly assessing natives is a particularly important skill when traveling in foreign regions and in places where the Anglo-German’s safety may be at issue. When the protagonist in W.H.G. Kingston’s Ned Garth (1878) warns his white comrades against leaving the caravan, he tells them: “If you attempt to go alone, you will be murdered by the robbers through whose territory we have passed. No white men can

---

travel among these savages, unless in considerable numbers, well armed” (202). In such a manner, then, the adolescent’s decision-making skills are further put to test in the final book of Falkenhorst’s series, Pioniere der Kultur in Deutsch-Südwestafrika (1900). In this story, a young German by the name of Kurt Nurke arrives in Walvis Bay, nowadays Namibia, to embark on a cross-country search for his lost uncle, who has recently inherited a sizeable amount of money. Kurt has never been to Africa, yet has been given a small portion of the inheritance by his brother-in-law to engage in the search by himself in this vast land. But before he can do so, Kurt is approached by a group of several other older white travelers (“gold-diggers”), one of whom, a Dr. Lautenschlager, invites him to join their party into the interior. Kurt reflects upon the right course of action:

The speech of the gigantic Dr. Lautenschlager flowed like honey. Why, didn’t the swindlers back in the beloved homeland also distinguish themselves with good manners and beautiful speeches! And how unpleasant to Nurke was the red-haired, ever-mocking Reiner! What a piercing glance he had! Oh, this man would have no scruples to shoot down a travel companion among the bleak and desolate dunes. Then there was silent Fritz Müller, with his shifty gaze! Could, should Kurt Nurke trust this company with his cash and money vouchers? If only he could make inquiries about these men! (19)

At first glance, Kurt does not want to entrust his safety and his money to these “gold diggers,” although they appear to be native sons of Germany. He considers engaging some of the local Khoikhoi (referred to as Hottentots at the time) to act as his guides.

“But what should he do? Travel to Windhoek alone by oxcart with Hottentots he didn’t understand? Could the wild fellows not just as well murder and pillage him. He who has

69 “Dem hünenhaften Dr. Lautenschlager floß die Rede wie Honigseim, aber zeichneten sich die Bauernfänger in der lieben Heimat nicht auch durch gute Manieren und schöne Reden aus? Und wie unanagenehm war Nurke der rothaarige, immer spöttelnde Reiner! Welch stechenden Block er hatte! Ach, dem Manne würde es wohl keine Skrupel bereiten, um einer Geldbörse willen einen Reisegefährten zwischen den öden Dünen niederzuknallen. Dann der schweigsame Fritz Müller mit dem lauernden Blick! Ob sich wohl Kurt Nurke mit seiner Barschaft und seinen Geldanweisungen dieser Gesellschaft anvertrauen durfte? Wenn er nur Erkundigungen über diese Herren einziehen könnte!” (19)
the choice also has the pain [of choosing] (20). He decides instead to hedge all his bets. He chooses to travel with the caravan, but he hires his own natives and purchases a supply of goods to trade along the way. His hired Khoikhoi, Nurke reckons, “would watch over the Hottentots of the gold-diggers, and the reckless treasure-hunters could not risk a robbery in the presence of the savages” (20). His own wagon with supplies, Nurke hopes, will make it harder for the gold diggers to steal from him and will leave him with his own transportation and means of income along the way.

Yet Nurke’s best plans go awry very quickly. He finds it very difficult to keep his servants in line. They refuse to obey his commands, pretend they do not understand what he is saying, and they steal from him any chance they get. “If Mother Nurke or Mrs. Brise could see this, there would be a holy dressing-down. Kurt had also thundered already, but the sly Elias [one of his native servants] pretended he didn’t understand a word of his young master’s newly acquired Dutch, and shook his head chagrined and amazed at all the warning and dissembling, even the powerful curses” (26).

Nurke is very quickly reduced to a child by the cunningness of the local natives. He learns quickly that he should not have engaged the Khoikhoi without knowing how to “handle” them properly. Even worse, he was wrong to suspect foul play from his countrymen. But despite Nurke’s lack of confidence, not only does Dr. Lautenschlager take command of

70 „Doch was solte er thun? Mit Hottentotten, die er nicht verstand, allein per Ochsen wagen nach Windhoek reisen? Konnten ihn die wilden Kerle nicht ebenso gut ausplündern und totschlagen? Wer die Wahl hat, hat auch die Qual“ (20).

71 „würden die Hotentotten der Goldgräber bewachen, und die verwegenen Schatzgräber könnten im Angesicht der Wilden doch keinen Raub an ihm versuchen“ (20).

his natives, but he takes Nurke “under his wing” and guides him throughout the rest of their journey.

Unfortunately, Dr. Lautenschlager’s tutelage comes a little too late for Nurke. Towards the end of their journey, the caravan lands in a flood valley surrounded by mountains. The water rises suddenly from the nearby river and Nurke is unable to move his wagon fast enough to avoid the incoming flood, despite Dr. Lautenschlager’s quick directions. Nurke’s hired hands desert him and shortly thereafter Nurke follows them, ultimately losing all his earthly possessions, including the entire sum of money his brother-in-law had advanced him—but lucky to have saved his own life. Dr. Lautenschlager, Nurke’s mentor, is not so positive about this outcome, however. He cries out: “Such a little child! There goes some huckster off into the wild country to search for a rich Uncle. Had the luck to find honest friends, but doesn’t listen to good advice. Hey, why didn’t you listen to me? If you had bought a horse, then you would still have your bit of currency in your vest pocket” (47).  

Again, the mistakes of the adolescent provide the “white father” with the opportunity to not only put the hired Khoikhoi in their place, but also reassert Dr. Lautenschlager’s command over Nurke and the caravan. He lambastes Nurke for his poor decision-making throughout the trip—for being too suspicious of his white traveling companions; for having wasted money on hiring a crew, wagon, and goods (instead of a simple horse); and for being unable to properly direct his hires. In each of these cases, Nurke’s failures simply point to the experience and ability of Dr. Lautenschlager in relation to the lazy natives and inexperienced Nurke.

---

140
Shortly after Dr. Lautenschlager’s outburst, however, a stranger approaches the cavern from one of the neighboring mountains. Suddenly Dr. Lautenschlager is deeply suspicious, and commands everyone to ready their guns. He believes his suspicions are justified (unlike Nurke’s earlier) because, as the stranger approaches, it becomes clear from his dress that he is no European. Dr. Lautenschlager describes him as: “Well-dressed, light complexion, blond hair, but the nose and mouth of a Hottentot. A bastard, then!” (50)

The caravan comes face-to-face with another person of mixed race—only this time the stranger, named Ari-Uri, is a mixture of Boer and Khoikhoi. Considering Ferdinand Rothe’s and Father Klaus’s negative reaction to Colorado in *Im Togoland*, one would expect Dr. Lautenschlager to give this mixed blood a hostile reception. And yet, Dr. Lautenschlager and his caravan are in desperate need of help out of the valley, much as Paul Sturm found himself in need of Colorado’s help at the town palaver over the dead native’s debts. Instead, Dr. Lautenschlager has to trust Ari-Uri out of necessity. He tells his followers, “Children, ...perhaps this “Urian” or whatever his name, is leading us into an ambush, then we’ll have to fight. But staying here is also no good for us, because from up there, his accomplices can shoot us down very easily. Besides, he seems to me to be an honest fellow (53). Thus Dr. Lautenschlager bypasses the extensive decision-making that Paul Sturm must undergo regarding Colorado in *Im Togoland* and he simply announces his decision to the group, further emphasizing his authoritative command over

---

74 „Gut gekleidet, helle Gesichtsfarbe, blondes Haar—aber Nase und Mund hottentottisch. Ein Bastard also!” (50).

75 „Kinder, . . . vielleicht führt uns dieser Urian [Ari-Uri] oder wie er heißt in einen Hinterhalt; dann werden wir fechten müssen. Aber das Bleiben hier nützt uns auch nichts; denn von oben her könnten uns seine Spießgesellen kinderleicht niederknallen. Er scheint mir übrigens ein ehrlicher Kerl zu sein” (53).
the party by referring to them (even the other older and experienced gold-diggers) as “Kids!”

Clearly it is Nurke’s role to hold up the authority of Dr. Lautenschlager both with his verbal support and by needing correction and leadership. Nurke’s “childish” behavior provides Dr. Lautenschlager with the opportunity to demonstrate “adult” behavior to both Nurke and to the natives. Yet rarely is it acknowledged in the text how much the positioning of the white father is dependent on the adolescent. In fact, Nurke’s seemingly colossal “mistake”—to purchase the wagon and then lose the wagon in an unfortunate twist of fate—proves to be one of the lasting lessons of the novel, and not just for Nurke or for the reader, but for the “white fathers” themselves. For shortly after Ari-Uri leads the caravan out of the gorge (safely!), Nurke is reunited with his uncle, Fritz Müller, at his farm. And after an additional period of time, Nurke and Uncle Müller learn that they must abandon the settlement in the face of a new Nama-Khoikhoi uprising led by Hendrik Witbooi. In essence, Fritz Müller learns that he, too, will lose all his possessions in a single twist of fate. Yet rather than enhance the significant parallels between Nurke’s decision-making and his uncle’s, the novel never acknowledges them. It is also never suggested that perhaps Uncle Müller could learn from Nurke’s experience himself. In fact, Fritz Müller’s decision-making process to establish a farm in territory still under clear dispute with the Nama, Khoikhoi, not to mention the Herero, is completely ignored; instead our attention is drawn to the “windfall” of the inheritance he receives. By grace of Uncle Müller’s inheritance, he is free to leave his farm and to ignore the consequences of his presence and the impending struggles between the Khoikhoi, Herero, Nama, and the German troops (which will result in the German massacre of 3,000 to 5,000 Herero
just 16 years later, initially instigated by this same Witbooi in real life). In a fitting farewell, the uncle adopts Nurke as his son and makes him inheritor of all his property—using the reestablishment of the patriarchal line to postpone the consequences of his actions by placing them on the young man.

As we have seen, both the stories of Paul Sturm and Kurt Nurke in Falkenhorst’s Jung Deutschland in Afrika series point up how adolescents are employed to make the decisions of native interaction, implementing the racist ideology that supports the colonial discourse—so that the “white father” remains detached and uninvolved. But none of Falkenhorst’s novels so openly questions the methods and ideology of the colonizer as the seventh book in the series, Zum Schneedom des Kilimandscharo (1896). In this book, Falkenhorst is able to differentiate more clearly between alternative methods of colonizing because he uses more than one main protagonist, and the protagonists, unlike in most of his other novels, are closer in age, not the father-and-son types so typical of these adventure novels. Captain Lange is the leader of the caravan to garrison a military outpost in the vicinity of the Kilimanjaro mountain, and he is accompanied by a younger (it is not clear by how much) researcher named Karl Hellmann, whose mission is to collect geological samples and survey the environmental features of the region. The differences in occupation and in temperament between the two are immediately apparent. “The older of them [Captain Lange], already in his prime, was well-built and presented a military posture; he had an energetic gaze and every one of his movements revealed resoluteness; his words were short and specific: for Captain Lange was accustomed to giving orders” (17).\footnote{Der ältere von ihnen stand bereits in höherem Mannesalter; er war stark gebaut und zeigte eine militärische Haltung; energisch blickte sein Auge, und jede seiner Bewegungen verriet Entschlossenheit;}

In contrast to Captain Lange, however, is the soft-hearted and
gentle Dr. Hellmann, a friend to all natives, but particularly the women and children who follow him around in camp: “This friendly man didn’t concern himself with military deeds; he was a scholar, a naturalist by profession. He collected flowers growing along the way, listened to the songs of the birds, observed the activity of the animal world of the steppe and kept the instruments in good condition with which he regularly read the temperature, atmospheric pressure, humidity, and so forth” (17-18). The narrator, however, finds the differences in temperament and occupation a distinct blessing.

Falkenhorst clearly uses this dual-leadership set-up to emphasize that Germany’s colonial approach is hardly monolithic. The difference in temperaments puts in question what is the “right” approach to take with the native? Be soft or hard? Brian Street (1975) boils down these approaches to the “harshness” and the “kindliness” approaches (42). Falkenhorst suggests that these two can work together for the betterment of the native condition: “By virtue of this very difference in character the two companions were splendidly matched; they completed one another: the strong paired with the mild nature had a good ring to it here as well” (18).

But in practice the partnership falls apart. Despite the outwardly positive appearance of the partnership of these two men on the expedition, their differences quickly cause discord instead. The third character who causes the discord between the German leaders is a young native Dschagga woman by the name of Nialodia. Nialodia runs into the camp of the expedition one day on her way
to visit the native god of the smaller peaks of Kilimanjaro, named Kibo. She has run away from her Dschagga family because conditions have grown worse there. Her father has been strangled, her mother killed, and her uncle, the new chief of her tribe, hates her. She was promised to a trader from the coast (most likely a slave trader) but instead left her home rather than be given to him (15). Hellmann is immediately taken by the poor young woman and requests from the captain that she remain with their caravan for protection until they can drop her off at a local mission for care and education in European ways. Captain Lange, however, refuses, citing the fact that if he were to give Nialodia protection, they would incur the hostilities of her uncle Mamba and the Dschaggas, something he does not want to risk when he needs safe passage through the land to arrive at the military station (35-7).

Hellmann’s and Lange’s difference of opinion thus puts in question the purpose of the expedition into the interior and, in fact, the mission of German colonization altogether. For, according to Hellmann, the central objective of German intercession in Africa should be to help and support the locals by protecting them from slave traders as well as by providing them with alternative means of subsistence and an altogether new way of life. Yet Lange’s primary concern is the safety of the caravan and the stability of the region. The question Lange asks is how the “cultivating” of the natives can occur without the strong arm of the military to back up the colonists? Lange’s primary concern is therefore appeasing Mamba so that the military part of the expedition may succeed. So, despite Hellmann’s protests, Lange sets down his orders regarding Nialodia: “I’m sorry, Hellmann, . . . but I am responsible for the safety of the caravan, and I believe the witch is a danger to our expedition. The commander of the military station shares my
view, and since all ideas from you have come to naught, I must make use of my authority. Nialodia will be handed over to chief Mamba. Those are my orders!” (37)

Lange’s orders create a deep rift between the two men that takes practically the entire novel to mend.

Critic Ansgar Häfner (1985) suggests that the Lange, Hellmann, Nialodia triangle illustrates the moral/epistemological structure underpinning the colonial discourse of the novel, as well as European culture in general. Häfner writes: “All three are elements of European civilization. Both men represent, on the one hand, the spheres of power, dominance, reality and, on the other hand, kindness, liberalism, fantasy; and the only woman, Nialodia, represents the ‘eternal feminine’; that is, love, desire, irrationality, longing and devotion” (9).

By calling attention to the characteristics of European perception that each of the figures represent in the narrative, Häfner illustrates how the colonialist identity is constructed as a whole in the novel in relation to Nialodia. Hellmann will ultimately concede to Lange not just the importance of the militaristic outlook, but, more importantly, will also concede his way of identifying and relating with the Other, represented by Nialodia. Häfner explains:

Foil to the youthfully enthusiastic Hellmann, who still needs enlightening, is Lange, the adult who neither dreams nor loves, but rather has integrated himself into the command structure positively and therefore is in the right. For him there is no tempting tainted by the laws of nature, by the Other,

---


80 „Alle drei sind Elemente der europäischen Zivilisation. Die beiden Männer vertreten einerseits die Bereiche Macht, Herrschaft, Realität und andererseits Güte, Liberalismus, Phantasie und die einzige Frau, Nialodia, das Prinzip des ‘ewig Weiblichen’, also Liebe, Begehren, Irrationalität, Sehnsucht und Hingabe“ (9).
because he does not anticipate the Other, only himself. And this autocentric-autistic Self is the ideal of the colonialist personality. (10-11)

Thus, according to Häfner, behind Lange’s military background lies the “ideal” colonialist personality that learns to dismiss the Other and remain steadfast in his European values and sense of self. What is most important for our purposes here is how this shift in Hellman’s perception of Nialodia represents for Häfner becoming “experienced,” (erfahren) or “growing up.” Hellman does not “grow up” until he adapts Lange’s stable binary of self versus other with regard to Nialodia, which Häfner calls the “ideal of the colonial personality.” Growing up throughout the course of the novel, and learning to experience the native in a different way, Hellman’s transformation, accordingly, puts in question the Anglo-European way of perceiving the Other. Even if Lange’s militaristic outlook is not the “ideal” colonial personality (which I would argue it is not, rather is one of several approaches which the Falkenhorst books as a whole suggest), it is clear that Hellmann, the younger adolescent in this case, plays a particularly important role in this text as the figure that negotiates between two colonial perspectives on how to perceive and work with natives. The adolescent negotiates the meanings and the implications of these separate perspectives as he matures into adulthood, choosing, of course, whichever perspective the stable white father of the narrative has chosen, and of course, shoring up the white father’s authority and the racial typology underlying the novel.

Scouting Amongst the Savages without “Going Native”

The conflicting desire to know the other without becoming the other so typical of late nineteenth century colonial discourse comes to life in these novels through the scouting and spying missions of white adolescents. It is yet another way in which the adolescent negotiates the separation between the white father and black child in order to maintain the white father’s power. To blend in amongst the natives, remain unrecognized, and then extract oneself without harm or change to one’s cultural identity is to the late nineteenth-century reader further proof of the stability and superiority of the Anglo-European culture. It is therefore one of the most important adolescent rituals that the young characters of these novels undergo in their transformation into colonizers. Yet it is also a ritual that is much more valued by Victorian than Wilhelmine adventure novel writers.

The difference between the Victorians as opposed to the Wilhelmines in perceived fear of those of mixed race or hybrids may, again, stem from the fact that Darwin was more widely read and accepted, at least before the 1890s, in Britain than in Germany. Charles Darwin’s opinion of mixed races was as straightforward as it was negative. He writes: “From these facts we may perhaps infer that the degraded state of so many half-castes is in part due to a reversion to a primitive and savage condition, induced by the act of crossing, as well as to the unfavorable moral conditions under which they generally exist” (qtd in Lubbock 499). Also borrowing from Darwin’s perspective, E.B. Tylor reports on those “civilized” men who “went native” in the company of savages. He writes: “Their theory is that, given a higher and a lower civilization existing among two races, a mixed race between the two may take to the lower or an intermediate condition”
(46). It is not degeneration of the higher culture into a lower form, rather the mixing of blood which causes the mixed (“tainted”) blood to take on the characteristics of the lower race. The fear was thus twofold: 1) that a civilized person, remaining too long in “savage” territory would adopt “savage” ways, 2) the mixing of blood would bring down forever the “higher” race. The fear/fascination of mixed race people (and also hybrid animals) contributed to the Victorian fear of getting “caught” in the interior of sub-Saharan Africa, and thus fueled one of the most popular Victorian adventure tropes—to “scout” or “spy” on the native whilst remaining racially “pure.” Of course, Rudyard Kipling’s Kim is perhaps the most famous of all scouts, yet several types like Kim appear in G.A. Henty’s and Gordon Stables’s novels. The mobility and flexibility of the adolescent scout guarantee that the Victorian reader can access the other at its most intimate level without losing his sense of cultural superiority.

To scout without “going native” is one of the qualities prized most highly in the stereotypical Henty hero, who has often either grown up as the child of a colonist or soldier stationed in a colony and learned the native tongue, or by fortune or accident has spent a significant amount of time amongst the natives picking up their language and customs. Desiring to make himself as useful as possible, Gregory in With Kitchner in the Soudan (1902) offers his services to General Kitchner as a spy:

I talk Baggara better than the negro dialect that passes here. . . . as the old nurse from whom I learnt these languages had been for a long time among that tribe, she devoted, at my mother’s request, more time to teaching me their Arab dialect than any other, and I am convinced that I could pass unsuspected among them as far as language is concerned. There is no great difference between Arab features and European, and I think that when I am stained brown and have my head partly shaved, according to their fashion, there will be little fear of my being detected. As to costume, that is easy enough. (Henty 95)
What is even more significant than the fact that Gregory has the background and knowledge of the “Other” culture is that he can infiltrate unnoticed and then return unscathed from his experience. This “dipping in” and then “dipping out” of the native culture would prove both the inferiority of the native culture, since it could be mimicked so well, and also the natural superiority of the white adolescent in his ability to mimic the traditions of the native and yet remain personally “intact” when he resumed the garb of his true cultural identity. Being able to undergo such a transformation further demonstrates that the qualities that make Edgar a British adolescent are not skin deep.

Edgar, in Henty’s The Dash for Khartoum (1890), having fallen into the enemy’s hands and now working as a slave, also fantasizes that his ability to “pass” as a native will be the means of his salvation. “I may be a slave a long time . . . but sooner or later I will escape. I will get to speak the language like a native. I am already almost burnt to their colour, and shall ere long be able to pass as one of themselves” (218). Whether as a spy, a scout, or whether as a means to effect an escape, passing is a key activity that models how adolescents could contribute to the colonial project.

Scouting is a distinction of class as much as it is of culture. Lower middle-class and working-class British adolescents, according to the theories of the day, had the advantage of being able to blend in more easily because their lower-class status meant they inhabited similar characteristics of the savage. This assumed recognition of the similarity of lower middle-class and working-class adolescents with savages is often used to humorous effect in British adventure novels. In Gordon Stables’ Stanley Grahame (1886) the “boy Green” is the comic character, popping in and out of the text at random. At one point, the narrator exclaims: “But look, someone else suddenly appears on the
scene. It is that ubiquitous boy Green, and he now stands in front of his captain. A pitiable appearance he presents, for he has just escaped from the prison in which he had been confined, his clothes torn, his hair disordered, and wrists and ankles bleeding” (223). The boy Green, who is a “very second-class boy” according to the narrator, is also the one with the most mobility in the novel. He transfers between the British man-of-war and the slaver ships with apparent ease, if a little physically the worse for his escape act.

The boy Green also manages to leave the British ship undetected as they arrive at their final destination on the coast of Africa, and he is able to infiltrate much deeper into the inland than the middle-class soldiers that follow him slowly with the troops in tow. He interacts with tribes deep in the interior with little effort: “He [Boy Green] never drew a sword nor allowed his followers to do so, they mixed as freely with those fierce savages as if they had been walking in Fleet Street, and as if everybody was friendly” (320).

Then, using his unique position, he manages to spark a fight amongst the local tribes in order to distract them from the British soldiers that are heading inland from the ship. The boy Green remarks: “Well, can’t yer see the game, dunderhead? We pits Rumfoozulum against Kumfoozulum, and we just stands aside and sees ‘em peck—hey, Scottie?” (320)

The result is that the officers are able to defeat the natives who have captured several white captives and rescue them. The boy Green tells his comrades after the fight: “Wot you calls cheek is merely tactics, and what you terms howdausity is only another name for strategy” (334).

Similarly, R. M. Ballantyne suggests in Black Ivory (1873) that it is Disco’s working-class background that leads him to come up with an audacious supposition. He tells his solidly middle-class companion, Harold, “No, sir; it’s my opinion that there ain’t
no such thing as savages—or, if you choose to put it tother way, we’re all savages together” (196). The young middle-class adolescent “admitted that there was much truth in what he said, but rather inclined to the opinion that of the two sets of savages the uncivilized were, if anything, the wildest. Disco however, contrary to his usual habits, had nailed his colours to the mast on that point, and could not haul them down” (196). Thus, when Disco displaces the progressivist ranking of cultures by suggesting that the savage is neither below the European, nor even all that different from him, Harold’s response is to suggest that Disco’s remarks are hasty and not well-thought-out. Harold cannot abide by the thought that there exist similar “savage” tendencies in both African and Anglo-European cultures without suggesting a ranking between the two. Then Ballantyne uses the appearance of a young native who happens to walk by at that moment to further reestablish Harold’s cultural ranking: “Meanwhile Harold’s opinion was to some extent justified by the appearance of a young man, who, issuing from the jungle close at hand, advanced towards them” (196). The young native is dressed in a manner that to Harold and the narrator suggests his ranking as “true” savage. Thus, although lower middle-class and working-class adolescents might inhabit certain characteristics that make them better able to “pass” in the world of the native, they are consequently more susceptible to “going native,” or becoming the “savage” that Disco suggests the Europeans are. It is this strong sense of morality based on progressivist logic that separates the middle-class adolescent from the others and makes him the ideal candidate for scouting.

As a consequence, the most important aspect of scouting and spying for middle-class adolescents is to be able to do so with ease and to blend in without detection,
although such an action may seem implausible, if not ridiculous. Gregory thus amazingly “passed wholly unnoticed among the crowd. There was nothing to distinguish him from others, and the thought that an Egyptian spy, still less one of the infidels, should venture into their camp had never occurred to one of that multitude” (115). Similarly, Clinton’s buddies in The Dash for Khartoum (G.A. Henty, 1890), when presented with his costume, praise its authenticity: “Well, there is no fear, Clinton, of anyone recognizing you as an Englishman. You may ride in the middle of them from here to Khartoum, and they would never suspect you as far as looks go” (277). If the British explorer Richard Burton was able to go to Mecca in disguise, the young men suggest, then certainly they can master a native disguise as well (270). Joseph Bristow (1991) suggests that: “Since the moral mission of empire formed the most basic of all assumptions in this kind of adventure, it remained very much in the background of the narrative. Emphasis fell on the complexities of action: reconnoitering enemy territory; planning the logistics of battle; carrying out a successful raid; and so on” (147). But with scouting, the moral mission of empire combined in the actions of the adolescent. It was the role of the adolescent, in fact, to embody the moral through physical action and thereby demonstrate cultural superiority.

There are few, if any, examples of German adolescents taking on the garb and language of natives, infiltrating enemy lines and scouting out for their own kind. For instance, in Falkenhorst’s Das Kreuz am Tanganjika (1897), Lieutenant Werner, the leader of an expedition inland to rescue a German merchant, decides he must infiltrate the nearby Arab town to discover information about the whereabouts of the Arab who has captured the missing merchant. While his mission is dangerous (the Arab slave dealers
are hostile towards Anglo-Europeans, who are abolitionists), and even though Werner knows he needs to be surreptitious in order to get the information he desires, he maintains his German dress—the uniform of an officer. Instead, Werner extracts what he needs to know by throwing out decoy: he reveals a letter that suggests (falsely) that the German governor will reimburse one of the Arabs for goods he lost in a former trade gone bad. Then Werner suggests that the governor will also reimburse the Arab he is looking for if he only knew where he was located. Surprised by what Werner reveals and overcome with the thought of getting some of the money, a young Arab blurts out the location (58-60). The mission is accomplished without losing one’s cultural insignia or signification.

The fact that German adolescents rarely, if ever, go undercover amongst the natives to obtain information also points to the differences between German and British colonization in Africa. Because Germans were relatively “new” to the colonizing game, the German young adult fiction writers of the middle to end of the nineteenth century occasionally suggested in their novels that they had friendlier relations with the natives than the “old” colonial powers like Britain. This is certainly one of the excuses Bismarck and the first colonizers use to establish their colonies in the first place: they claimed that the British were not adequately “protecting” the natives in the coastal regions in sub-Saharan Africa, when in fact the British wanted to only maintain coastal trade relations and monitor the waters for slave ships. This difference is reflected in Der Kaffeepflanzer von Mrogoro (C. Falkenhorst, 1895). A Swahili slave dealer discusses the European occupation of the region with his grandson, whom he hopes to groom for the trade. “But you know the Wadeitschi [the Germans] have now occupied the coast,” the grandfather tells the young man. “They are the worst of the Wasungu [the whites]. The English
fought us with their warships [man-o-wars] on the seas only, and left us undisturbed on land. The Germans have the hunger for land” (68). Falkenhorst here portrays this slave dealer’s disdain for the Germans so that the reader, in opposition to his comments, will feel superior not only to the slave dealer, but also to the British. As the Europeans who are more committed to penetrating deeper inland to engage full-heartedly with the slave trade at its roots (not just mop up the results on the high seas when it is too late), the German colonists believed (at least in the fantasy world of the adventure novel) that they were winning the deeper respect of the full-blood interior natives who had not yet been corrupted by Arabs or the slave trade. Likewise in Unter den Palmen von Bagamojo (C. Falkenhorst, 1894), Sudanese refugees claim they receive better treatment from the Germans. “Yes, . . . in Egypt and in the Sudan they have treated us badly, [they] set Europeans after us to drive us away; but the Germans are completely different; they treat us well; in battle they go in front, and thus we will follow them everywhere” (118-19). With such scenes, German adventure writers imply German colonists would not need to “pass” as natives to extract important information. They would have already established such an important and respectful relationship that the natives would have gladly helped them (or so they would have us believe.) Sibylle Benninghoff-Lühl (1983) suggests that some of the most basic themes of German colonial novels from the beginning included: “A ‘rationale of closeness to the people’, a ‘proud national awareness’ and a ‘fervent love of the fatherland’ [which] are not limited to the period from 1933 to 1945, but are from


\[83\] „Ja, . . . in Ägypten und im Sudan hat man uns schlecht behandelt, stellte Europäer hinter uns, um uns anzutreiben, die Deutschen aber sind ganz anders, sie behandeln uns gut, im Gefechte gehen sie stets voran, und da werden wir ihnen auch überall hin folgen“ (118-19).
the start part and parcel of the declared objectives of German colonial literature” (201).\textsuperscript{84} In truth, any real advantage the Germans had at the time would have been negligible and/or have slipped away by 1892 when Robert Louis Stevenson publicized the harsh practices of the German colonizers in Samoa to worldwide criticism. And such differences would have been lost on the natives of sub-Saharan Africa, anyway, since both countries were occupying land that they were not welcome in.

Scouting for the British thus provided a way in which the British could prove to themselves that their superiority would be maintained even at the closest of contact with the native. If Germans did not feel they needed to “pass,” they certainly emphasized the importance of developing native relations through adolescent interaction and development. The adolescent was the most uniquely positioned figure to achieve the closest intermingling with natives without actually mixing blood. Scouting and other native interactions became one of the most important “rites of passage” for the adolescent apprentice.

**Bending the Binary with Training in Native Relations**

So far we have focused on how the adolescent illuminates and supports the colonial discourse by keeping separate the white father and the black child. But the adolescent plays an even more significant role in the colonial narrative. By being the most uniquely positioned figure that is responsible for the interaction between the white father and the black child, the Anglo-German adolescent is also a figure that reveals the inherent problems with the binary separations upon which the colonial discourse is

\textsuperscript{84} „’Volkverbundenes Denken’, ’stolzes [ebenda] Volksbewusstsein’ und ’glühende Vaterlandsliebe’ sind dabei nicht etwa auf die Zeit von 1933 bis 1945 beschränkt, sondern gehören von Anfang an zu den erklärten Zielen der deutschen Kolonialliteratur“ (201).
based. The training of the adolescent in native relations in fact demonstrates that a true separation of white from black, Anglo-European from African, and adult from child is hardly feasible, or even desirable, despite the fears of the writers and adult colonizers of these texts. In the process of training to be a colonizer, the white adolescent reveals just how much the colonizing mission, and in fact the identity of the colonizer himself is completely dependent on the native.

These adventure novels, which center on the engagement of the European self with the African Other, play with imposed separations of old and young, white and black, colonizer and colonized. While attempting to maintain the separation between the two, some writers, such as Robert Michael Ballantyne, known as one of the first British authors to gear his work specifically for a younger audience, will intentionally reverse the trope in order to call attention to those binaries. Stuart Hannabuss (1989) has noted how Ballantyne, unlike some other adventure novel writers, has this tendency to play with these supposed separations in his work. He writes: “We have seen that his work, from the beginning, demonstrates an ambivalence, a role-playing shyness, exhilaration mixed with guilt. We find this in his attitude to fact and fancy early on, and to the ways in which as an authorial figure he moves about a stage of his own making” (69). But even though his intentions are playful—to encourage the young adult reader to imagine himself as the “Other” in the midst of an exotic environment, at certain key points, Ballantyne’s playfulness gets away from him and his intentional reversal of the binary further puts into question its signification.
One such example of an insinuated role reversal between Europeans and Africans in Ballantyne’s work is in the following passage from his *Black Ivory* (1873). Ballantyne describes the beginning of his protagonists’ expedition down the Zambesi river:

> Behold our travellers, then, fairly embarked on the waters of the great African river Zambesi, in two canoes, one of which is commanded by Harold Seadrift, the other by Disco Lillihammer. Of course these enterprising chiefs were modest enough at first to allow two of the Makololo men, Jumbo and Zombo, to wield the steering oars, but after a few days’ practice they became sufficiently expert, Disco said, to take the helm, except when strong currents rendered the navigation difficult, or when the weather became so ‘piping hot’ that none but men clad in black skins could work. (87)

The slippage of the binary between colonizer and colonized is signaled already by the beginning of the second sentence when, after setting up Harold and Disco as typical white colonizers, or “travellers” who “commanded”, Ballantyne then refers to them as “chiefs.” These “enterprising chiefs” consequently “allow” Jumbo and Zombo to train them in boat navigation. Although the young white Europeans’ dependence on the two Makololo men is clear, Ballantyne never acknowledges this dependence. In fact, it must be inferred from the passage that the young white men need “a few days practice” to become “expert” in navigation, but still must defer to the West African men in choppy weather and when the sun is strong. Thus, these “enterprising chiefs” are hardly the leaders in this scenario. In fact, although Ballantyne designates that the young European men are the leaders and the ones with the power, he simultaneously derides that power and leadership by first referring to them with terms usually associated with natives (chief); and secondly by secretly acknowledging their youth and inexperience. Clearly, Ballantyne is making light of the white boys who are “playing” at being chief—a bit of gentle humor that he expects his young readers will enjoy, not be turned off by. But what
is also clear is that the separation between colonizer and colonized, white and black, is more complicated, and it is complicated by the age and inexperience of the young European, both in the text and without.

**Learning to Climb and Gaining Perspective**

The skills that the young Anglo-European protagonists must acquire in order to survive in Africa and subsequently become good colonizers also belies a reliance on the African native that, after learned, is then denied, although full denial is not really possible. The fact that these young adolescents must learn the skill from the natives upsets the initial distinction created between colonizer and colonized in these novels. One such example is the skill of climbing a tree for the purpose of surveying the land. In fact, the ability to survey the land is essential to completing the colonizing mission. Surveying allows colonizers to discover the best lands for development, the best routes for trade, and also helps the colonizers with military strategy to avoid surprise attacks from either warring tribes or slave traders. One typical mission of the Europeans who venture into Africa prior to colonization is finding and stopping slave ships. The captain of one such ship patrolling for slavers in *Deutsche Marine am Kongo und in der Südsee* (1892) by Eginhard von Barfus laments: “If only one had a point higher up, from which one could gain a panoramic overview. . . . We could sail around for days among these endless little islands without discovering any suspicious vessel, unless we happen by pure chance upon the channel where it lies at anchor” (8).85

---

85 „Wenn man nur hier irgend einen höher gelegenen Punkt hätte, von dem man einen Überblick gewinnen könnte . . . Wir können noch tagelang zwischen diesen zahllosen Inselchen umherfahren, ohne irgend ein verdächtiges Fahrzeug zu entdecken, wenn uns der Zufall nicht gerade in den Kanal führt, in welchem dasselbe vor Anker liegt“ (8).

159
The captain of the *Daphne* in Harry Collingwood’s *The Congo Rovers* (1886) is also on the hunt for a slave ship known to cruise the waters at the mouth of the Congo. But the tangle of tributaries and the general swamp-like environment makes it difficult to gain a perspective of the countless bays in which the ship could be hiding. The captain tells his young British companion, Dick Hawksley: “Come, Mr. Hawkesley, you are the youngest, and ought therefore to be the most active of the trio; give us a specimen of your tree-climbing powers. Just shin up aloft as high as you can go, take a good look round, and let us know if you can see anything worth looking at” (101-2). Here, Dick’s youthfulness makes him stand out amongst the crew as the best able to climb the tree to complete the needed survey. The older men of the expedition wait on the ground while Dick completes the essential survey of the land. But unlike Dick, Erhardt in Deutsche Marine am Kongo und in der Südsee does not need to be asked to put his agility and energy to use for the good of the mission. When he volunteers to climb a tree to also gain the essential panoramic overview, the captain agrees, remarking, “I’d send up one of our [native] people, but you can’t always rely on their reports, should they actually discover something” (8). Clearly, these two young Anglo-Europeans serve their captains not just by being able to climb the tree, but also by knowing what to do when they get to the top—by knowing how to accurately survey, carefully record the view, and report it back to the captain.

Nonetheless both boys’ knowledge of tree-climbing comes from having learned the techniques of Congo and Cameroon natives. Erhardt, explaining his climb through the voice of the narrator, plainly acknowledges his source: “I did it as I’ve often seen

---

86 „Ich hätte schon einen unserer Leute hinaufgeschickt, doch kann man sich auf deren Berichte nicht immer verlassen, sollten sie ja etwas entdecken“ (8).
Negroes in Cameroon do it—braced my feet against the trunk, held fast with my hands, and clambered up like a monkey” (8). While Erhardt uses a technique that he admits is directly copied from the natives, Dick is not so fortunate. He had difficulty determining how to scale his tree, which has a very broad, fifteen-foot girth. He must be further trained in how to climb his tree by his second lieutenant. The second lieutenant shows him how to bind some vines together to make a large loop around himself and the tree trunk. Using this loop as a support, Dick then wedges himself up the length of the tree. While the lieutenant does not acknowledge where he himself learned the technique, it is most likely that he also picked it up while working in the Congo area, where his ship has been commissioned. But by the time the knowledge is passed down to Dick, the origins of the information have been almost entirely erased. A quick comparison of illustrations on the next page, however, demonstrates the similarity of technique between Dick and a generic native of Cameroon.

But more important than even how both these young Europeans learn the technique is how they are identified in the narrative with their ability to climb trees. Both young European men are represented as “monkeys.” Erhardt—perhaps in his youthful naïveté—has no problem associating himself with monkeys, or sharing that association with Cameroon natives, but the designation of “monkey” in The Congo Rovers (1886) is quite negative. It comes about when, early on, Dick fails at his first, uninformed ascent of the large tree. He claims it is because there are no “ratlines” (the transverse pieces of rope that form a rope ladder to help sailors navigate the bulwarks of a ship); the second lieutenant chides him: “Ratlines, you impudent young monkey! . . why, an active young

---

87 „Ich machte es, wie ich öfters von Negern in Kamerun beobachtet, stemmte die Füße gegen den Stamm, hielt mich mit den Händen fest und kletterte wie ein Affe in die Höhe“ (8).
Illustration 6:

Tree-Climbing Technique Comparison

Please note illustrations are not original size. The illustration on the left is a detail of the far right.

Unter den Palmen von Bagamojo, Carl Falkenhorst (1894)
From the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz

In Kamerun, Carl Falkenhorst, (1887)
From the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz

Congo Rovers, Harry Collingwood, (1886)
From Davis Library, UNC Libraries
fellow like you ought to make nothing of going up a spar like that” (102). In fact, both young men discover that tree-climbing is much harder and slower than they expect—“it was no easy feat,” exclaims Erhardt. “It took a good ten minutes before I reached the crown; I was dripping as though emerging from water and not a little exhausted” (8). Dick explains: “when we reached the tree it became evident that the task of climbing it was not likely to prove so easy as the skipper had imagined” (102). They find that not only do they need specific training on how to climb trees without any lower branches (such as palm trees), or trees with wide trunks, but that this skill requires specific knowledge from the local natives.

While in the midst of an adventure, these white protagonists and writers are hesitant to acknowledge their connection and dependence on the African native, but it becomes harder to deny in other novels that aim to present at least some of the features of the land and people of Africa in addition to the action and adventure. Carl Falkenhorst’s books acknowledge some of the essential skills that the natives possess that become crucial for the Anglo-European colonizer. He writes of natives in Cameroon: “It’s interesting to watch how the Blacks clamber up the high trunks. A strong elliptical form made of woven palm leaf stems is laid around the trunk and tightly tied. The climber leans back against this hoop, face toward the trunk, braces himself with his feet against the trunk, and climbs up; it goes slowly” (40-1, In Kamerun, 1887). This technique is

---

88 “Es währte doch gut zehn Minuten, bevor ich die Blätterkrone erreichte. Ich war wie aus dem Wasser gezogen und nicht wenig erschöpft” (8).

suspiciously very identical to the one the second lieutenant teaches Dick in *The Congo Rovers*.

Consequently, the young adults of these adventure novels are not simply miniature versions of their white fathers, nor are they carbon copies of the natives. They learn from the natives to climb trees and then move beyond them by conducting a detailed survey that both earns them the praise of their white fathers, and too, moves them towards becoming the superior colonizer. But through their development, we discover the skills of the African population that are essential to the colonizing mission, but whose native origins become repressed. In fact, white colonizers need the skills of climbing difficult trees as well as the agility and physical prowess of youth in order to even get to use their surveying knowledge to survive in Africa.

**Defining Difference by Taking the Dive**

Anglo-German adolescents also learn from natives how to handle dangerous animals of sub-Saharan Africa. Adventure novels are filled with scenes of daring feats that require amazing physical skills and completed by natives who act as the white man’s guide into the interiors of Africa. Only by exaggerating the physical aspects of the feat and lessening the skill needed to complete the task can the white reader accept these amazing feats of the black natives. But the developing young adolescent gains important animal-handling knowledge from these natives that help him to survive the African climate. The young adult in the text learns by copying the native, and then using the same action to distinguish himself from the native by accentuating his affective and logical abilities. Critic Abdul JanMohamed (1986) writes: “By subjugating the native,
the European settler is able to compel the Other’s recognition of him and, in the process, allow his own identity to become deeply dependent on his position as master” (85). Thus, while the young man attempts to reassert his superiority with these special abilities by the end of the novel, the very act of having learned these skills from the native both puts into question this superiority as well as reasserts his reliance on his African companions.

When Otter, Leonard’s faithful black dwarf companion in H. Rider Haggard’s The People of the Mist (1894), is forced to do battle with the Water Dweller, a giant, mystical reptile, he asks himself, “And how can I, who am but a common Knobnose dwarf, do battle against the king of evil spirits, clothed in the shape of a crocodile?” (275). Yet it is in fact because Otter believes that the animal is a spirit that he is driven to the amazing battle. Although more fantastic, Haggard’s battle between Otter and the Water Dweller is otherwise very similar to countless portrayals of natives battling crocodiles in other adventure novels. For instance, Igubo in W.H.G. Kingston’s In the Wilds of Africa (1872) completes a stunning act of revenge on a crocodile that has eaten his expedition’s pet monkey, Chico. Igubo dives into the water, wrestles, and guts the crocodile from the side with his knife, as illustrated on the next page (245).

Niam of Karl Burmann’s In the Heart of Africa (1878) also exhibits his prowess by killing the crocodile that ate Mungo, a native boy. Interestingly, Burmann uses the exact same illustration as Kingston to portray this feat. But as much as this feat of bravery and prowess amaze their European bystanders, they are at the same time horrified, because Igubo and Niam are motivated by revenge—a “baser,” non-Christian affective response. Andrew, the young British narrator of In the Wilds of Africa (W.H.G.
Kingston, 1872), tells the reader that he “could not refrain from crying out, and entreating
[Igubo] to come back” after seeing him dive into the water after the crocodile, “but he
paid no heed to me, and swam on” (244).

Illustration 7: Frontispiece from W.H.G. Kingston’s In the Wilds of Africa (1872)
From Davis Library, UNC Libraries (photo by Tom Nixon)

And when the natives are not exhibiting super-human, even animalistic qualities
in these texts, then they are guilty of inaction—or of not displaying the “higher” affective
quality of selflessness. In Carl Falkenhorst’s Weißbart, Weichherz (1888), Suleika, the
local native princess, loses her three-year-old in the crocodile-infested river near the
village. She screams for help, but none of her fellow native villagers, who had previously
been hunting the crocodiles in the river, moves to rescue the boy (101). Ultimately it is
Whitebeard, the German, who performs the noble deed, demonstrating not only his
prowess and bravery, but also his “soft heart.” In a similar vein, Frank, in G.A. Henty’s
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By Sheer Pluck (1880) knows exactly what to do when observing the struggles of a soldier in the nearby Gaboon river. Henty writes that the young British officer “at once threw off his Norfolk jacket [and] plunged into the stream. . . .[then] Frank speedily came upon the alligator, and finding its eyes, shoved his thumbs into them. In an instant the creature relaxed his hold of his prey and made off, and Frank, seizing the wounded man, swam with him to shore amid the loud cheers of the sailors” (315).

Hence the action of jumping into danger to either kill a savage beast or rescue someone from a savage beast is a common trope in such adventure novels, that serves to both solidify the young European adult’s reliance on the natives as well as to distinguish him from the natives, as he develops throughout the narrative. Benninghoff-Lühl (1983) reminds us that as the Anglo-European colonial endeavor shifted from mere exploration to establishing lucrative markets in colonial goods and slaves, the distinction of the native as an uncorrupted, but wild, “noble savage” of the jungle was no longer adequate. “With the expansion of trade these traits are no longer seen as virtues. The savage must demonstrate more useful qualities in order to be acknowledged as a human being at all” (66). The shift away from identifying natives as noble savages simultaneously created the space for white Anglo-Europeans to find a way to suggest their own superiority. The juxtaposition of the Anglo-German protagonist’s performance with the native’s performance thus distinguishes the adolescent from the native through his affective capabilities—none of the white youths are motivated by revenge; they are motivated instead by the “selfless” desire to save someone else. And yet the actions and the skill of the native remain with the protagonist even as he moves beyond them—the black, native
Other is intimately integrated with the white, European Other in the binary construction, which is revealed only at moments when the binary is tested.

One such moment is in G.A. Henty’s *With Kitchner in the Soudan* (1902). Gregory, stationed at a machine gun on a gunboat traveling on the Nile, notices a woman flailing helplessly in the water. He instinctively jumps into the river to save her, only to realize that he won’t be able to regain the gunboat as a result of his actions. At that moment, Zaki, Gregory’s faithful black servant, jumps into the river after him. Henty writes: “Within ten yards of him was a black head, and a moment later Zaki was beside him. He had been working at Gregory’s Maxim [a machine gun], and had *suddenly missed his master*. Looking around he had *seen him struggling with the woman* in the stream, and *without hesitation* had leap* overboard*” (emphasis mine, 162). But instead of praising Zaki for his bravery, extraordinary loyalty, or at least acknowledging that Zaki makes the exact same mistake as him, Gregory chastises the native: “I’m sorry you came,” he tells him, “for it is only throwing away your life” (162). In fact, Zaki’s actions allow Gregory to skip over acknowledging his own mistake and turn directly to reprimanding Zaki. Later, when General Kitchner learns of what happened and finally chastises Gregory as well for abandoning his post, the reader has a chance to juxtapose Gregory’s motivation with Zaki’s. Zaki, having followed his master into the water, clearly appears to have simply mimicked Gregory’s actions—thus making it appear that Gregory is more noble and selfless, because by jumping first, he demonstrates that he is not just repeating someone else’s actions. But the possibility that Zaki, too, wanted to save his master and/or save the woman, which is clearly suggested when he sees both his master *and the woman* in the water, is undermined by Gregory’s comments and the
narrator himself, who describes Zaki’s actions instead as simply instinctive with the words “suddenly” and “without hesitation.”

The Henty historian and critic Leonard Ashley suggests that because “the Mother Country [Britain] did not have to deal with the natives close up, as the settlers did . . . [she] could afford the luxury of liberal ideas and the illusion that these ‘children’ [of Henty’s adventure novels] were capable of thinking and acting like ‘grownups’” (247). Yet it is clear in this, one of Henty’s last novels, that it is precisely the adolescent’s close association with the native—if only of the imaginary type—that gives him the ability to act “like a grownup” at all in these texts.

Unifying the Self out of the Chaos of Others

The process of turning the adolescent into an adult colonizer requires a self-reflexive working out of identity in relation to the colonial Other which, simultaneously, reaffirms a culture’s coding of both the Anglo-European and his Other. In other words, as the Anglo-European adolescent learns to define himself as good and the colonial project as worthy, the Other becomes simultaneously bad and unworthy, thereby reaffirming racial typing. Kathryn Castle (1996) writes:

Securing youth into the imperial ethos involved both positive identification with Britishness and a distancing from the undesirable ‘other.’ Images of race created to satisfy imperial prerogatives therefore answered deeply felt needs in the population as a whole, and were a testing ground for their own strengths and weaknesses. The complementary nature of the projection of national identity and the process of self-definition strengthened the impact of racial imagery in this era. (8)

The encounter of the young adult protagonist with natives reaffirmed each other’s racial identity according to Anglo-European norms, but it also provided the adolescent with the
opportunity to work out his individuality and personal worth in the context of an assumed tribal chaos. The adolescent’s involvement with tribal politics throughout his journey thus helps to unify his own sense of self, if at the cost of unduly projecting the image of natives and tribal relations as in a state of disarray.

The typical adventure novel structure is centered on freedom of movement that first allows for interaction with the chaotic native Other and then swiftly moves away from it to reaffirm and resume the unity of the European identity. In most British novels, groups of explorers, naturalists, hunters, traders, or even stranded boat passengers travel through Africa only temporarily in these novels—they take notes, survey, collect specimens and bounty, and exchange goods with the natives, but the objective is usually to exploit Africa and return to the homeland. To remain in Africa would risk not just one’s health, but also succumbing to its supposed chaos. Whether it is slave trading, tribal feuding, cannibalism, or savage animals, Africa’s greatest danger is that it will trap the Anglo-European and disintegrate his united self both physically and psychologically. Hence, at one level, the tribes that the Anglo-Europeans encounter along their journey are perceived as dangerous because they literally want to “trap” them—keep them bound in service to the tribal chief. In Kingston’s novel, In the Wilds of Africa (1872), a local chief delights in going hunting with his British companions, because their superior guns bring him an abundance of game. As a consequence, however, the chief resists their request to move on. “In vain I [the young British protagonist Andrew] protested against being detained, and made signs that we were determined to go, whether he wished it or not. This made him [the native chief] very angry, and . . . we feared that, should we really make the attempt, he would use force to prevent us” (292). In order to escape the
tribe, then, the two young British men leave the camp very early in the morning when the villagers are still recovering from the previous night’s revelries.

While some chiefs, like the one in Kingston’s novel, want to detain their Anglo-European guests in order to capture more food, for many others, they want these white men to help them to regain the upper hand over their neighboring tribes. Thus, the British or German is required to upset the balance of power between tribes which, while relatively equal in most cases, also fuels the cycle of violence and revenge killing, as one tribe does not have a clear advantage over the other. Consequently, the young adolescent, as he faces the chaos and disunity of tribal warfare for the first time, develops a sense of united self as he learns to manage the tribal interactions. Perhaps the most famous example of the Anglo-European’s role in the reestablishment of order out of tribal chaos is in King Solomon’s Mines (1885) by H. Rider Haggard. The British bring both the source of chaos (the true heir to the throne) with them and are at the same time the decisive factors that resolve the civil war that breaks out as a result. In preparation for battle, Infadoos, their native guide, tells the amassed warriors of the Kukuana tribe: “the white lords from the stars, looking down on the land, had perceived its trouble, and determined at great personal inconvenience, to alleviate its lot” (344-5). From their position as surveyor-of-the-land, then, the British restore the rightful king to the throne with their superior fighting skills and weapons, and thereby create a whole, united tribe again. Thus, the development of surveying skills, from those gained by climbing a tree to those gained by technological or even “mystic” advantage, has its practical as well as metaphorical uses for the development of the young adolescent into an adult colonizer.
In fact, these adolescents need intra-and extra-tribal strife in order to develop their leadership and management skills as they take on the roles of doctor, judge, or general, depending on the needs of the situation. The most typical role for which these youth train in these books is that of military leader. For both Dick of *The Congo Rovers* (Harry Collingwood, 1886) and Erhardt of *Deutsche Marine am Kongo und in der Südsee* (Eginhard von Barfus, 1892) mentioned already, this is the ultimate outcome of their development throughout the novel, from tree-climber to military leader. Both Dick and Erhardt leave their respective ships with their superiors and a select number of soldiers on a mission that will call them from their passive position, as follower, into a commanding role. Dick is instructed to go with a lieutenant to survey the mouth of a river in preparation for an attack on a slave ship. But instead, his ship is attacked by a group of natives, and when his lieutenant is severely wounded in the skirmish, Dick assumes command of the group of soldiers. Similarly, Erhardt, whose boat has been ordered from the Congo to the Bismarck Archipelago in the Pacific, is sent on a mission to survey a tribe of Papuans, in preparation for “punishing” them for having attacked and killed everyone on board a German merchant ship. But a foiled surprise attack on the Papuans leads to the death of many of the German soldiers, and the severe wounding of the others, including the captain. Erhardt remains the only able-bodied officer. The narrator explains the significance of the situation:

In the middle of the wilderness; far away from any kind of help; in constant danger from attack by savages who, despite their losses, might with the help of their tribal mates easily be able to muster again a significant overpowering force; the impossibility of turning back with the seriously wounded over the impassable, mountainous stretch of land
through the incinerated villages to our boats: all of this was almost too much for the head of a nineteen-year-old young man! (97)

Nevertheless, Erhardt manages to hold out through the night, against additional attack by the natives, to rescue his wounded comrades the next day. Similarly, Dick, far from the mother ship, must organize his comrades and supplies in order to survive against the continuing onslaught of the natives. They hole up in a makeshift fort and take turns on watch. Dick explains: “then ensued an anxious time indeed for all of us, and especially so for me, upon whom rested the responsibility of directing what steps should be taken for the safety and preservation of the little force under me” (322). But the natives are out-strategized by Dick’s mustering of his troops, and they also make a fatal error in not taking advantage of their exhaustion, for the night passes quietly and rescue comes the next day. Both Dick and Erhardt now have moved from mastering the skills needed for climbing trees, or for saving drowning victims from crocodile attacks, to taking charge in a crisis. Mastering the skills of natives ultimately propels them into being able to further distance themselves from the natives as they assume command in an adult and colonizer-like fashion. But the solidifying effect that assuming command has on these European youths is only possible by exaggerating the chaos and danger of the natives.

While in adventure novels, the unification of the self leads only to the establishment of the adolescent as a leader at the conclusion, in Carl Falkenhorst’s novels, this tension between chaos and creation of individuated self takes on more significant meaning. In Der Baumtöter (1894), for example, the proper management of
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90 “Mitten in der Wildnis, von allen Hilfsmitteln weit entfernt, der Gefahr ausgesetzt, von den Wilden jeden Augenblick angegriffen zu werden, die sich trotz der erlittenen Verluste leicht mit Hilfe ihrer Stammesgenossen zu einer bedeutenden Übermacht wieder sammeln konnten, die Unmöglichkeit, mit den Schwerverwundeten über den unwegsamen, bergigen Landstrich nach dem eingeäscherten Dorfe zu unseren Booten zurückzukehren, alles das war fast zu viel für den Kopf eines neunzehnjährigen jungen Mannes!” (97)
tribal disorganization has much larger consequences for the Anglo-Europeans’ colonial business ventures and ultimately for the training of the German adolescent in effective colonial administration. When young Hans Ruhl arrives in Cameroon territory (the story takes place before official colonization), he forsakes his apprenticeship in cocoa plant management for the lure of higher profit in rubber export. In the process, however, Hans quickly realizes that in order for his business in the export of rubber to succeed, he must rely on the natives to show him where the rubber plants are as well as bring them to him and prepare his rubber supply for market. But in order to get the natives to work with him, he must supply them with the only commodities they want: guns, powder, and ammunition. One particular native, Ekoë, in fact only desires to take revenge for his tribe on the neighboring tribe for having razed his entire village. Instead of sparking a local economy fueled by the desire for European goods, then, Hans learns that his enterprise only accelerates a tribal feud.

For a while, Hans takes the position of a typical trader who profits from the tribal instability and cycle of revenge killing by supplying Ekoë with his desired weapons and ammunition. Hans develops his business and his own identity and perspective of colonization from this relationship. But it does not last long. Ekoë and some of his followers seize control of a crucial trade and communications passage in the hills and kill a few native traders. With their vital communications and freedom of movement compromised and the tribal feud reignited, Hans and his older European planter/father figure, nicknamed “Treekiller,” must intercede to restore peace in the land. Consequently, Hans decides that interacting with the natives at this stage in the development of the colony is unwise and he chooses to return to the life of a planter,
where, like his planter/father, he can remain separate from the natives. “On the edge of
the forest the public from Buëa, Sopo and Mapanja [the local villages] were arranging a
victory party. Treekiller didn’t like it amongst the warriors—he climbed back down to
the Criollo valley [where his plantation resided] and [Hans] followed him” (157). The
German planter refuses to mingle any more with the natives so as to avoid getting further
involved with tribal disagreements and risk losing his freedom of communication and
movement. And instead of creating order of the chaos in Cameroon tribal relations
through capitalism and thereby establish himself as a trader/exporter, Hans, the young
German adolescent, retreats to a type of business he thinks will distance him from the
natives and their “problems.” At the conclusion of the novel, the narrator informs us:
“Ruhl no longer sought to convince the Bakwili of his friendship; in reality he loathed
them” (159).

Thus, the book proposes that the temporary solution to the problematic chaos
(until the military arrive and law and order are established) is to remain separate from the
natives, but this decision promulgates a false sense of security based on the
reestablishment of the binary. In fact, the land that Treekiller has acquired on which to
create his cocoa tree plantation is actually Ekoë’s former village. Thus, what goes
unacknowledged throughout the entire unfolding of the story is the real possibility that
the supposedly “innocent” planter’s land played a significant role in the flare-up of tribal
warfare in the first place. The silence surrounding this important gap in the text and the
fact that both Hans and Treekiller need the native population to work for them on their

91 „Am Rande des Waldes veranstalteten die Aufgebote von Buëa, Sopo, und Mapanja ein Siegesfest.
Baumtöter litt es nicht unter den Kriegern, er stieg hinab in das Criolloval, und Ruhl folgte ihm“ (157).

92 „Ruhl suchte nicht mehr, die Bakwili von seiner Freundschaft zu überzeugen; in Wirklichkeit
verabscheute er sie“ (159).
plantations belies their attempt to ultimately fix the binary as it existed before and deny the interrelationship of colonizer and colonized in Cameroon, even before colonization.

The similarity of tropes and narrative progression in the books described here point to the overall role of the adventure novel in playing with the binaries of colonizer/colonized, white/black, and adult/child for the benefit of the Anglo-European sense of self embodied in the developing adolescent. The instruction of the British and German adolescents throughout the course of the novel illustrates how the young male figure at times enhances the colonial objectives by supporting the separation of the white father from the black child. But the role of the adolescent also reveals moments when the colonizer is dependent on, and in fact inseparable from, the colonized.

The juxtaposition of British and German texts in this chapter also illustrates the working out of another, larger self—the developing national and colonial identity of a newly unified Germany. The fact that several of the plots of German texts discussed here bear uncanny resemblance to British ones only reinforces the reflexive nature of the British and German relationship during this time, as these German writers worked out their new nation’s relationship with its neighbors in the shadow of an older brother, and Britain reconsidered the colonial context in light of this new imperial upstart. And while these German texts replicate much of the style and structure of British adventure novels, they do at least concentrate more on the particularities of the African regions under German control than the British. Thus while Harry Collingwood’s The Congo Rovers (1886) takes place at the mouth of the Congo only, Eginhard von Barfus’s Deutsche Marine am Kongo und in der Südsee (1892) moves north to the German-controlled Cameroon territory and then to the Bismarck Archipelago in the Pacific, as if to
literally—and literally—claim these areas away from the British. In such a manner, the authors of these books seem to continue with the same fantasy of their young protagonists as they create an imaginary space for Germany and its colonies—even if it is at the continued expense of Central Africans, fictional or otherwise.
CHAPTER IV

A (W)Hole History: Caverns and the Construction of Spiritual Adolescence

In her book, *Imagining Africa: Landscape in H. Rider Haggard’s African Romances* (2001), Lindy Stiebel reveals how the subtext of Haggard’s works shape the imperial discourse of the African adventure novel as much as the overt actions of the characters. She references Edward Said’s distinction between manifest and latent Orientalism, suggesting that land is perhaps the most important “imaginative arena” where the effects of latent Orientalism can be viewed. This is even more evident in the works of a writer such as H. Rider Haggard, whose fictional landscape became the most popular image of Africa south of the Sahara for countless Anglo-Europeans during the late nineteenth century, and whose novels also served as a model for other works about Africa. Stiebel writes: “the bedrock of a discourse of Africanism—in the sense in which I use the term—is its geography, the land; a land that is physicalised and sexualised by the novel writers in nineteenth-century England who used Africa as their setting” (7). It is certain characteristics of the Africa, in fact, that make the discourse of Africanism different than other colonial and imperial discourses.

Perhaps the most famous of these topographical characteristics is the cave. *King Solomon’s Mines* (1885) brought the mystery and excitement associated with underworlds to a colonial context, but it was Haggard’s repeated use of the cave in subsequent novels that made the cave one of the most popular metaphors of African
An underground cave world features prominently in *She* (1887), *Allan Quatermain* (1887), *Allan’s Wife* (1889), *People of the Mist* (1894), *Elissa: The Doom of Zimbabwe* (1900), and *Benita: An African Romance* (1906), to name the most prominent. Haggard’s caves represent a liminal space between the dream world, or fantasy world, and the awake, rational state. Most famously, the underground world geography of *She* influenced Freud’s development of his theory of a layered personality, and inspired Jung’s theory of anima, which he suggested was quite evident from the fervor with which Haggard wrote the book, in a mere six weeks. But it is only in the last several decades that Haggard’s work has been critically examined as imperial fiction. Most recently, Haggard’s African romances have taken on additional scrutiny for their political underpinnings and their portrayal of women, particularly in *King Solomon’s Mines* and *She*. Critics such as David Bunn, Elaine Showalter, Anne McClintock, and Laura Chrisman have suggested that the heroic quest, represented in *King Solomon’s Mines* as a cave journey, is a male-centered myth designed in reaction to the rise of the New

---

93 Explorations revealed several caves of note with which Haggard was probably already familiar, and which he might have even visited during his stay in South Africa. The Cango Caves were known to Anglo-Europeans as far back as 1790 (Middleton and Waltham 18). In the nineteenth century, the Sudwala Caves in the Transvaal were rediscovered by “Samcuba” or “Somquba,” relative of the Swazi king Sobhuza I, as he was fleeing his brother Mswati II. Formed about 240 million years ago, the Sudwala Caves are now known as the oldest caves in the world (“Sudwala Caves”). Another set of caves, the Sterkfontein and Wonder Caves northwest of Johannesburg, were discovered in the 1890’s. Outside of South Africa, few other significant cave structures have been found on the continent, with the exception of those in East Africa and Ethiopia, where smaller caves made of volcanic rock have been located. The continent appears to have significantly fewer caves than other continents. Modern geologists suggest this may be due in part to the scarcity of karst (limestone) deposits (Middleton and Waltham 18). Other speleologists argue that Africa has not been considered cave-rich because few have looked for them, particularly in Central Africa (Swart 82).

Woman in Victorian and Edwardian culture. They have suggested that the journey to and through the cave can be likened to an exploration of the female body. Critics such as William Scheick and Shannon Young\textsuperscript{95} have, like Stiebel, read Haggard’s sexualized landscapes for the displaced presence of women in African adventure novels and the creation of a homosocial, if not homosexual, world outside of the bounds of Victorian society.

But part of the problem with reading caves and African landscape only for their sexual and psychic characteristics is that it gives the impression that these unconscious sexual drives dominate nineteenth-century imperial discourse; and that they are, as well, characteristic of a pan-European image of Africa at this time. Referencing Patrick Brantlinger’s (1988) metaphor that “Africa grew ‘dark’ as Victorian explorers, missionaries, and scientists flooded it with light,” Rebecca Stott (2001) suggests: “as this mythologized landscape [of Africa] becomes dark it also becomes distinctly feminized in this period” (150). But can we draw from only one particular British writer this general conclusion that all colonial landscapes were sexualized and feminized? Even if we allow for the enormous impact H. Rider Haggard’s writings had on adventure novels on an international scale, they do not speak for other European experiences of Africa. At the time of Haggard’s greatest success, King Solomon’s Mines, the European powers and America had just concluded the Berlin Conference, the result of which had not only put Africa in the headlines, but had reinvigorated general interest in colonization, particularly for the Germans, who had sponsored the conference in the first place. The newly united

Germany had just succeeded in establishing its own first few colonies in Africa, and the newspapers and media in Germany were full of speculation on the future of colonization. Imagining about African exploration and colonization was therefore not something that Haggard or the British were doing by themselves.

In fact, within just two years of the publication of *King Solomon’s Mines*, Carl Falkenhorst came out with his second book, but first in a three-part series he would call *Ein afrikanischer Lederstrumpf* (1888-89). In *Weißbart, Weichherz* (1888), Falkenhorst uses a cave structure around which to center the plot and characters of the book; however, the function and significance of Falkenhorst’s cave differs widely from Haggard’s. In fact, the title asks his readers to parallel the series to the more famous earlier set of adventure novels written about Native Americans by James Fenimore Cooper, called *The Leatherstocking Tales* (which was and still is very popular in Germany). Taken together, though, Falkenhorst’s *Weißbart, Weichherz* in comparison with Haggard’s novels helps to provide a more nuanced picture of how Europe viewed Africa during this time through the lens of the cave journey metaphor.

Caves in and of themselves were also fascinating to Anglo-Europeans in the nineteenth century for what they revealed about the past—both the past of humans themselves as beings and their cultural past. Earth’s history became more and more
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96 The first German translation of *King Solomon’s Mines*, by M. Strauß, was not published until 1888, the same year Falkenhorst had published *Weißbart, Weichherz* (1888). Considering the fact that Haggard’s novel was an instant success and that Falkenhorst did keep himself abreast of British youth trends (he wrote an article in 1890 for *Die Gartenlaube* entitled „Das Jugendspiel“ on the British public school system’s emphasis on physical education for youth), it is very possible, and even probable, that he did read it in English, considering the similarities in plot structure. E. Peschkau, the *Gartenlaube* reviewer of youth book selections for the 1888 Christmas season, does not note these similarities, although he mentions both publications together (807).

97 The celebrated discovery of some bones of a Neanderthal man in Düsseldorf in 1857 sparked a revitalization of Anglo-European interest in the ancestors of modern man (Van Riper 132). By the time
important to late nineteenth-century scientists once human history was linked to
geological time with human fossils. Yet once linked together, earth’s and mankind’s past
also became more and more questionable to nineteenth-century scientists the more they
realized how extensive the history of both really was. Tim Murray (1993) writes that:
“During the course of the nineteenth century scientists began to debate the age of the
earth (and the extent of human antiquity) in units of time which had hitherto literally been
unimaginable, and for many practitioners they remained that way” (175). The further
that human history stretched back, the more scientists, and writers interested in
archeology and anthropology like Haggard, desired to “fill” that history to account for
Anglo-European actions during that time. Haggard’s biographer, Morton Cohen (1960),
points out the British writer’s personal fascination with the archeology and anthropology
of the day, sparked in part by his friendship with anthropologist Andrew Lang. Cohen
writes:

He [Haggard] firmly believed that the past held the answer to the riddle of
the present and the future; if one could understand the past, one could
understand life. In primitive cultures lay the answers to universal
problems, and in the wisdom of ancient times were eternal truths to
enlighten us today. His search for ultimate meaning lay behind his
attachment to the past, and his deep interest in primitive life and early
cultures later led him to write the books some critics have called the
romances of anthropology. (104)

Haggard’s caves are archeological sites where the novel’s white adventurers can explore
history as well as the present unknown landscape in the depths of Africa. By inventing a
history of a great white civilization in Africa of which latter-day black Africans are

---

British geologist William Pengelly discovered flint tools underneath three to eight inches of stalactite
containing the remains of extinct animals at Brixham cavern in 1858, it was established, although with
continued debate, that humans existed before extinct animals, or a Biblical flood (90-2). These events
kindled widespread Anglo-European interest in cave hunting in the late nineteenth century to find
additional artifacts that would corroborate or disprove the Brixham cave findings (Marsden 42). Then
Marcelino Sanz de Sautuola’s discovery of the magnificent cave paintings in the Altamira Cave in Spain in
1879 seemed to be the final piece of evidence linking prehistoric man with caves.
ignorant, Haggard adds another dimension of control over them by marshalling history for his own and for Britain’s purposes.

The geography of the cave therefore reveals a temporal dimension in a spatial realm. The cave suggests to nineteenth-century Anglo-Europeans a journey to the prehistoric past through archeological findings. A temporal dimension is suggested by the very structure of the cave. Most caves are not just holes in a cliff or in rock—they are more complicated structures with several chambers and pathways. Their complicated geography depicts the uncertainty of a physical and metaphorical journey into the past. But this underground world will still maintain an overall linear trajectory from cave opening to cave end, regardless of where that path may ultimately finish. The cave is an underground world to the characters, just waiting—perhaps asking—to be explored.

This linear trajectory through the cave moves the explorer from daylight into darkness, and usually back into daylight. It is for this reason that caves have traditionally been associated with the realm of the dead and of the underworld. Archeologists were also finding in caves important bones of prehistoric ancestors that were preserved much better than had they been exposed to the climatology of the region in general. Passage through caves has deep symbolic meaning stemming back to the very origins of human mythology itself. Voyages through the depths of the earth have taken on naturalist and spiritualist significance, particularly in Greek mythology, as a metaphor for the changing of the seasons (Persephone’s visit to Hades) or a trip to the underworld to challenge death, such as Orpheus’s journey to bring Eurydice back to the realm of the living or Hercules rescuing Theseus as one of his tasks. Some suggest that Christ’s bringing Lazarus back from the dead or even Christ’s resurrection itself is an example of a
katabasis. This katabasis, or descent into a particular geographical area, has remained an important feature of myths over time, and their literary reincarnations. Caves feature in 1001 Nights and in early European folklore. Dante’s Divine Comedy (1308-21) and Mozart’s The Magic Flute (1791) are more recent adaptations of the underworld and cave journey motif, as well as Jules Verne’s Journey to the Center of the Earth (1864).

Burgeoning interest in the myths of man in the nineteenth century also helped fuel this view of the cave as gateway to the underworld as anthropologists like E.B. Tylor in Primitive Culture (1871) speculated on cultural trends to support his theory of animism, or a universal religion. Tylor suggested that the association of caves with the dead reflected a doctrine of future life at an early stage in civilization: a “subterranean Hades” was “the wrong side of another heaven, which covers another earth below, whither the dead will go down to their new life” (152). Thus caves once again were associated with primitive peoples—not necessarily the prehistoric kind, but what many Anglo-Europeans viewed as the prehistoric in modern times—the “savage” civilizations, one group of which were the native black Africans. “Among the lower races, the tendency to localize the region of departed souls above the sky seems less strong than that which leads them to place their world of the dead on or below the earth’s surface” (157).

Pointing out that these “lower races” are drawn to the concept of an underworld, whereas higher civilizations placed their spirits above the skies, Tylor maps the hierarchy of civilizations according to earth’s zones.

Primitive peoples began to associate caves with death, Tylor also suggests, because they patterned the path of the sun through the course of a day with the course of

98 German anthropologists such as Adolf Bastian and Rudolf Virchow disagreed with Tylor’s evolutionary model of civilization, suggesting instead a theory of cultural relativism. This important difference will be discussed later in the chapter.
a human life. “It is by the simplest poetic adaptation of the Sun’s daily life, typifying Man’s life in dawning beauty, in mid-day glory, in evening death, that mythic fancy even fixed the belief in the religions of the world, that the Land of Departed Souls lies in the Far West or the World Below” (134). The journey through the cave, then, also symbolized the passage from birth to death of a man’s life. Escaping the cave was a test of life, the survival of which confirmed the youthfulness of the adventurer, and by proxy, the rejuvenation of the adventurer’s cultural standing. Consequently, the cave represented more than just the sexualizing of African landscape or the depths of the multi-layered psyche of the human, but a journey of cultural discovery that was carried out at an individual level.

In fact, what is missing from analyses of Haggard’s caves as either sexualized “bodyscapes,” a reworking of Victorian man’s place in relation to the New Woman, an engagement with psychic realms of the mind, or a spiritual transition, is how these anxieties caused by antinomies of past and present, birth and death, man and woman, darkness and light, for example, are worked out in the construction of the “spiritual adolescent” via his rite of passage through the cave. The paralleling of individual with cultural merit through cave exploration similarly reveals how the individual, whether as the character who moves through the cave, or the reader traveling with the character, is fashioned through the same discourses that structured the Anglo-European vision of cultures. Both character and reader are thus subject to these antinomies, whether they are young characters with a “hint of gray hair,” or older adventurers that act like “little boys,” or whether they are the “Big and Little Boys” to whom Haggard had dedicated King Solomon’s Mines or Falkenhorst’s audience of “young and old” (“jung und alt”). In fact,
Cohen suggests that Haggard’s novel was an even bigger success than Robert Louis Stevenson’s *Treasure Island* (1883), on which Haggard patterned *King Solomon’s Mines*, specifically because he did not limit his narrator or the focus of his audience to the boy; rather, he encouraged both adults and young people to pick up his book (89). In Haggard’s novel as well as in the adventure novel in general, antinomies between young and old, past and present, and birth and death are worked out in the reader and character’s shared rite of passage through the cave and their successful adoption of a “spiritual adolescence.”

In attempting to illustrate the broader Anglo-European fascination with origins, manipulation of history for colonial purposes, and fear of death represented in the construction of a “spiritual adolescence,” then, this chapter examines the most well-known of Haggard’s African adventure novels (and in particular *King Solomon’s Mines*) with several of Carl Falkenhorst’s novels, but most centrally *Weißbart, Weichherz*. The function and significance of the elaborate cave construction of *Weißbart, Weichherz*, in comparison to cave structures such as those of *King Solomon’s Mines*, *Allan Quatermain*, and *She* put into sharper relief the characteristics of Haggard’s novels that are more distinctly British and/or representative of Haggard’s individual personality. While Falkenhorst’s cave reveals a similar fascination with archeology and anthropology, his emphasis on personal and religious redemption and the lack of an overt sexual landscape distinguishes Haggard’s sexual and psychic cave metaphors as uniquely personal and perhaps more representative of Victorian culture.

By juxtaposing the construction of the “spiritual adolescent” with the structure of the cave itself and the Anglo-European construction of history, the latent Africanist
temporal paradigm of progress that structures the entire fictional world becomes more apparent. By embodying an awareness of linear time and cause-and-effect—of how the past is connected to both the present and the future—the characters in the novel demonstrate personal characteristics that are supposedly culturally superior and that the readership should emulate. As “spiritual adolescents,” Anglo-European readers and characters cultivate the ability to bridge time while being themselves evidence of the progressive development of cultures once this ability is acquired. Spiritual adolescents as hybrids that bridge past and present into the future, that conquer a fear of death and stasis by bridging the divine with the secular world, thus make the temporal scheme of the novel seem plausible. They give meaning to the notion of “youthfulness” by reacting against a fear of both aging and naïveté. Consequently they, by their very construction and function, tap into a fundamental fear of Anglo-Europeans: for the British, being too “old” for the new imperial game; and for the Germans, being too young, or too naïve to parent another geographical space. By personifying this awareness of childhood and old age, past and future, in the present moment, adolescents ultimately demonstrate the nineteenth-century Anglo-European need to understand and control time itself.

**Creating History through the Cave Journey: The Spiritual Archeologist**

Anglo-European understanding of nineteenth-century Central African culture was closely linked with their changing views of prehistory. These two concepts coalesced in the metaphor of the cave in late nineteenth-century adventure novels about sub-Saharan Africa. The fictional realm of the cave allowed a space for these adventure novel writers to both speculate on the past of mankind as well as simultaneously speculate on the
nature of latter-day native black Africans as the characters of the novels, both African and Anglo-European, interacted within the depths of the cave.

Up to the early nineteenth century, the prehistoric past of man was relatively unknown to Anglo-Europeans. The dominant theory of the history of man in Britain came from the story of the flood and Noah’s ark in the Bible, from which theologians and scientists alike extrapolated that man’s past was short in comparison with the history of the planet. William Paley, in his *Natural Theology* (1802) argued that man had only been on earth at most six thousand years (22-3). While the newest archeological and anthropological discoveries in the early nineteenth century began to suggest that man was present before the presumed date of the Flood over six thousand years ago, it was Charles Lyell’s *Principles of Geology*, published 1830-33 that really put forth the most significant critique of Diluvialism. Lyell suggested that the geological structures of the earth had been formed not by the catastrophic, one-time-only events marked in the Bible, but by processes that were still going on in the present day. This work influenced John Lubbock’s *Prehistoric Times* (1865), which firmly accepted the existence of a human past outside of Biblical time constraints. Lubbock suggested that archeology was the “link between geology and history.” But while doing away with Biblical time constraints, he continued to link natural phenomena and human development to a model of historical progress with the help of Charles Darwin’s *Origin of Species* (1859). Thus, by the time of E.B. Tylor’s *Primitive Culture* (1871), the theory of cultural progress based upon an evolutionary model had become the most prevalent theory of history and culture in Britain. It was also the basis of the British understanding of contemporary African culture south of the Sahara.
But while British anthropology was so closely bound with Biblical history and later with evolutionary theory, German anthropologists kept themselves apart from these influences. The early anthropologists such as Adolf Bastian and Rudolf Virchow formulated anthropology in Germany as an attack on the long-established tradition of humanism by focusing on the “quantity” of cultures not the “quality,” which humanism fostered by advocating the study of the “elite” ancients. By establishing anthropology as the study of all the *Naturvölker* (natural peoples) as a way of learning about *Kulturvölker* (cultured peoples), but without suggesting that civilized peoples formed out of natural peoples, Bastian based the discipline on a cultural relativism that did not fit with evolutionary theory. In Bastian’s *Das Beständige in den Menschenrassen* (1868) and *Die Cultur und Ihr Entwicklungsgang auf ethnologischer Grundlage* (1871), Klaus-Peter Koepping observes: “he insists that any attempt to put diverse cultures on a hierarchical ladder of high or low, according to the scheme of some evolutionists, is futile. He also cautions against trying to divide the world into savage and civilized peoples” (17). Both Bastian, in his review of Tylor’s *Primitive Culture*, and Virchow, in the preface to his translation of Lubbock’s *Prehistoric Times*, keep quiet about both authors’ arguments regarding evolution, while still praising the presentation of information (Zimmerman 49). Matti Bunzl and H. Glenn Penny write of Bastian and Virchow: “Instead of the creation of evolutionary hierarchies, they advocated large-scale research that would chart the specificities of all the world’s peoples, followed, in turn, by a determination of those aspects of human life that were truly universal” (11). While British anthropologists studied modern non-European “primitives” to determine an overall evolutionary structure to the development of mankind, Germans studied *Naturvölker* (at least in the initial stages
of anthropology in pre-1890’s Germany) to fulfill their cultural pluralist and liberal objectives of developing the self through learning about “natural” peoples.

Even though the names for the study of prehistoric peoples in both Germany and Britain, called “Vorgeschichte,” and “Prehistory,” implied a progressive notion of history marked by the acquisition of language, for German anthropologists “primitives” were not, as they were for the British, peoples at an earlier stage of development, but peoples who existed in harmony with (or close to) nature (Naturvölker) and who were not yet corrupted by “civilization.” Zimmerman explains: “Whereas primitives were the earliest actors in a narrative that also included Europeans, Naturvölker were, by definition, excluded from the narrative of progress central to German self-understandings. Indeed, German anthropologists appeared reluctant to identify their own ancient forebears with contemporary non-European societies, despite their view that both groups were essentially identical natural peoples” (50). The central differences between German and British anthropologist’s views of native non-European peoples, then, centered on nature and time. The Germans kept a stricter divide between nature and culture, keeping their own past culture separate from nature, and also separated their conception of time according to that divide. “Natural peoples” existed outside of time, whereas progressive time belonged strictly to civilized, cultured peoples. Zimmerman continues: “In Germany, both historians and anthropologists viewed nature—and therefore natural peoples—as fundamentally separate from history, narrative, evolution, and even time. . . . Conceptually connected to cultural peoples but simultaneously part of nature, natural peoples provided what German anthropologists hoped would be a position outside the historicity in which traditional humanists had trapped themselves” (51). For the British,
contemporary Africans lived in a time before history and at the beginning of the evolutionary arc of civilization, regardless of whether they had remained there, in stasis, for time immemorial, or had regressed to that state from an earlier, more advanced state. For Germans, Naturvölker such as Africans literally inhabited a place outside of time and outside the reaches of civilization.

But whether or not Africans were in cultural stasis as a part of nature, or at the bottom rung of civilization, they were portrayed in adventure novels of the late nineteenth century as having little or no awareness of history or of time. The fictional Central African worlds of Carl Falkenhorst and H. Rider Haggard are thus isolated microcosms physically and temporally cut off from the rest of the world to enhance the fantasy element of the adventure, but also to provide justification for the Anglo-European’s intervention. Unable to improve without contact from other lands, if even just to foster trade, these African tribes are portrayed by both Haggard and Falkenhorst as backward and stagnant—susceptible to corrupting outside influences (such as the Arabs) without the protection of white Anglo-Europeans.

The isolation and stagnation of these tribes is enhanced by the imaginary topography of the novel. The Kukuana tribe and what is known as King Solomon’s mines are cut off from the world outside southern Africa by a desert and virtually impassable mountain range. The Zu Vendis realm of Allan Quatermain is only accessible by boat on a narrow, dangerous stream that runs through a mountain, and which will be cut off completely by the end of the novel (Haggard 631). Other natural barriers cut off the inhabitants of mythic central Africa from the rest of the world: In the Sudan, the Sudd swamp, formed out of the White Nile, creates a virtually impassable barrier of papyrus,
hippopotami, and crocodiles for Heinz, known as Whitebeard (Weißbart) in Weißbart.  

Weichherz (1888) to escape the clutches of an Arab slave dealer.

Only a few people had climbed up the mountain range till now, but none had dared go down to the river, for the descent on the far side of the mountain was even more precipitous; jagged rocks fall away for a hundred feet or more. Any risk-taker daring to descend there would have to be on guard every moment not to plummet and land shattered below. These mountains formed a natural barrier which separated the environs of Hassan’s Seriba\(^99\) from the nearby river. \(47\)\(^100\)

The Tsetse fly also creates a barrier, as Mr. Rogers and his boys in Off to the Wilds (George M. Fenn, 1881) resist taking their animals north of the Zambesi River where the fly is prevalent, for fear they will be stranded there if the insect bites and infects their animals.

Cut off from the rest of the world geographically, these African tribes also appear to be cut off from their own past. When Quatermain inquires about the construction of King Solomon’s road and other apparently man-made features of the Kukuana environs, he gets a limited response from Infadoos:

“The road ends there,” he said, pointing to the mountains, known among the Kukuanas as the “Three Witches.”

“Why does it end?” I [Quatermain] asked.

“Who knows?” he answered, with a shrug; “the mountains are full of caves, and there is a great pit between them. It is there that the wise men of old times used to go to get whatever it was they came to this country for, and it is there now that our kings are buried in the Place of Death.”

“What was it they came for?” I asked eagerly.

---

\(^99\) A seriba, more commonly known in English as zariba or zareba, is a fence that surrounds a camp, usually made out of thorn bushes. Seribas were a common means of defense in the Sudan area, particularly in desert areas. Seriba can also refer generally to a fortified camp, as is the case here. Hassan’s fortified camp is named “Seriba,” yet it is located in a forest area.

\(^100\) „Nur wenige hatten bis jetzt die Bergkette erstiegen, aber hinunter zum Strom hatte sich niemand gewagt, denn der Abstieg jenseits des Berges war noch steiler; hundert Fuß und mehr fielen scharfe Felsen ab, und der Kühne, der es wagen würde, dort hinabzuklettern, mußte jeden Augenblick gewärtig sein, daß er stürze und zerschmettert unten anlange. Eine natürliche Schranke waren diese Berge, welche die Umgebung der Seriba Hassans von dem so nahen Flusse trennte.” \((47)\)
“Nay, I know not. My lords who come from the stars should know,” he answered with a quick look. Evidently he knew more than he chose to say (313).

Asking why the road does not end, Quatermain shifts the direction of the question from purely descriptive to one that requires rationalization. Asking why the road ends suggests there must be a reason for the physical phenomenon for which Infadoos must account. Quatermain expects a response based on cause-effect logic—the road is gone because X happened. But Infadoos’s answer betrays the logic of Quatermain’s question. Infadoos responds with another question: “Who knows?” In fact, the answer to why the road ends does depend on “who knows.” Infadoos later references the “wise men of old times,” as those who would know. But this answer is unacceptable to Quatermain and his group, and Quatermain assumes Infadoos must be hedging or have no idea of the road’s history because he answered a baited, cause-effect question in a way that evaded its logic.

Separated so long from the outside world, Quatermain assumes Infadoos and his Kukuana tribe must have also lost the connection with their ancestors and the significance of the man-made structures that they live amongst. When Quatermain probes further, Infadoos confirms he has a very vague notion of the tribal past, ultimately responding to Quatermain “coldly:” “I am but a child and cannot talk with my lord on such things” (313). Quatermain himself appears to be suspicious that Infadoos is really that ignorant of the past, further enhancing the reader’s amazement at this little timeless region in the middle of such a vast land.

The cave journey thus begins with the journey to the cave. By placing the cave in the middle of obscure and isolated geography, Haggard, and other adventure novel writers like him, superimpose on the topography the anxieties they have about the search
for their own history and culture by making those of the Central Africans’ difficult to encounter. Stiebel (2001) writes: “Haggard’s inventiveness knew no bounds in the construction of obstacles to be conquered, as they always are, in his African romances. On one level, the journey is an arduous physical one in which several African helpers may lose their lives, and on another level it is a psychological test of nerves for the Englishman” (66). The hardship the Anglo-Europeans encounter on their journey to the center of Africa makes the journey more meaningful to them—if African culture and history is so difficult to find, their mission of discovery highlights their ability to connect the past with the present as well as place themselves within that history.

Haggard also contributes to the portrayal of the native Central Africans as unconnected with their own past by misrepresenting the origins of archeological ruins in sub-Saharan Africa. Haggard’s idea for Ayesha’s stone and earth realm in She, or even the ancient monuments around King Solomon’s mines was most likely sparked by a rumor he heard while in South Africa about the building remains found at Great Zimbabwe of the Munhumutapa Empire (also called Monomotapa Empire), now known to have been built between the eleventh century and the fifteenth century by a migrating Bantu tribe (Cohen 109). Such rumors were undoubtedly fed by Adam Renders’ initial discovery in 1868 and then reports of German archeologist Karl Mauch’s limited exploration in 1871, who first proposed that the buildings were constructed by a white race (Cohen 108 and Malley 284). Even two decades later and several years after Haggard’s publication of King Solomon’s Mines (1885) and She (1887), British archeologist J. Theodore Bent continued the misnomer by speculating that the ruins were

101 Having come across a local guide book that suggested he based these books on the Zimbabwe ruins, Haggard later denied any direct connection, stating that he “only heard in the vaguest way of the Zimbabwe Ruins, and not at all of the famous caves in East Africa” during his time there (qtd in Stiebel 28).
of Phœnician or Babylonian origin; the true black African origin not firmly established until the mid-twentieth century. By claiming that the magnificent ruins his characters come across are products of a bygone “white” civilization, such as the Greeks, Phœnicians, Babylonian, or even Jews, Haggard questions that the natives of Central Africa have a culture, let alone a history. This mere speculation translates in Haggard’s adventure novels into the more general theory that Africa is full of great ruins and that current Africans are living in timelessness, disconnected from their great (white) past.

Allan Quatermain writes in King Solomon’s Mines:

A country like Africa . . . is sure to be full of the relics of long dead and forgotten civilisations. Nobody knows the age of the Egyptian civilisations, and very likely it had offshoots. Then there were the Babylonians and the Phœnicians, and the Persians, and other peoples, all of them more or less civilised, to say nothing of the Jews whom everybody ‘wants’ nowadays. It is possible that they, or any one of them, may have had colonies or trading stations about here. Remember those buried Persian cities that the Consul showed us at Kilwa. (49)

The fact that all of the “long dead and forgotten” civilizations that Quatermain mentions here are not black Africans suggests that only these outsiders were ever capable of starting civilization on African soil, and these attempts ultimately even failed at that.

“The desire this strategy expresses,” Stiebel remarks, “is a validation of the British presence in Africa, for if foreign civilisations had once established themselves in Africa, then a historical precedent had been set for Britain to do likewise” (96). Assigning history to what appear to be man-made ruins becomes an early means for Quatermain and his travelers to assert control over the population. Mawuena Kossi Logan (1999) suggests, to the contrary, that this need to control the ownership of the ruins illustrates the

---

reverse: “The archeological findings in Zimbabwe—proof of ancient civilizations worthy
of respect—might have posed a serious threat to the assumed superiority of British
civilization” (150).

The discovery of archeological and anthropological artifacts is also an important
motivation of the Germans in Weißbart, Weichherz (1888), although not to the same
extent as those in King Solomon’s Mines (1885). In Weißbart, Weichherz, Hassan, the
ex-patriot Frenchman turned Muslim, discovers the real “treasure” of a cave in the
Sudan—pots, pans, and utensils from what they presume were the previous inhabitants.
Yet their presumptions do not lead them to conclude these ancestors are either white or
part of an ancient non-African civilization that migrated here. They see little need to
disassociate the native black Africans from the artifacts as a means of justifying their own
place in history. Rather, they investigate the remains as a window into another culture’s
activities. They immediately connect the artifacts with the local Dinka tribe. Hassan
exclaims: “On the first day already [of their cave inhabitance] . . . it occurred to me the
Dinka had housed themselves here for weeks, that they probably must have left tools
behind which we could use quite well now” (143-4).103 In fact, at no point does either
Hassan the Frenchman or Whitebeard, the central German protagonist, ever consider the
artifacts as anything other than the products of native black Africans, although they both
fantasize that their discoveries mirror some of the great archeological discoveries of
ancient civilizations. In contrast to Haggard, whose in-depth knowledge of African tribes
was based primarily on the Zulu, Carl Falkenhorst gathered his knowledge from
extensive research of nineteenth-century explorers’ and anthropological reports. Just four

103 „Schon am ersten Tage . . . war es mir eingefallen, daß die Dinka hier wochenlang hausten und daß sie
wohl Geräte zurückgelassen haben mußten, die wir jetzt sehr gut brauchen konnten” (143-4).
years after Weißbart, Weichherz, Falkenhorst would publish a three-volume, six hundred page plus history of the tribes and noblemen of Africa entitled Schwarze Fürsten (1891-2). While Falkenhorst’s depictions are perhaps less imaginative, they at least provide a deeper understanding of Central African tribes that does acknowledge a native history as understood by latter-day anthropological and archeological studies.

Falkenhorst’s interest in native black tribes of sub-Saharan Africa, such as the Dinka, clearly spills over into his fictional work early on, in the exuberance with which Hassan and Heinz comb the cave for these archeological artifacts. Hassan tells Heinz of his feelings the moment he discovers these magnificent objects: “A scholarly man lifting precious urns from the rubble of Pompeii can hardly feel more joy than I experienced then” (145). He even begins to fancy himself an archeologist:

Meanwhile, since you weren't back yet, I did some archaeological studies. I observed the jugs and pots, without handles, cleaned them of the bat dirt and was able to discern the ornamentation. Triangles and zigzag lines come to light everywhere on them. (145)

Hassan studies the artifacts for their similarities to try and draw some conclusions about Dinka culture from the past. Hassan even discovers an iron kettle, quite a significant find when one considers that anthropologists and archeologists were still debating whether or not the iron age had occurred in Africa, where, and when. Some anthropologists suggested tribes in Central Africa imported iron from Europe and could only make basic

---

104 „Ein Gelehrter, der aus dem Schutt in Pompeji kostbare Urnen hervorholt, kann schwerlich mehr Freude empfinden, als ich damals empfand“ (145).

105 Da du noch nicht zurück warst, machte ich unterdessen archäologische Studien. Ich betrachtete die henkellosen Krüge und Töpfe, reinigte sie von dem Schmutz der Fledermäuse und konnte die Ornamente erkennen. Ueberall kommt in ihnen das Dreieck und die Zickzacklinie zum Vorschein. (145)
iron pellets for flintlock guns. Hassan’s discovery of an iron kettle disputes such theories about the ancestors of natives in Africa. Instead, the iron kettle causes Whitebeard to speculate: “There must be a complete Dinka economic industry [Wirtschaft] hidden within the caves. Where there are iron kettles there must also be iron spatulas leaning in a corner somewhere” (146). The archeological discovery causes Whitebeard to consider the economic development of the Dinkas—the artifacts thus substantiate the presence of Dinka history.

Extensive knowledge of the reports of African explorers and missionaries, however, does not absolve Falkenhorst from resorting to some of Haggard’s same paradigms. Having acknowledged that the Dinka tribe at least has a history before the presence of Anglo-Europeans in Africa, Hassan reports the “conclusions” of his archeological study: “The Dinkas’ forefathers had bought the pottery from the neighboring Bongos and the kettle comes from a Bongo smithy as well. The culture has not progressed at all here in decades. The water jug here resembles the one brought here like one egg resembles another. . . . Jugs of oil like this one here stand even today in the homes of the Dinkas and your Suleika [Whitebeard’s servant] putters around with such frying pans” (145). With just a few words, Hassan thus takes away the Dinka’s cultural heritage by claiming they did not make their own pots and jugs. He claims the

---


107 „In den Höhlen muß eine ganze Dinkawirtschaft verborgen sein. Wo es eiserne Kessel gibt, da müssen auch eiserne Spaten irgendwo im Winkel lehnen“ (146).

actual techniques to construct and design the jugs were borrowed from the nearby Bongo tribe (one egg resembles another), and even suggests that the pots that require metalworking, such as the iron kettle, were literally transported to the Dinka’s, since the Dinkas could hardly have knowledge of such technology on their own. Hassan’s reversal regarding the origins of the cave artifacts thus demonstrates the same type of rhetorical manipulation of native black tribes through the controlling of history. While Falkenhorst may have had extensive book knowledge of Africa, and Haggard a six-year real experience of South Africa, neither experience is sufficient to change the cultural paradigms that orient both worlds.

The purpose of the journey to the cave and in the cave has been at one level, then, an archeological exploration to discover and then to manipulate history. As characters like Quatermain, Sir Henry, Good, Whitebeard, and Hassan work to connect the past with the present, so too, does the novel itself encourage the reader to perform the same kind of synthesizing. Haggard provides his readers with a map to King Solomon’s mines and with a picture of the Sherd of Amenartas, Leo’s ancient Egyptian ancestor in She (1887), so that the readers can do the archeological work themselves as they follow along in the narrative. Morton Cohen (1960) writes that Haggard took extra pains to ensure that the map appeared as authentic as possible by having it drawn on linen and in real blood (91). While Falkenhorst does not provide a map or other pseudo-authentic “artifacts” to analyze, he provides his readers with plenty of ethnographical and geographical details to study. In such a manner, the reader is encouraged to take on the role of a spiritual archeologist in the bridging of past and present through the interpretation of the artifacts. The Anglo-European spiritual archeologist both discovers the existence of the past in
these caves as well as interprets that history correctly for the native black Africans, in so
doing, refiguring his own cultural self in the process.

**The Passage of Time: Finding Life through Facing Death**

There are physical ways in which the cave is a marker of time—through the
artifacts it contains and through its natural geological processes. But the cave also marks
time metaphorically as a symbol of the passage of human life. Passing into the darkness
of the cave suggests a retreat from the life-giving sun, and a journey into the realms of the
underworld or the spiritworld—the land beyond the living. Entering a cave meant, in this
metaphorical sense, approaching or challenging death, or the loss of rational
consciousness, even stasis, which symbolized the end of human existence—at least in
physical form. The loss of light as one moved from outside to inside the dark cave that
has no natural, or integral, light source like the earth and humans have the sun, was
representative of this change of life. Thus, as much as the cave connected readers to past
civilizations through artifacts, it also **literally** connected the reader to the past through
representatives of the human past: the dead. Entering the cave meant coming close to
Death and even risking your life both physically and spiritually as a consequence; it was
therefore one of the most crucial tests of individual character, cultural standing, and even
the will to live itself.

For Victorians, poised on the brink of a new century, the journey to and through
the “heart” of Africa also meant reaching for life-sustaining nourishment that would
revitalize their aging empire in the face of stiff competition from abroad. The journey to
the so-called “origins of life” represented metaphorically the opportunity to reinvigorate
oneself and one’s culture in order to face the challenge (or fear) of rising global competition for colonies. Gerald Monsman (2000) observes: “Like the native, the European must go to the land, must discover the natives’ wealth, not in the form of diamonds but as a power of rebirth, renewal. This is the fundamental mythopoetic hook on which Haggard hangs his heroic quest” (281). Yet Quatermain, Sir Henry, and Good’s eventual escape through a back shaft of the mine, exhausted and worse for the journey, puts in question their ultimate success in individual and cultural renewal. While for Germans the journey to Africa truly meant a cultural rebirth through the establishment of their first colonies, for the British, the impending competition meant that more was riding on their journey to find rebirth in the cave.

Quatermain conveys the spiritual import of King Solomon’s mines immediately when he likens the cave to a cathedral: “Let the reader picture to himself the hall of the vastest cathedral he ever stood in, windowless, indeed, but dimly lighted from above . . . and he will get some idea of the size of the enormous cave in which we stood, with the difference that this cathedral designed of nature was loftier and wider than any built by man” (384). This “natural cathedral” clearly is awe-inspiring to Quatermain and consequently to his readers, but it does not cause him to reflect on his spirituality; rather, he reflects on its awesome size in comparison to human-made structures. Its construction literally leaves him “speechless:” “It is impossible for me to convey any idea of the overpowering beauty and grandeur of these pillars of white spar, some of which were not less than twenty feet in diameter at the base, and sprang up in lofty and yet delicate beauty sheer to the distant roof” (384). While clearly the size and space of the chambers
register on the viewers, it is also the cave’s sublime beauty that leaves them speechless—language fails to describe what is beyond verbal representation.

In fact, at conflict within Quatermain and his companions as they travel through the mine is their urge to “experience” the cave through their senses and to resist succumbing to their fantasies and fears of the place. Yet Quatermain’s instincts undermine his attempts at supplanting them with reason, and the more he attempts to rationalize the cave, the more fantastical and magical it becomes. Wendy Katz (1987) explains: “Latent spiritualism is sparked into life by the irrefutable experience, and the experience becomes the basis for truth . . . Haggard, with formula in hand, sets up his own anomalous mobile laboratory, as it were, and goes to work testing skepticism, science, and materialism, only to have them overcome by the potency of the spirit (120). The more Quatermain denies his need for a spiritual connection in the mine, the more the mine becomes magical and the more the journey itself becomes important as a means of connecting the secular and scientific realm with the spiritual.

The other-worldly aspects of the Cave of Spirits in Weißbart, Weichherz are also quite apparent from the outset, enhanced by the fact that all the information that Whitebeard knows about the cave has been gathered from the gossip of the village which has turned into legend over time. Whitebeard reports the information he has gathered:

People [of the Dinka village] told of the enormous caves at the end of the gorge, which could accommodate many people and entire herds of cattle. Decades earlier, in times of war, the Dinkas had more than once escaped with all they owned into that ravine and its cavities and had successfully defied their overpowering enemies at this narrow entrance. But one time, as they sought refuge in the caves, they found them to be inhabited by evil spirits, and these caused many people and cattle to perish. Hardly any men or women emerged from those tombs alive; the oldest among them who knew of the access had long since died, but a pious respect for the spirits remained in the tribe, and even the bravest dared not set foot in that
“Gateway of Death,” as they called the entrance to the gorge, let alone dared penetrate the “Cave of Spirits.” (49)

Like Haggard, Falkenhorst immerses the origins of the Cave of Spirits in mystery—most Dinkas have no knowledge of how the cave was used by their ancestors. All they know is that it is a place to be feared that is inhabited by “evil spirits.” Only the few remaining older members of the tribe might possibly remember why the cave developed such a reputation, and even then why the Dinkas began to believe them to be inhabited by evil spirits is still unclear. While Haggard’s Quatermain probes Infadoos about the history of King Solomon’s mines, highlighting Infadoos’ resistance to questions that expect cause-effect answers, Falkenhorst’s Whitebeard merely omits the reasons why the cave became associated with spirits. He does not question directly, at least at this point, the Dinkas’ decision-making process, stating simply: “they found them to be inhabited by evil spirits.” It was the evil spirits, however, that caused many people and cattle to perish, which in turn made the Dinkas, at least as reported by Whitebeard, fear for their lives when near the caves: “Hardly any men or women emerged from those tombs alive,” Whitebeard reports. Later, when Whitebeard does find a chamber within the cave that contains many dead bodies of the Dinka, Whitebeard’s analysis, in retrospect, becomes crucial. Considering the fact that there is some justification to the Dinka’s association of the cave with death, does the fact that (according to Whitebeard) the Dinkas turned this

109 Die Leute erzählten, daß am Ende derselben sich gewaltige Höhlen befänden, die viele Menschen und ganze Rinderherden beherbergen können. Vor Jahrzehnten zu Kriegszeiten hatten sich die Dinka mehrmals mit Hab und Gut in jene Schlucht und jene Höhlen gerettet und an dem schmalen Thor siegreich den Angriffen übermächtiger Feinde getrotzt. Aber einmal, als sie in jenen Höhlen wieder Rettung und Heil suchen wollten, fanden sie dieselben von bösen Geistern bevölkert, und diese brachten ein großes Sterben über Menschen und Vieh. Kaum einige Männer und Frauen waren lebendig aus jenen weiten Grüften hervorgekommen; die Aeltesten, die den Zugang noch kannten, waren längst gestorben, aber eine heilige Scheu vor den bösen Geistern erhielt sich im Volke, und selbst der Mutigste wagt nicht, in das „Thor des Todes“, wie man den Eingang zu der Schlucht nannte, den Fuß zu setzen, geschweige denn in die „Geisterhöhle“ vorzudringen. (49)
association into an actual fear of dying mean they extrapolated the fear from the presence of the evil spirits, or did Whitebeard associate their reverence for the dead with a fear of dying?

The correlation between caves and death is obvious in these texts, but, as illustrated above, this association is a precarious one fraught with additional, sometimes unintentional, meaning. The Kukuanas refer to King Solomon’s mine as the “Place of Death,” where their former kings are buried, and the gateway, already mentioned above, through which Whitebeard has to pass in order to get to the Cave of Spirits is, in fact, called the Gateway of Death. Thus, the caves of both King Solomon’s Mines and Weißbart, Weichherz symbolize meeting death face-to-face. And as if the legends of the local Dinka tribe were not enough, Whitebeard actually meets Death himself in the form of a dressed-up skeleton as he enters the Cave of Spirits: “He already stood at the verge of the very personification of Death. He needed only to reach out his hand, to touch it, and he wanted to touch it, wanted to knock it down, to banish the rest of the stark dread creeping into his heart. He literally wrestled with the gruesome phantom itself in this moment” (65). Death looms large before Whitebeard, getting in the way, both literally and metaphorically, of his journey through the cave. The skeleton both blocks the passageway and also serves as a warning as he begins his travels to a realm beyond life.

Death represents both a challenge to the life that Whitebeard’s youthfulness represents (the opposite of birth), and also suggests stasis. Stasis for Whitebeard is something negative—in his world where progress means everything, stasis means lack of

---

110 „Er stand schon dicht vor der wahrhaftigen Personifikation des Todes. Er brauchte nur die Hand auszustrecken, um es zu berühren, und er wollte es berühren, wollte es umwerfen, um den Rest der blassen Furcht zu bannen, die sein Herz beschlich. Er rang in diesem Augenblick wirklich mit dem grausigen Phantom“ (65).
development and lack of development means cultural and individual stagnation. Thus, what Whitebeard fears the most is that he might catch his “death” from the skeleton the more he stops to gaze upon it: “He stood there a minute as though turned to stone, it seemed to him as if he were looking into a mirror and it were feigning a death mask instead of his own countenance” (65). Whitebeard fears being turned into stone—being petrified—or being frozen in time. To be frozen in time, or out of connection with the past and the future, is to Whitebeard the ultimate death, because it would represent both an individual and a cultural death. In fact, Whitebeard cannot proceed into the cave until he knocks down the carefully propped-up skeleton.

Quatermain and his companions also encounter death within King Solomon’s mines in a way that challenges their notions of linear time. It is not the discovery of the bodies of the Kukuana tribe’s former kings inside the cave, nor how these kings died, that shocks the European travelers so much as how this tribe, and for that matter, how the cave, treats death—for the flesh on the bodies inside the cave does not decay, the bodies do not further disintegrate into dust. They are suspended in their death state through the geological processes of the cavern. Quatermain notices with some horror the process as it starts to work on Twala, the most recent king to be left in the chamber:

Over the whole surface of the corpse there was gathered a thin, glassy film, which made its appearance yet more appalling, and for which we were, at the moment, quite unable to account, till we presently observed that from the roof of the chamber the water fell steadily, drip! drip! drip! onto the neck of the corpse, from whence it ran down over the entire surface, and finally escaped into the rock through a tiny hole in the table. Then I guessed what it was—Twala’s body was being transformed into a stalactite. . . . This was the way in which the Kukuana people had from time immemorial preserved their royal dead. They petrified them. (387)

111 „Eine Minute lang stand er wie versteinert da; es war ihm, als ob er in einen Spiegel schaute und dieser ihm anstatt des eigenen Antlitzes eine Totenmaske vortäuschte“ (65).
This petrification process thus turns the kings of the Kukuanas literally into stone—it returns them to a natural, but non-human state. But unlike being turned into dust, from which life can be born anew, the stalactites of the Kukuana kings remain suspended—unable to be reborn or able to change and grow. For the Anglo-European explorers, temporal stasis in the form of mummification, or petrification, meant both individual death and cultural stasis, and even perhaps opened up the possibility of regression.

Stasis also meant a loss of connection between the past and the present. And clearly Haggard suggests that just such a loss of connection has happened to the Kukuanas, for even though all their ancestors are buried in the secret chamber in the Place of Death, hardly any of the tribe knows about the place. Ignosi, having finally taken his place as the new king, is not able to recount much about the chamber to Quatermain. “There, too, in the Place of Death is a secret chamber, known to none but the King and Gagool,” Ignosi remarks. “But Twala, who knew it, is dead, and I know it not, nor know I what is in it” (377). Ignosi, in fact, does not enter the mines with Quatermain, preferring to take care of his tribe in the environs of the cave system, perhaps also fearing that to enter it might mean his own death.

The Cave of Spirits that Whitebeard enters is also a graveyard. Only instead of suffering the slow petrification process as a result of dripping water, the bodies in the Cave of Spirits are covered with guano. Whitebeard has stumbled upon a burial chamber of the Dinkas from which the skeleton at the entrance of the cave came. “He beamed the light, found bones everywhere, skeletons peering from out of the masses of guano. Surely the Dinkas, overwhelmed by the great Dying-off, had laid their dead to rest here”
Whitebeard must journey through the chamber of skeletons to reach the exit of the cave. In the darkness, all he can see is a faint phosphorescent glow. “Perhaps something was decaying there in the passageway, and the mold was giving off a deceptive phosphorescent glow [appearance]” he tells himself (70). While the phosphorescent glow turns out to be daylight streaming from the distant exit, Whitebeard at first must come to grips with his fears of decay and death to make it through the passage and find this out.

To enter and travel through the cave, then, is to challenge death at some level for these Anglo-European protagonists who prize so heavily their youthfulness and activity. And their adventures do leave a physical mark on their bodies. Quatermain, although already fifty-five, recalls once having escaped being trapped in the mine, that his “stubbly hair came out of that cave about three shades grayer than it went in” (405). Whitebeard, although only in his early twenties, receives a snakebite from entering the Cave of Spirits, which also threatens his life: „The fresh blush of youth no longer graced his cheeks, the pallid color of the haggard face harmonized with the untimely graying of his hair” (76-7). Their challenge is to successfully escape the trap of timeless stasis within the cave and retain their youthfulness and life by exiting, yet they will remain forever marked by the experience of the cave journey. Whitebeard even labels the exit gate at the other end of the Cave of Spirits “Life’s Gate” to further emphasize the sense that the cave structure represents to him transition and change, not stagnation. “Life’s Gate” thus not only

112 „Er leuchtete hin, überall fand er Knochen, Gerippe, die aus den Guanomassen hervorschauten. Sicher hatten die von dem großen Sterben befallenen Dinka hier vor Jahrzehnten ihre Toten beigesetzt“ (67).

113 „Vielleicht verweste dort etwas in dem Gange, und der Schimmel warf seinen trägerischen phosphoreszierenden Schein“ (70).

114 „Das frische Rot der Jugend schmückte nicht mehr seine Wangen, die blasse Farbe des eingefallenen Gesichtes harmonierte mit dem frühzeitig ergraunten Haar“ (76-7).
celebrates overcoming death in the cave, but also overcoming the fear of being trapped in the cave—and in stasis.

The fear of death both motivates the Anglo-Europeans’ motion through the cave as well as forms their own sense of self as spiritual adolescents through facing their own mortality. They demonstrate through their journey and through themselves their need to master time by controlling death, and by coveting youth over old age and childhood. Ignosi remarks at the end of King Solomon’s Mines, “The ways of black people are not as the ways of white men, Incubu, nor do we hold life so high as ye” (336). In fact, Ignosi’s perception is quite revealing. Earlier, when Infadoos had warned his European guests that the kraal of the king was a long journey away, Allan Quatermain retorted: “It is well . . . all time is before us, for we do not die. We are ready; lead on” (305). Quatermain’s claim of immortality is his way of suggesting they (he and his companions) will not be defeated along the journey—they will not ultimately succumb and die. Here their sense of immortality is based on an antagonistic view of time based on a linear structure—it is to be conquered (as if it could be conquered) before it gets them. This view of immortality is very different from the one held by the Kukuanas—that time does not need to be conquered or overcome, because it is cyclical. If life ends, it will eventually rise up again.

Whitebeard is also a character who is interesting for the way in which he embodies, and perhaps synthesizes, the extremes of age. While his birth name is Heinz, Whitebeard picks up his nickname at the beginning of the first installment of Falkenhorst’s series from the natives of the Sudan region, where he is engaged as a hunter for a large export company out of Khartoum. “'Whitebeard' the natives called
him, and the name stuck, though he was still young in years and had not yet celebrated his 24th birthday” (11). Whitebeard’s blonde hair, his Aryan trademark, is the source of his newly-adopted nickname, and yet it takes on quite a different meaning in the fourth chapter of the narrative. On a hunting trip to provide food for himself and the village of Dinkas where he lives, Whitebeard shoots at a group of buffalo. Unfortunately, his shot only angers the buffalo, which come charging at him. With no time to reload and without any landscape features to provide cover, Whitebeard must face the nearest of his attackers. “Whitebeard stared keenly at the bull closest in front of them into his sparkling eyes. He did not move and the steer stood still, too, as though cast in iron. Whitebeard didn’t blink an eyelash, though the few short seconds seemed an eternity to him. Eye to eye—he’d never faced off with an enemy this way before” (31). He stares at the bull, “eye to eye,” and eventually the bull walks away, apparently stared down. “Only later did he [Whitebeard] learn, later the mirror showed him: in that fearsome moment when he'd grappled eyeball to eyeball with the steer, his hair had turned gray, and it remained gray all his life. . . . He had actually become Whitebeard” (32). Although only twenty-four, Heinz retains this marker of his courage, experience, and presence of mind—grey hair—for the rest of his life.

115 „‘Weißbart’ nannten ihn die Eingeborenen, und der Name Weißbart war ihm geblieben, obwohl er noch jung an Jahren war und noch nicht seinen vierundzwanzigsten Geburtstag gefeiert hatte” (11).


This symbol of physical old age, instead of representing the end of life, represents instead Whitebeard’s experience despite his young years. But his grey hair also does represent his old age—not of physical years, but of perhaps spiritual and cultural years. He becomes a father figure to practically all the natives he comes across on his travels in Africa, arranging marriages, teaching farming, hunting, and other life skills, and acting as tribal judge. Has Whitebeard traded in his cultural trademark, the blonde hair that linked him to his Aryan roots, for this symbol of wisdom, age, and character? Most definitely not. Instead, he inhabits both at the same time, bridging the cultural as well as temporal divide with his “white hair.” By inhabiting both Aryan characteristics and moral characteristics at the same time, Whitebeard defies death, yet also upholds a sense of cultural superiority based on progressive time for the civilized.

While Quatermain is perhaps not the unifying character that Whitebeard is, other Haggard characters do represent this quality. Leo of She (1887) literally symbolizes the cultural superiority of Anglo-Europeans by representing their connection to great ancient civilizations, in this case Egypt. Malley (1997) writes: “The study of the past for these Englishmen is a profound act of self-discovery. In Leo’s blood flows, as it were, the experiences of much of Western culture. This nineteenth-century English explorer represents the culmination of culture diffused from the dawn of civilization” (281). Leo’s father explains to his friend, Holly, one of the reasons why it is so important the right guardian for Leo be chosen: “Listen; this boy will be the only representative of one of the most ancient families in the world, that is, so far as families can be traced. You will laugh at me when I say it, but one day it will be proved to you beyond a doubt that my sixty-fifth or sixty-sixth lineal ancestor was an Egyptian priest of Isis, though he was
himself of Grecian extraction, and was called Kallikrates” (She 9). If Leo loses his life through the mismanagement of his guardian or for any other reason, then he takes with him, at least according to his father, one of the last connections to the great Egyptian and Grecian past. By suggesting that such a connection between Egyptian, Greek, and British culture exists, Haggard implies that British culture not only has developed over many thousands of years, but that it developed out of other clearly advanced cultures, such as the Egyptians and Greeks. If time is linear and cultural development progressive, then British culture stands at the pinnacle of these other great empires. Leo, his very physical make-up, and his bloodline connects nineteenth-century Britons with a fictional glorious past, and in so doing, represents the cultural superiority of the British now and into the future.

Journeying to and through the cave, then, meant these adventurers and their readers were taking on Death itself—not only the possibility of their own mortality, but of the preeminence of the British Empire, and even Anglo-European culture itself. David Bunn (1988) observes what he considers two historical “threats” to the nineteenth-century romance out of which Haggard’s novels arise: the overabundance of adventure stories being published, and the excessive competition for colonies. This second threat meant: “the ‘free’ exotic space demanded by laissez-faire discourse, and needed as a context for romance, was eroded steadily as imperialism made inroads into the tropics” (23). In this sense, it becomes clear why the cave journey reemerged in late nineteenth-century imperialist discourse and became a popular metaphor—the cave symbolized the threat of the collapse of wide open spaces waiting to be explored. In the period after the Berlin Conference, these “virginal” lands could no longer be promised to Anglo-
European colonizers. They would have to fight each other and fight the land to get it. Logan (1999) remarks, ironically, that “Instead of ‘law and order,’ we could say that it was European ‘tribal’ wars that led to the formal partition and conquest of Africa in the nineteenth century—wars that still continue today in industrialized, therefore ‘civilized,’ nations in various, but not so obvious, forms (xiv). Faced with such a rise in “European tribal wars,” it becomes even more imperative that the next-generation colonizer embody the experience and knowledge of a wise, old culture with the courage and the stamina of the young to keep on progressing into the future. By uniting knowledge with spirit in bowels of the earth, or even in the depths of the female body, these adventure novel writers were taking the battle to the origins of life itself.

A Return to Origins: Gagool and Aka’s Temporal and Cultural Threat

Since the mid-1980s, critics such as Sandra M. Gilbert, Susan Gubar, Elaine Showalter, and Rebecca Stott118 have explored the role of women in Haggard’s texts, centering their analysis on the infamous character Ayesha from She (1887). They suggest that the portrayal of women and the feminized landscape in Haggard’s texts are symptomatic of the Victorian male explorers’ anxieties about the New Woman. While these critics expand upon Mary Louise Pratt’s static view of African landscape as a virgin paradise waiting to be explored, the result of the Monarch-of-all-I-survey trope she describes in Imperial Eyes (1992), more recent critics, such as Rebecca Stott (2001), have

---
opened up the analysis of Haggard to illustrate that women in his texts are a source of fear as much as they are either romanticized or sexualized. She writes:

Where the landscape is feminized in colonial discourse, it is not always described as a virgin. Sometimes, when the landscape represents a threat to the explorer its femininity is demonized (seducing femme fatales), or when the explorer imagines himself as a scientist the landscape is desexualized (corpse-to-be-dissected) and when this happens the oscillations between types of femininity create significant tensions and ambiguities. (153)

If, as some critics have suggested, the cave represents female genitalia, then cave exploration equates to a confrontation at the most symbolic and intimate level of the power of woman to give birth to man and to create life in general. This journey to the origins of life sets up an antagonism between man and woman, as these Victorian men confront the regenerative power of the womb that, instead of expelling them, now seems to enclose and capture them. Along these lines, Stott argues: “as the journey progresses the position of mastery over this giant body simply cannot be sustained. Landscape is gradually revealed to be a kind of incestuous, potentially cannibalistic and monstrous mother. The imperialist fantasy of consumption is replaced by the nightmare of being consumed” (155). In Haggard’s text, Gagool, the shriveled old native woman, becomes their guide on this journey and thus literally, as well as metaphorically, represents Quatermain, Sir Henry, and Good’s nemesis.

But the fact that Falkenhorst’s villain is a young male pygmy while Haggard’s is a shriveled old black woman, Gagool, however, puts Haggard’s fearful women into context and suggests that the sexualized nature of Quatermain, Sir Henry, and Good’s journey to origins is one that is a predominant Victorian preoccupation, and less-so a pan-European one. In fact, David Bunn (1988) argues that “though the equation between woman’s
sexuality and Africa is used as a point of reference for the male subject, this is not to say that all subjectivity always dramatizes itself in this way” (25). Gagool and Falkenhorst’s Aka demonstrate together that, of uppermost fascination, to both Victorian and Wilhemine culture, was a fascination with origins—both the origin of man as well as the origin of mankind—not necessarily gender politics. Gagool and Aka, an old black African woman, and a young male Aka pygmy, respectively, are threatening to the Anglo-Europeans because they have special knowledge of the origins of mankind and they represent time and culture as non-progressive. They are the nemeses of these spiritual adolescents because they possess a special knowledge of caves that makes them dangerous, yet because of this knowledge, they are also integral to the success of the Anglo-Europeans’ journey. Both Quatermain and Whitebeard need Gagool and Aka, respectively, to guide them through the cave system, and yet they resist and even fear them while in the process of needing them.

Native African women in both Haggard and Falkenhorst’s novels possess special knowledge of the history of their tribes that makes them revered religious figures of their village, but mysterious and even threatening to Anglo-Europeans. The most famous of these female religious figures is Haggard’s Gagool from *King Solomon’s Mines*. She holds a significant degree of power within the Kukuana tribe as advisor to the king and even has demonstrated that she can remove and instate kings at her will. But her power does not just arise from her close proximity to the leadership—she is feared and respected for her knowledge because it transcends present time. She is the only one of the tribe who knows anything of the history of Solomon’s road and the mine. She is therefore the only one of the Kukuana tribe that does not need these British adventurers to “parent”
her. In contrast, it is she who has the ability to teach them—she has the gift of prophecy. At the court of Twala, Quatermain and his group are introduced to her and her king for the first time. After Quatermain exhibits his skills at shooting, Gagool begins to speak: “Listen, all things that live and must die! Listen, all dead things that must live again—again to die! Listen, the spirit of life is in me, and I prophesy. I prophesy! I prophesy!”

Here she exhibits her knowledge of life and death and by extension her awareness of all time—past, present, and future. She does so as a direct challenge to Quatermain, who had just demonstrated his own power over life and death with the gun. Gagool then predicts (correctly) that blood will be spilled soon. She intuits that Quatermain and his group are seeking a white person who has not visited their land. She also guesses that they are more after the “bright stones” than the white person, and, finally, she predicts that Umbopa has a secret to reveal. Thus, Gagool challenges Quatermain’s knowledge of life and death: “all dead things that must live again—again to die!” She suggests that death is not the permanent end that Quatermain thinks it might be. She posits an alternative way of considering life and time—not as something with a beginning and an end, but as cyclical.

The African women of Falkenhorst’s books display a similar knowledge of tribal matters that seems to transcend a linear conception of time. Yet, perhaps because Germans viewed African natives as Naturvölker instead of as primitives, they did not find this unusual knowledge nearly as threatening as the British. Suleika of Weißbart, Weichherz (1888) has acquired special knowledge of local spirits from her father, and this knowledge of the spirits means she also has knowledge of the tribe’s past that others lack, which makes her very valuable to Whitebeard:
She . . . knew enough to provide information only to him [Whitebeard] on matters with which ordinary Dinka were less concerned. She told him of spirits which populate the world, of the Adjok—good spirits which linger with God, and of the evil Djok, which linger on earth. Sick persons came to her to be healed, and they whispered softly that Suleika was a Tyet, a sorceress, to whom even the wind and the rain were subservient. (104)\textsuperscript{119}

Suleika’s power arises from her knowledge of the spirits of the land, which, according to the locals, gives her power over life and death, which these spirits control. She is a medicine woman who treats the ill—so revered, it is even believed she has control over natural forces. For these reasons, Whitebeard consults her on tribal matters. She is the one who in turn informs him of the Dinkas’ rebellion in time to save his life. Her knowledge gives her uncommon insight into the matters facing the tribe, but it also separates her from the rest, causes her to be perceived as magical by the other tribe members, and as an educated widow of a tribe leader by Whitebeard.

While Suleika is not generally perceived as a threat by her tribe, Nalotera, Suleika’s replacement in the sequel to \textit{Weißbart, Weichherz, Der Löwe von Tanganyika} (1888), has become such a threat that she is accused of witchcraft. Condemned by her tribe leaders to undergo a witch trial, which would have surely resulted in her death, Nalotera is saved in the nick of time by Simba (Whitebeard’s new name in the sequel). Another young black Central African woman, Nialodia in \textit{Zum Schneedom des Kilimandscharo} (1896) is so feared by her community for her ability to communicate with spirits that she is exiled and condemned to death. But as is the case for Nialodia, these women, instead of being feared by the Germans, are instead symbols of the cruelty

\textsuperscript{119} “Auch wußte sie ihm allein Auskunft zu geben über Fragen, mit denen sich die gewöhnlichen Dinka weniger befahßen. Sie erzählte ihm von den Geistern, welche die Welt bevölkern, von den Adjok, d. h. guten Geistern, die bei Gott weilen, und von den bösen Djok, die auf der Erde weilen. Kranke kamen zu ihr, damit sie von ihr geheilt würden, und man flüsterte leise, Suleika sei eine Tyet, eine Zauberin, der selbst Wind und Regen unterthan seien” (104).
of African tribes and their reliance on superstition. Rather than threatening the white
man, Falkenhorst’s African women only further validate his power, for he is called upon
to intervene and save these women from persecution. The young German will eventually
intercede on her behalf with her father or the tribal leader, rescue their children from
slavery, or even arrange more suitable marriages.

Almost all of the African women of Falkenhorst’s tales are young and in the
prime of life. Their age contributes to his characterization of them, along with their
children, as the ultimate victim of victims in Falkenhorst’s narrative that is still centered
around a reading of Africa through the lens of the slave trade. As a result, Falkenhorst’s
portrayal of women contrasts significantly with Haggard’s women who, even though they
may be beautiful like Ayesha, reveal a “bestiality of the native woman hidden behind a
dazzling beauty” (Ben Driss 169). Haggard’s Gagool is the ultimate embodiment of the
native black woman as primordial beast. As an old, shriveled black woman, she
embodies the threat of old age, and the possibility of death, to the British. And when
Quatermain and his companions threaten Gagool with her life to get her to guide them
through Solomon’s mine to the treasure, she illustrates how her unusual stature puts her
outside the realm of their type of justice, which is dependent on the assumption that death
is the ultimate end to human life. “Die!” she shrieked, in terror and fury; “ye dare not
touch me—man, ye know not who I am. How old think ye am I? I knew your fathers,
and your fathers’ fathers’ fathers. When the country was young I was here, and when the
country grows old I shall still be here. I cannot die unless I be killed by chance, for none
dare slay me” (Haggard 379). Thus, Gagool believes her special knowledge of life and
death also means she has a type of immunity from those such as Quatermain and his
group, who believe in mortality and the finality of life. She appears to defy Anglo-European control because she does not adhere to the laws of nature’s progression, which stipulate that the life of every mortal being ends with death.

Not only Gagool’s conception of time different from the Anglo-European conception of time, it is perceived as so dangerous by the British that Quatermain suggests, tongue-in-cheek, that they should “put her out of her misery.” “See Gagool, mother of evil, thou art so old thou canst no longer love thy life. What can life be to such a hag as thee, who hast no shape, nor form, nor hair, nor teeth—hast naught, save wickedness and evil eyes? It will be mercy to slay thee, Gagool.” (379). To Quatermain and his friends, Gagool threatens the value of life because she transcends its attachment to the physical realm. That her old body still lives on suggests to them that youthfulness does not have much value—knowledge is more important than the flesh to her. Gagool responds:

Thou fool . . . thou accursed fool, thinkest thou that life is sweet only to the young? It is not so, and naught thou knowest of the heart of man to think it. To the young, indeed, death is sometimes welcome, for the young can feel. They love and suffer, and it wrings them to see their beloved pass to the land of shadows. But the old feel not, they love not, and, ha! ha! they laugh to see another go out into the dark; ha! ha! they laugh to see the evil that is done under the sun. All they love is life, the warm, warm sun, and the sweet, sweet air. They are afraid of the cold; afraid of the cold and the dark, ha! ha! ha! (379)

Gagool perceives that the weakness of the young is their reliance on their feelings, which keeps them bound to concerns of the flesh. The old, Gagool claims, have learned to control their feelings and so are able to appreciate life much more than the young. However, these British adventurers would claim that it is precisely these feelings (of empathy, self-sacrifice, etc) that give the young the essential ingredient of more evolved
beings. Gagool’s conception, in this way, minimizes the very characteristics that the
British claim makes them culturally superior. She proposes an alternative fantasy of
immortality that does not rely on behavior or on youth, and as a consequence it is
perceived as threatening by these adventurers, since these are the only characteristics that
would ultimately support their perceived superiority.

The apparent difference between King Solomon’s Mines and Weißbart,
Weichherz, then, is that it is a native African woman, Gagool, who leads Quatermain
through the cave, and it is a young male pygmy, Aka, who instead leads Whitebeard
through his Cave of Spirits. But how far do these differences go? Aka is Whitebeard’s
former slave-turned-servant, a faithful companion to Whitebeard until one particular day
when Whitebeard criticizes some of his hunting decisions, such as killing a nightingale
and poisoning a buffalo with snake venom. While Whitebeard considers these killings
cruel and unusual, Aka is clearly just performing according to the habits and traditions of
his tribe. But having expected Whitebeard’s praise at his skill, Aka is instead surprised
by Whitebeard’s reaction. The narrator exclaims (from the perspective of Aka): “A
beating for a superb shot—that was too much even for a Negro!” (18)¹²⁰ Aka turns
against Whitebeard, telling him he is leaving his service to return to his original tribe.
Before Aka does so, however, he brags to Whitebeard one night while drunk on banana
wine that he knows not only where the Cave of Spirits leads, but how to get through the
cave structure to the other side. The antagonism as well as Aka’s need for retribution is
evident in his words: “I am indeed bolder than you, Whitebeard. I have slipped through
the Gateway of Death, climbed over the gorge, I have thrown the skulls around in the
Cave of Spirits; I have crawled on all fours straight through the mountain to the river and

¹²⁰ “Prügel für einen Meisterschuß, das war selbst einem Neger zu viel!” (18)
back. Heard the ghosts which dart around there in the dark, caught them and eaten one, toasty warm. Ha! ha! ha! That's what Aka can do! Ha, ha, ha!” (50) Whitebeard’s interest is piqued by Aka’s statement. But the manner in which Whitebeard finds out about the route leaves him in doubt as to the authenticity of Aka’s words. Did Aka tell him just to brag, or is he setting Whitebeard up for a trap? Even from the outset, Aka’s duplicitous nature makes the journey through the cave more dangerous.

While Whitebeard does not force Aka to be his guide like Quatermain forces Gagool, it is still only by virtue of Aka’s superior knowledge that Whitebeard finds and ultimately makes it through the cave structure. Aka remains constantly on his mind as he journeys through the Gateway of Death and up to the Cave of Spirits. “How did Aka penetrate this path?” he asks himself time and again as he journeys on through the darkness (70). Aka becomes more of a mental guide for Whitebeard than a physical one, as he reviews over and over again Aka’s words, for clues on how to travel through the cave successfully. And so the journey through the cave itself, at least in Whitebeard’s mind, becomes a test in which Whitebeard views himself pitted against Aka—will he be smart enough, or able enough, to find Aka’s path? Can the German find his way through Africa’s landscape, or are there mysteries to the land that only the natives know? In this sense, Whitebeard, and Falkenhorst himself, do acknowledge, unlike Haggard, the possibility that the natives have superior knowledge of the land. For Falkenhorst, the central struggle is whether the young German will be able to learn from and adapt the

121 „Kühner als du bin ich doch, Weißbart. Durch das Thor des Todes bin ich geschlüpft, geklettert über die Schlucht, die Schädel habe ich in der Geisterhöhle umhergeworfen; auf allen vieren bin ich gekrochen quer durch den Berg bis zum Fluß und quer durch den Berg wieder zurück. Habe die Geister, die dort huschen im Dunkeln, gehört und gefangen und einen aufgefressen, brühwarm! Ha, ha, ha! Das kann Akka! Ha, ha, ha!” (50).

122 „Wie drang denn der Akka in diesem Gange vor?” (70)
natives’ special knowledge as Nativvölker; whereas Quatermain, Sir Henry, and Good instead see Gagool’s special knowledge as a threat to be conquered.

But as a figure that holds clues to the mysteries of Africa—even the mysteries of mankind in general—Aka is very similar to Gagool. At the beginning of the witchhunt led by Gagool in King Solomon’s Mines, a “solitary voice” of unknown origin cries out: “What is the lot of man born of woman?” The crowd responds, “Death!” (328) The inference here is not just that the “lot” of man is death, but that woman—who bore all men and is thus responsible for the life of all men—is also, at some level, responsible for the death of man. Woman as “creator” of man (at least in terms of gestation) holds the mystery of the origins of mankind, and thus should be viewed with suspicion. Aka, as a pygmy, holds a similar position. European scientists speculated in the late nineteenth century that pygmies were one of, if not the, original races of man. Gustav Fritsch, German anthropologist, suggested in an 1880 article for the „Zeitschrift für Ethnologie“ that the Bushmen of South Africa (now referred to as the San peoples) were members of the “original race” [Urrasse] from which all of mankind had evolved.

But pygmies, or short-statured peoples, also commonly called dwarfs, had, in fact, captured the fascination of Anglo-Europeans for centuries. Not just the Greeks, such as Aristotle, Homer, and Herodotus, told tales of short-statured peoples in their texts, but even the Egyptians, centuries earlier, represented dwarfs on their monuments, usually as one of the forms of the creator and sun god Re or later the dwarf gods Ptah and Bes (Klieman 4–5). Most depictions of dwarfs by the Egyptians and Greeks were of the achondroplasia type of dwarfism, characterized by a normal-sized torso, severely shortened limbs, and a large head. Homer’s Iliad contains the first known reference to
dwarfs as pygmies, and it was Herodotus’s description of pygmies in Africa (Aethiopia) that first associated dwarfs with cave-dwelling and snake-eating (6). In Medieval times, the development of the Great Chain of Being theory out of Christian thought caused theologians and scientists alike to begin to classify animals according to their resemblance to God (who took human form). Pygmies, instead, were associated with monsters and later apes (8-9). In the age of Enlightenment, pygmies were used once again to form an explanation of creation from a scientific standpoint, only now the term referred almost exclusively to apes from a biological perspective (11).

By the nineteenth century, explorations of the Pacific and South Africa brought Europeans into contact with the Andaman pygmies and the Bushmen, respectively. These two tribes in conjunction with rumors about pygmies in the interior of India comprised the extent of their knowledge of short-statured peoples in the early to mid-nineteenth century. Examination of both the Andaman pygmies and Bushmen led anthropologists to suspect that both of these peoples were the oldest of their respective regions—the Pacific and Africa. William Henry Flower, British anthropologist, writes of the Andamanese in 1889: “They are the least modified representatives of the people who were, so far as we know, the primitive inhabitants of a large portion of the earth’s surface, but who are now verging on extinction” (83). Fritsch (1880) suggests that the Bushmen, the “Urrasse” of Africa, also remained unchanged in their development for thousands of years (300). Pygmies were thus living examples of a very early stage of human development: “there is much about their condition of civilization . . . to induce us to look upon them, as in the case of the Bushmen in the south and the Negritos in the east, as the remains of a population which occupied the land before the incoming of the
present dominant races” (Flower 90). But the very characteristics of the pygmies that anthropologists revered for helping to advance science—isolation from outside cultures and an unusual physical make-up—are what also led Europeans to consider pygmies as a stagnant people, both biologically and culturally. In fact, as a set of peoples that did not develop either sociologically or physically (and that some suggested were biologically related across continents), the pygmies represented the worst kind of cultural stagnation.

But pygmies take center place in Falkenhorst’s novel not just because of the mystery of the origins of the human race that they stand for, but because they brought out the Anglo-European’s fear of and fascination with them as an isolated and physically unusual set of peoples. Pygmies were significant to Falkenhorst because they were also a symbol of Germany’s previous explorations of Africa and current contributions to anthropological studies of humans. It was, in fact, the German explorer George Schweinfurth who opened up the study of pygmies even further in the late nineteenth century with his discovery of the existence of the Aka peoples in 1870 when he visited the court of Mounza, king of the Monbuttu, in the Sudan (Flower 87). While the male Aka that Schweinfurth purchased from the king (in exchange for a dog!) perished along the journey back to Europe, Schweinfurth’s report of the existence of pygmy peoples in the interior of Africa confirmed what was long held to be only legend. But it wasn’t until a few years after Schweinfurth’s journey that Anglo-European scientists finally got a close-up look at this type of pygmy, when the Italian Miani was able to bring back two Aka boys. “Probably no two individuals of a savage race have been so much honoured by the attentions of the scientific world” wrote Flower in 1889 of this milestone (88).
These pygmy specimens, however, surprised scientists and shook their generally held beliefs about dwarfs, for the Akas were both much smaller than any other pygmies yet observed or measured by Anglo-Europeans, and they were not of the same proportions as those they knew: “One very interesting and almost unexpected result of a careful examination of these skeletons is that they conform in the relative proportions of the head, trunk, and limb, not to dwarfs, but to full-sized people of other races, and they are therefore strikingly unlike the stumpy, long-bodied, short-limbed, large-headed pygmies so graphically represented fighting with their lances against the cranes on ancient Greek vases” (Flower 90). The Aka pygmies thus called into question whether pygmies could be considered pathological—a race of people that simply represented a physiological anomaly of size (such as dwarfism was considered by some), or rather evidence of a significant relationship to the physical shape of man today, which might be evidence for evolution.

Aka and Gagool are thus figures who tap into the Anglo-German fascination with origins. They put in question the Anglo-European’s relationship with the Other and provide the protagonist with the opportunity to justify his cultural ranking. In fact, Gagool is to some extent a “pygmy,” or at least a short-statured person, herself. Quatermain describes her physical appearance:

I observed the wizened, monkey-like figure creeping up from the shadow of the hut. It crept on all fours, but when it reached the place where the king sat, it rose upon its feet, and, throwing the furry covering off its face, revealed a most extraordinary and weird countenance. It was (apparently) that of a woman of great age, so shrunken that in size it was no larger than that of a year-old child, and was made up of a collection of deep, yellow wrinkles. (321)
She is “half ape,” “half human,” traveling on all fours until she reaches the king, when she transforms herself back into a semi-human shape. Her ability to cross between the human-animal divide is seen here as an example of her lower cultural stature, however, since she does not choose to maintain her human form. Gagool also has a “projecting parchment-colored skull” and Quatermain notes: “its [Gagool’s] wrinkled scalp moved and contracted like the hood of a cobra” (321). Both of these characteristics might suggest an enlarged forehead, typical of the achondroplasia type of dwarfism.

Gagool is a “woman of great age,” but no bigger than “a year-old child;” she represents for the Anglo-Europeans the extremes of age, not the in-between. She embodies, according to Quatermain, the near-death state of a culture that has not rejuvenated, and the inexperience, perhaps naïveté, of a child. Gagool cannot successfully synthesize childhood and old age; rather, she represents the worst extremes of human development, a state of conflict which leads to her inevitable self-destruction—from the perspective of these Englishmen. Aka, too, embodies cultural and physical stagnation, because he is a full-grown man physically “stuck” in the body of a young person: “he was no taller than a boy of fourteen, although his face showed the first wrinkles of later manhood” (12). Whitebeard in fact refers to “Aka” not by the name his tribe has given him (“Red Snake”), but only as “Aka,” his people’s name. If in Whitebeard’s eyes Aka had any individuality, it has been reduced to a simple classification of “dwarf;” the “dwarf” is a suspicious being. The “dwarf” might be using the Cave of Spirits for his hideout, he fears (73).

123 “er war nicht größer als ein Junge von vierzehn Jahren, obwohl sein Gesicht schon die ersten Runzeln des späteren Mannesalters aufwies” (12).
It seems that the journey through the cave must ultimately lead to a confrontation between the Anglo-Europeans and their native guides, because none of the white adventurers can accept the alternative view of time and history that both Gagool and Aka represent, as well as the fact that they do not fear dying. In fact, these Anglo-European journeymen view their travel to the ends of the cavern as a journey to the ultimate origins of life and death, and their task, to reformulate and control those origins. They are attempting to carve a space for their own individual and cultural renewal because they fear their need to rely on either woman or a primitive cultural race, such as the pygmies, for the answers to life’s mysteries.

The antagonism between Whitebeard and Aka comes to a climax at the cave itself. All Whitebeard can think about as he approaches the cave is whether or not Aka will pose a threat to him or his plans to use the cave to escape from Hassan the slave dealer. In his mind, Whitebeard has built up Aka into his great nemesis, the result of one confrontation with him while he was drunk. The narrator writes, “Then the evil one surely stood in the way of Whitebeard's plans; then he had to be prepared for that, that an evil Spirit was indeed up to no good in the cave, and it would probably take him a lot of effort to get the better of this ghost or scare it away” (74). Immediately after these words, the narrator continues: “The Aka are the true bushmen of the African Interior, and the other Negroes think they are sooner related to apes than to man,” as if trying to justify the comments beforehand by reminding the readers of the Akas’ cultural and biological

---

124 „Dann stand der Boshaite sicher den Plänen Weiβbarts im Wege; dann mußte sich dieser darauf gefaßt machen, daß wirklich ein böser Geist in der Höhle sein Unwesen trieb, und es würde ihn wohl viel Mühe kosten, diesen Geist zu bezwingen oder zu verscheuchen“ (74).
Thus, when Aka does materialize in physical form inside the Cave of Spirits as Whitebeard is exiting it after his first exploratory journey, the scene is set not just for a personal showdown, but a cultural one.

And as if to remind readers of the cultural as well as physical threat Aka poses, Whitebeard is bitten in the ankle by a snake right after spotting Aka in the depths of the cave, torch in right hand. Aka yells at Whitebeard: “Hi, hi, hi! Hu, hu, hu! Hi, hi, hi!” (74). Whitebeard is thereby thrown off balance, and Falkenhorst writes:

> The torch fell from his hand, and as if chased by the Furies, Whitebeard fled to the entrance of the cave. “Hi, hi, hi! Hu, hu, hu! Hi, hi, hi!” the hellish call sounded forth, and the bats flew screeching and buzzing back and forth behind him. Finally the broad hollow; in a few bounds he reached the entrance. “Hi, hi, hi!”
> It roared ever nearer; desperately grasping the rifle, Whitebeard turned around, and there in the depths, swinging the burning torch, stood a specter, half devil, half ape, half human! It gave out an inarticulate sound and lifted a drawn bow in its left hand. (75)

Confused between his own thoughts and the image and sounds before him, Whitebeard only sees a “specter, half devil, half ape, half human” before him, not Aka. Whitebeard is confronted, not by Aka himself (whose ability to shoot a lethal arrow from a bow he holds in one hand is quite dubious), but by his own superstitions and fears of pygmies—from simultaneous religious (half devil), biological (half ape), and an anthropological (half human) perspectives. He draws his gun quickly and shoots Aka, managing then to

---

125 „Die Akka sind ja die echten Buschmodner des Inneren Afrikas, und wie die übrigen Neger meinen, sollen sie den Affen näher verwandt sein als den Menschen” (74).

126 „Hi, hi, hi! Hu, hu, hu! Hi, hi, hi!” Die Fackel entfiel der Hand, und wie von Furien gejagt, floh Weißbart dem Eingang der Höhle zu. „Hi, hi, hi! Hu, hu, hu! Hi, hi, hi!” tönte und jagte hinter ihm das höllische Rufen und kreischend und schwirrend flogen die Fledermäuse hin und her. Endlich war die breite Höhlung, in wenigen Sätzen der Eingang erreicht. „Hi, hi, hi!” scholl es immer näher; krampfhalt die Büchse haltend, wandte sich Weißbart um, und dort in der Tiefe, die brennende Fackel schwingend, stand ein Gespenst, halb Teufel, halb Affe, halb Mensch! Stieß unartikulierte Laute aus und hob in der Linken einen gespannten Bogen. (75)
run out of the cave, through the Gateway of Death, and to the village, where he sinks into unconsciousness from the snake poison.

Quatermain’s confrontation with Gagool also ends with her death, but not at the hand of Quatermain’s. Gagool leads them to the treasure chamber and invites them to take the jewels. “There are the bright stones that ye love, white men, as many as ye will; take them, run them through your fingers, *eat* of them, hee! hee! *drink* of them, ha! ha!” (393) They are so important to Quatermain and his group that Gagool suggests they “eat” and “drink” them, as if they were necessary to sustain their lives. But in fact Gagool is being sarcastic: she is making fun of their obsessive need for these inanimate rocks and minerals that have so little value to her as objects of wealth. Clearly Gagool’s assessment of the Englishmen’s greed is not far off. Quatermain brags: “There we stood and shrieked with laughter over the gems which were ours, which had been found *for us* thousands of years ago by the patient deliverers in the great hole yonder, and stored *for us* by Solomon’s long-dead overseer. . . . Solomon never got them, nor David, nor Da Silvestra, nor anybody else. We had got them” (393). But it is the fact that these stones were coveted by Solomon, David, and Da Silvestra that makes them especially valuable to Quatermain. His possession is significantly more important because he can place it within the context of history—a history that intentionally excludes and ignores the ancestors that Gagool references when she enters the cave.

While Quatermain, Sir Henry, and Good are fondling the treasure, however, Gagool leaves the chamber, unbeknownst to them until the Englishmen hear the cries of Foulata. From Foulata’s cries, it becomes apparent that Gagool has attempted to trap them in the treasure chamber by closing the stone door on them. But she must fight
Foulata before she can get the door down, and even then, Gagool is unable to twist under the falling door fast enough to get to the other side before it crushes her to death (394). It is only then, after the death of Gagool, Quatermain reads into her statement—not her warning that they are blinded by the lust for wealth—but instead her supposed “intentions”—that she planned to trap them in the mine all along, although he does not actually even witness the crime: “I saw the point of that sneer of hers about eating and drinking the diamonds now. Perhaps somebody had tried to serve the poor old don in the same way” (395). Thus, while Gagool’s statement points to the Anglo-Europeans’ obsession with the minerals, Quatermain responds only according to his own fears and preconceived notions. He does not see the excess of his obsession—so driven to collect minerals that he does not consider the essentials of life; rather, he reads in her statement the threat that she will “serve” them like someone had served the don.

As a consequence, the confrontations between Quatermain and Gagool and Whitebeard and Aka both end in the unpleasant deaths of the Central African natives (Whitebeard, semiconscious from the snake bite, believes that he may have left Aka to die a slow death in the cave). The spiritual adolescence of the Anglo-Europeans appears to have won out in the battle to control origins. But their deaths are not as easily justifiable as perhaps Haggard and Falkenhorst would have the reader believe. Gagool’s words just prior to trapping the group in the cave highlights the greed that brought Quatermain into the cave in the first place and distracted him (despite her obvious clues) so that she could get to the exit. In fact, when gazing at the treasure in the cave, Quatermain even hints that they look “as though we were conspirators about to commit a crime” (393). The fact that the group of Englishmen leave the cave with very few jewels,
having cheated death, and also cheated Gagool’s prophecy, but without the majority of the treasure, however, does seem to suggest that there actions are wrong, at least in part. Gagool has saved the majority of her tribe’s cultural legacy from the British grave-robbers, but at great cost.

While Quatermain and his British comrades lose very little sleep over the death of Gagool, however, Whitebeard, on the other hand, frets a great deal about the fate of Aka. Quatermain can, in fact, rest assured that he did not cause Gagool’s death by his overt actions, and does not bother to question himself any further. Haggard, at this point, concludes the novel with the British adventurers’ successful return to “civilization,” and there is little to no consideration for the future of the Kukuana tribe once Quatermain and his companions have returned the throne to the proper male heir, Ignosi. Whitebeard, on the other hand, is the one who kills Aka. Not only can he not escape responsibility for his death, but he never does—the remaining half of the book is in fact about Whitebeard’s displaced guilt and attempts at penance for his crime. Weißbart, Weichherz, then, centers on the personal moral development of the central European (German and French) protagonists in a land ravaged by slavery and savagery that is (from their perspective) bereft of higher morals and values. While Gagool represented the guardian of the Kukuana’s culture and history, Aka represented the future of inner Africa—a future that Whitebeard killed in an instant with his fears and snap judgment.

**Spiritual Rites of Passage in the Cave Challenge**

As we have seen, the cave forms the backdrop for the central struggle of the novels—between the cultured Anglo-European adventurer and the representative,
regressive native of sub-Saharan Africa. The challenge of the cave causes the Anglo-European to become more self-reflexive mentally and spiritually in order to face and conquer his adversaries. The journey through the cave is thus a journey of character development that holds personal as well as cultural implications. It is by journeying through the cave that the spiritual adolescent ultimately distinguishes himself from the short-statured pygmy and the shriveled old woman.

The physical characteristics of the cave challenge the Anglo-European adventurers with sensory deprivation. The cave creates a situation where the travelers must survive without the benefit of one or many of their senses. This is a particularly important challenge for a post-Enlightenment culture that emphasizes discovering knowledge empirically. In both novels, the protagonists are at some point thrown into darkness, forced to rely on their sense of touch, smell, or hearing. Whitebeard’s “flame went out and darkness enveloped those pressing forward” (67). He has to use his outstretched hands to make his way through the passageways, because the cave does not provide natural light. However, finding his way in the dark proves more challenging than he originally thought when he comes to the chamber of Dinka skeletons. Now the walls of the chamber are too wide apart for him to find the way through: “with his outstretched right hand he was unable to reach the other rockface, and he didn’t want to leave the left-hand wall; it was a blind man’s staff for him” (68). Whitebeard must consider an alternative way through the cave without the use of his hands, or risk getting stuck and perishing in the cave.

127 „Flamme erlosch und tiefe Finsternis umfing den Vorwärtsdringenden“ (67).

128 „mit der ausgestreckten Rechten vermochte er die andere Felswand nicht wieder zu erreichen, und von der linken Wand wollte er nicht fortgehen; sie war ja der Stab des Blinden für ihn“ (68).
Although Quatermain, Good, and Sir Henry manage to conserve their matches in the treasure chamber of King Solomon’s mine, they also find they must eventually face the darkness of the cave without any material to create a stronger light source. They ration out their matches just to further their escape—to discover how to open the hatch in the floor of the treasure chamber, and to orient themselves as they wander through the back passages looking for a way out. Quatermain remarks: “It seemed to us that we had escaped Death in the darkness of the chamber only to meet him in the darkness of the tunnels” (402). Traveling without the benefit of light is thus another significant challenge to the Englishmen—for failing at this task does have deadly consequences.

More challenging to Quatermain is the silence the group is confronted with in the cave. It is the lack of any sound, human or otherwise, that causes Quatermain, more than anything else, to begin to give up hope of finding an escape:

Reader, you may have lain awake at night and thought the silence oppressive, but I can say with confidence that you can have no idea what a vivid, tangible thing perfect silence really is. On the surface of the earth there is always some sound or motion, and though it may in itself be imperceptible, yet does it deaden the sharp edge of absolute silence. But here there was none. We were buried in the bowels of a huge, snow-clad peak. . . . We were cut off from all the echoes of the world—we were as already dead. (397)

Both Quatermain’s group and Whitebeard yell and shout to break through the silence barrier, but to no avail. Both parties are far from other humans, in the “bowels” of the earth. In fact the echo of their voices, returned only by the walls of the caverns, simply furthers their sense of being cut off from the rest of the human population. “Again and again Whitebeard repeated his call, but the echo scoffed at him, the same uproar kept following among the night inhabitants of the grotto; finally the fluttering and buzzing
went on nonstop, the underworld seemed alive with invisible spirits” (165). The only response Whitebeard hears to his cries comes from the bats that live in the cave, but which grow into “invisible spirits” because he is deprived of his vision to see them in the dark cave. The chamber of skeletons also carries with it an aura of silence brought on by death. “No one could be a witness to this scene. Eternal darkness covered everything here” (68). Here, the visual element of darkness is transformed into something tactile. Like a thick blanket, or a layer of dust, darkness seems to plaster everything in the Dinka death chamber.

Even more challenging is the feeling the travelers get that they are moving, but going nowhere. Whitebeard remarks: “Perhaps there were confused paths and intersections here, a labyrinth of caves and galleries; a labyrinth from which there was no rosy light of return” (68). When Quatermain’s group reaches the passageways beyond the treasure chamber, he tells the reader: “we seemed to be in a stone labyrinth which led nowhere” (402). To move and yet to be going nowhere is perhaps one of the greatest fears of the Anglo-Europeans that they are forced to overcome by facing the challenge of the cave. They must prove that they can find a way to still progress without becoming literally “trapped” inside the cave.

They fear a physical entrapment within the cave, but not strictly out of fear there would be little to no chance of rescue in these isolated places. They also fear they will succumb to the same elements that they believe led the natives to stagnation—even

129 „Immerfort wiederholte Weißbart seinen Ruf, aber immer höhnte ihn das Echo, immer erfolgte derselbe Aufruhr unter den nächtlichen Bewohnern der Grotte; schließlich hörte das Flattern und Schwirren nicht mehr auf, von unsichtbaren Geistern schien die Unterwelt belebt“ (165).

130 „Niemand konnte Zeuge dieser Scene sein. Die ewige Nacht deckte hier alles“ (68).

131 „Vielleicht gab es hier Kreuz- und Irrgänge, ein Labyrinth von Höhlen und Galerien; ein Labyrinth, aus dem es keine Ruckkehr aus rosige Licht mehr gab“ (68).
regression. Gagool tells the Quatermain group: “Go more slowly, white men . . . . Why will ye run to meet the evil that shall befall ye, ye seekers after treasure?” (381) She taunts them, suggesting it is, instead, their drive to progress that will ultimately lead them to “evil,” not lingering in the cave. But Quatermain and his group do not heed her warning. They fear instead that she wants to slow their progress to keep them suspended in her realm of petrified mummies for eternity. Robert Fraser (1998) writes: “The macabre death-in-life of this tableau of one-time kings represents and entombed civilization, ossified by history into a bizarre condition of synchronous stasis” (35). In fact, the group’s fears appear to be somewhat well-founded at the conclusion of the novel, for when they finally find Sir Henry’s brother, George, he is caught in just such a limbo. While not in the cave itself, he is trapped on an oasis in the middle of the desert, surrounded by sheer cliffs. And significantly, it was Jim, a Bechuana, and George’s servant, who is the cause of his entrapment. When attempting to scale the sheer cliff, Jim “loosed a great boulder of rock, which fell upon George Curtis’s right leg, crushing it frightfully. From that day he had been so dreadfully lame that he had found it impossible to go either forward or back, and had preferred to take the chances of dying on the oasis to the certainty of perishing in the desert” (413). Stuck in a position where he could go neither forward nor backward, George is stuck in stasis and can do nothing, according to Anglo-Europeans, but stagnate or die.

These physical challenges, however, only provide the impetus, and perhaps the reason, for the development of the qualities of the spiritual adolescent that Anglo-European culture admired. Depriving the white protagonists of certain senses, such as sight or hearing, only emphasizes the importance of being able to shift to other less used
senses, such as touch or smell. Quatermain turns the tables on the group’s feeling of impending doom when he smells fresh air in the chamber. Then, by feeling for the draft of air, the group comes across the trap door in the floor. Stomping on the door reveals that it is hollow, and careful examination of its construction leads to discovering the means to open it, which leads to their eventual escape (399). Entrapment in the cave forces the group to both rely on their less-used senses, as well as examine details to rationalize a way out of the predicament.

Similarly, when Whitebeard is trapped in the chamber with the Dinka skeletons without a light and unable to feel for the direction of the passage by reaching both walls with his arms, he starts to lose faith that he will make it through the passage. He becomes envious of the animal instincts of the bats that are able to see in the dark and travel well with the use of their wings:

Enviable beast that turns and finds its nest in the deep night! Enviable for its instinct, which is greater here than proud human intellect!
O could his arms but grow, grow tremendously long!
Bold hunter, master of all intrigue, do you now demand wonder and magic? (69)

Here Whitebeard’s human characteristics do not benefit him as he sits in the darkness, unable to rationalize a way out of the cave. Although a good hunter, Whitebeard now is helpless—unable to see his enemy in order to shoot it. He is trapped. That is, until he realizes he can make use of what he brought with him, namely, his gun. “How could he lose his head so easily like that?” he chastises himself. “The gun doubled his arms’
length. Halali, halloo!” (69)  

By reconsidering how he could use his gun other than for the function for which it was originally intended, Whitebeard makes it into something that is more useful for getting him out of his predicament. The challenge of the geography of the cave thus forces Whitebeard to think outside of his normal routine, where his enemies are only the two and four-legged kind. In fact, it is not the advanced technology of the gun that ultimately helps him; rather, it is his own ability to reconceptualize what is on hand and use what the situation provides him.

At a certain point, though, both Quatermain and Whitebeard come to recognize the limitations of their own knowledge and skills. Perhaps the biggest challenge the cave offers is how these Anglo-Europeans will ultimately accept and integrate the help of their black African guides to not only get out of the cave, but help them develop as individuals—without losing their sense of cultural superiority. Quatermain has threatened Gagool with her life to help him, and while he benefits from that help, he never acknowledges it. But while Whitebeard did not initially ask Aka for his help, he does acknowledge the significance of the help once he receives it indirectly. For it is, in fact, the remains of a trail left by Aka in the Dinka chamber of skeletons that ultimately provides Whitebeard’s means of escape. Whitebeard recalls Aka’s words the evening of their dispute: “I have crawled straight through the mountain!” (70)  

And based on this piece of information, Whitebeard drops onto his knees in the chamber, thinking it will help him find an exit (70). He discovers small mounds on the floor that lead in a particular direction. “These piles could have been thrown up only by the 'red snake'

---

133 „Wie konnte er nur so leicht den Kopf verlieren? Die Flinte verlängert seine Arme ums Doppelte. Halali, halalo!” (69)

134 „Gekrochen bin ich quer durch den Berg” (70).
[Aka]; they were the thread of Ariadne, with whose help the dwarf found his way in the labyrinth” (71). Thus by touching in a systematic fashion, this time on the floor instead of along the walls which he could no longer grasp, Whitebeard finds and follows the path that Aka left and that will help him to cross the chamber. At one level, Whitebeard does succeed because he uses his alternative senses. But he does not get the idea until he reconsiders Aka’s words (and “lowers” himself to feel on the floor). Thus Whitebeard succeeds more so because he puts himself in the place of Aka and considers how the pygmy must have surmounted the challenge beforehand, since Whitebeard knows Aka was indeed successful at crossing the cave. “Only the sharpness of his senses could the Aka negro trust, and Whitebeard began to exert his senses as well; perhaps they would reveal something to him, some secret of the underworld” (70). And so Whitebeard is successful because he can capitalize on Aka’s strengths as a “child of nature.” He thinks as Aka would think, falls back on his instincts, like Aka, and thus finds the trail. Whitehead succeeds by using enough of his “natural” instincts to help him find his way, while retaining his reasoning abilities as a cultured German. Wendy Katz (1987) describes the journey to and through Africa as a struggle between instinct and reason: “Geo-metaphorically, Europe represents reason and Africa intuition. In Africa, Haggard’s European characters assume, people exist in natural harmony with their environment, this being the heart of primitivism. It is this assumed harmony that foreigners want to grasp, discovering not so much Africa as themselves (97). Whitebeard


136 „Nur der Schärfe seiner Sinne konnte der Akkaneger vertrauen, und auch Weißbart begann jetzt seine Sinne anzustrengen; vielleicht verrietten sie ihm etwas, irgend ein Geheimnis der Unterwelt“ (70).
and Haggard will succeed through the cave only when they accept the knowledge of the black African and merge that knowledge with their own experience.

Of course, it is not just instinct and reasoning skills that the Anglo-Europeans need to cross the cave, but also moral and spiritual motivation. Quatermain teases his readers before telling them of his entrance into the mine—the excitement is so intense he will not comment upon it: “I had better leave out the feeling of intense excitement with which we set out on our march [to the mine] that morning to the imagination of those who read this history” (380). By refusing to articulate his emotions, he only enhances the reader’s own excitement because it is so unquantifiable. Whitebeard, too, during his moments of worry while he sits, apparently lost in the chamber of skeletons, tries to keep in perspective his motivation for entering the cave. “As he sits and ponders now, the lust for adventure awakens again within him, the get-up-and-go initiative. The danger stimulates him and he schemes how he will find the passageway to the river” (70). The spirit of adventure keeps both Whitebeard and Quatermain from getting bogged down, both spiritually and physically, in the caves. It keeps them both moving forward—progressing. As Whitebeard begins to create his own Ariadne path with the clothing off his back, he exclaims: “And if it came to pants and shirt as well, and if he had to creep forward barefoot and naked as Adam, ever onward was his watchword [Losung]!” (71)

Whitebeard’s reference to Adam is quite telling. It shows an acceptance of a possible “return to nature,” like Adam in the Garden of Eden, in order to find his way out and

137 „Während er nun sitzt und nachdenkt, erwacht in ihm wieder die Lust an Abenteuern, der Unternehmungsgeist. Die Gefahr reizt ihn und er entwirft schon Pläne, wie er den Durchgang zum Fluß finden soll“ (70).

138 „Und wenn noch Hose und Hemd an die Reihe kommen sollten, und wenn er barfuß und nackt wie Adam fortkriechen müßte, vorwärts war seine Losung!“ (71)
begin to progress again. For Quatermain, however, returning to the Garden of Eden would be tantamount to “going native,” or regressing. While both Quatermain and Whitebeard count on their spiritual motivation to help them to avoid stagnation—help them keep moving forward in order to get out of the cave—it is Whitebeard who understands that “going native,” which to him means “going natural,” is not necessarily regression.

In fact, the journey through the cave has a much higher meaning for Whitebeard than Quatermain and his group. The journey through the cave is also a test of faith, both personal and spiritual faith. It tests Whitebeard’s faith when he hears noises and sees unidentifiable moving objects, but resists attributing these natural sources (the cave and the bats) to “wonder and magic” (69). Hassan struggles with his own spiritual values as he makes the journey with Whitebeard near the end of the novel. As the two navigate the cave, literally running (or crawling) for their lives in an attempt to escape from the rebelling Dinkas, Whitebeard reflects on their journey: “As grim as the future lay before them, they both encountered unexpected, unknown dangers, but Whitebeard trusted in God and with the same confidence Hassan closed his tired eyes for the first time in many years in refreshing sleep” (149). Faith brings these two refugees safely through their journey. It keeps their minds focused on getting through the cave, rather than dwelling on incidentals along the way.

But by naming the gate at the end of the cave system Life’s Gate, intentionally the opposite of the name of the gate at the cave system’s opening: the Gateway of Death (named by the Dinkas), Whitebeard implies more than faith as an essential part of his

---

139 „So finster lag auch vor ihnen die Zukunft; beide gingen sie ja ungeahnten, unbekannten Gefahren entgegen, aber Weißbart vertraute Gott und mit demselben Vertrauen schloß heute Hassan zum erstenmal nach vielen Jahren die müden Augen zum erquickenden Schlaf“ (149).
journey through the cave. Hassan remarks: “Those are strange stations, my friend! Think we'll really be going through that gate to a new life?” (151) The journey for Whitebeard is thus a journey of salvation, and even rebirth, for himself and for Hassan, and it is perhaps even a metaphor for Falkenhorst’s hopes for the rebirth of Africa in the hands of the Germans. While the British certainly used Christian motifs to structure and to supplement their fictional adventures in sub-Saharan Africa during this period, none are as personal as Whitebeard’s—certainly not Haggard’s.

Throughout his three journeys back and forth through the cave system, Whitebeard tests his faith in Christianity, while also struggling with his fear of being swept into an animal- and nature-centered cult that he imagines the Dinkas worship. Initially barred from getting near the entrance of the cave because it is on top of an apparently insurmountable cliff, Whitebeard claims it is the “mountain spirits” who block him from the entrance” (56). Later, safely out of the cave structure but still recovering from his snakebite, Whitebeard dreams of his visit to the Cave of Spirits:

He soon found himself in the Cave of Spirits. He and Leo carried torches; their red light glistened on the wet walls of the grotto; illuminated altars of whitish stone, dangling icicles, peaks and festoons; caused slender pillars, vines, indeed, entire churches and cathedrals to arise before his astonished eyes; a stream flowed at Whitebeard’s feet, a small lake lay in the distance, and the torchlight shimmered red in its shiny reflection. Whitebeard went over to the lake. It was teeming with many white newts the size of our common lizards. They climbed onto the bank and encircled Whitebeard. They looked like a host of white mice. Suddenly they appeared to grow; they reached the size of rats or cats. They sprang around him like white leopards, they grew even larger—a horde of white, raging rhinos stormed beneath him with earth-quaking tremors. The

---

140 „das sind sonderbare Stationen, mein Freund! Ob wir wirklich zum neuen Leben durch jenes Thor eingehen werden?” (151)
Significant here is Whitebeard’s fixation on the animals of the cave—the moths and white mice that he may have actually come in contact with during his first adventure grow out of proportion to their natural size and they encircle him, seemingly threatening him as they close in. By contrast Holly dreams instead of Ayesha in *She* (1887): “In his dreams, Holly communes mentally with the dead past as it lingers in this preternaturally old, but still vital and alluring woman” (Malley 288). In Whitebeard’s mental landscape, however, he becomes trapped by the rhinos below and the collapsing ceiling above that they cause. Animals, the small ones as well as the larger ones, such as leopards and hippopotami, play a large role in Whitebeard’s mental imagining of the cave. He sees them as a threat—as another element of the cave that he must work against in order to get through to the other side. The animals in Whitebeard’s dream suggest that one of his most fundamental fears of this cave journey is that the animals will overcome him—that he will no longer be able to keep the separation between man and animal while in the cave.

It follows that Whitebeard fears he is under constant threat from these animals and spirits of the dream world, or even the underworld, while he is in the cave.

Whitebeard thinks that they will actually “catch” him and draw him into unknown, nether

---

141 Bald sah er sich in der Geisterhöhle, er und Leo trugen Fackeln; das rote Licht derselben funkelte an den nassen Wänden der Grotte, beleuchtete magisch herabhängende Zapfen, Spitzen und Festons, ließ vor dem erstaunten Auge schlanke Säulen, Manzeln, Altäre aus weißlichem Stein, ja ganze Kirchen und Dome emporwachsen; ein Bach floß zu Weißbarts Füßen, ein kleiner See lag in der Ferne, und rötlich schimmerte auf seinem blanken Spiegel der Fackelschein.

regions of the “underworld.” As Whitebeard peers into a stream at the back of the cave, the narrator writes: “He has to go back; he can't challenge the god of the Underworld; he must yield before him. If he stays any longer an invisible force will take hold of him and pull him relentlessly into the depths!” (167)

The great unknown pushes Whitebeard away from the stream and sends him running to the entrance of the cave.

The journey through the cave is therefore a journey from the supernatural, pagan form of spirituality embodied in animal figures to a Christian spirituality based on qualities such as self sacrifice, redemption, and rebirth of man separate from the animals. While Whitebeard wants to save the Dinkas from the horrors of the slave trade by using the exit the cave provides, he also wants to save them from another more important enemy: themselves. By reintroducing the cave to the Dinkas, Whitebeard wants them to overcome their superstitions of the place. In this way, it makes sense that the opening to the passageway leading up to the Cave of Spirits is a leopard’s den. Since the Dinkas believe that animals have spirits, they avoid the cave area because they must go through the leopard’s den to get to it. Hassan (before he reforms) takes advantage of their superstitions by embellishing these fears, suggesting the leopards turned into “were-leopards” at night:

So he [Hassan] never dispelled the people’s mad credulity; on the contrary, he enlarged upon it by telling of all sorts of monsters, and so it was that even his Egyptians and Arabs thoroughly believed that the devil himself lived beyond the Gateway of Death –that werewolves or rather were-leopards lived in the Cave of Spirits; that is, the souls of the deceased, which metamorphosed by night into leopards, roaming into nearby villages to kill the natives and satiate themselves with human

---

142 „er kann den Gott der Unterwelt nicht herausfordern, er muß ihm weichen. Bleibt er noch länger, so faßt ihn eine unsichtbare Gewalt und zieht ihn unaufhaltsam in die Tiefe!“ (167)
blood. So it happened that the Gateway of Death and that ravine had become a magic realm of these parts. (49)

Whitebeard wants to undo the Dinka’s own animal-based form of worship as well as the unreformed Hassan’s manipulation of them based upon their own superstitions. By reintroducing the Dinkas to the cave as a place without dangerous spirits, and by journeying with them from the leopard’s den at the entrance, through the gorge, up the cliff to the Cave of Spirits all the way to Life’s Gate, Whitebeard hopes to save the Dinkas from Hassan’s spiritual oppression. By overcoming their fear of were-leopards, Whitebeard hopes the Dinkas will move to a form of spirituality in which man is separate from animal, and in fact had nothing to fear from animals or animal spirits. Thus, the cave system that Whitebeard discovers becomes a topographical representation of the Anglo-European idea of spiritual development and natural order, at the conclusion of which the spiritual adolescent will successfully bridge the secular with the divine (Christian) world.

Redemption and Rebirth through the Spiritual Adolescent

The Dinkas down in the village in Falkenhorst’s Weißbart, Weichherz, however, end up never traveling through the cave, too busy rioting and burning down Hassan’s Seriba. They are not ready, at least at this time, for the message that Whitebeard has to offer. The person who makes the spiritual journey of the novel, then, is Hassan, the Frenchman living in exile in the Sudan to avoid trial for murder. He is the ultimate

---

143 Er [Hassan] zerstörte darum keineswegs den Wahn der Leute, zog ihn vielmehr groß durch Erzählung von allerlei Unholden, und so kam es nun, daß selbst seine Aegypter und Araber fest daran glaubten, daß hinter dem ’Thore des Todes’ der leibhaftige Teufel wohne, daß in der Geisterhöhle Werwölfe oder vielmehr Werleoparden hausten, d.h. Seelen Abgeschiedener, die sich während der Nacht in Leoparden verwandeln und in die nahen Dörfer ziehen, um Menschen zu töten und sich mit Menschenblut zu sättigen. (49)
villain of the novel, not just because he is a slave-trader and a Muslim, but because he is a European who converted from Christianity and committed murder and other sins multiple times over—in the eyes of Whitebeard, he culturally regressed. Yet it is precisely these characteristics that also make him the character most open to redemption and rebirth. Hassan’s redemption suggests the beginning of the end of the days when Africa could be considered by Anglo-European nations as a world separate unto itself—a place of refuge for the socially outcast, as well as a place that could be robbed without fear of retribution from “civilized” rules. If we compare some of the metaphors that Haggard and Falkenhorst use to explain their vision of Britain and Germany’s future relationship with Africa, a crucial difference emerges. Haggard once famously described Europe’s relationship to Africa in *Nada the Lily* as follows: “As Europe is to Africa, so is man to woman” (Stiebel 88). But Falkenhorst’s metaphor is the migratory bird, “Zugvogel,” who shuttles between the two continents (*In Kamerun* 87). “Zugvogel” is the name for the young protagonist of *In Kamerun*, who is expected to do the shuttling between cultures. Whitebeard’s place as redeemer in *Weißbart, Weichherz* suggests therefore a different role than that of a gendered and sexualized relationship with Africa. Rather, Whitebeard and Falkenhorst envision a new role for Anglo-European spiritual adolescents where Africa is connected to and engaged with the larger world community.

Falkenhorst uses the contrast between Hassan, the Frenchman, and Whitebeard, the German, to further emphasize the vision he has of Europe’s participation with Africa in the future. Hassan has a characteristically short-sighted vision of his life and his work throughout most of the novel. He is in the Sudan, after all, to avoid atoning for his misdeeds in France—able, in the still “wild” frontier land of Africa, to remain in hiding
from the laws of “civilization,” but is therefore in a temporal stasis. Hassan cannot leave
Africa to return to his past, nor is his future all that secure. In addition, Hassan has
chosen ways of living that are just as short-sighted. He leads raiding parties on nearby
villages to obtain slaves for the market, or he hunts for ivory. He does not consider the
consequences of his actions, let alone the sustainability of his endeavors. For example,
when Hassan hears that Whitebeard has explored the Cave of Spirits, he immediately
assumes that the Cave of Spirits must therefore be a hiding place for a cache of elephant
tusks—for why else would a European bother with the cave? Hassan’s initial reaction
mirrors that of Quatermain’s when he first hears of King Solomon’s mine. While he is
interested in finding Sir Henry’s brother, it is the lure of wealth, and the adventure in
obtaining that wealth, that attracts him most. Stiebel (2001) reminds us that: “The first
diamond in South Africa was discovered in 1867, precipitating a great rush of interest in
South Africa and its riches; thus King Solomon’s Mines within its story answers the
British readers’ avid anticipation of the treasure to be found in Africa, together with the
nightmare vision of entrapment in the Dark Continent through greed” (78).

Whitebeard, however, is the complete opposite of Hassan. He is a complete
failure as a merchant and a slave holder, and holds no interest in hunting for the purpose
of profit. Whitebeard in fact pities Hassan for his short-sightedness when it comes to the
cave. He scoffs: “‘Ivory!’ The craving for treasure, and for riches, had deluded, blinded
Hassan; he could not resist the demon which once seized him, and it had been the
ruination of him. Poor Hassan!” (166) Unlike Quatermain, then, Whitebeard does

144 „Elfenbein! Die Sucht nach Schätzen, nach Reichtum hatte Hassan geblendet, er konnte dem Dämon,
der ihn einmal erfaßt hatte, nicht widerstehen und dieser hatte ihn ins Verderben gelockt. Armer Hassan!”
(166)
recognize the Anglo-European lust for treasure, and he aims to set another example. Whitebeard’s challenge in the novel is not to change necessarily, but instead to remain true to his Christian principles and provide a good role model for the readership despite what influences and temptations he might encounter in Africa.

It is in fact the paralleling of Hassan’s versus Whitebeard’s reaction to their sins and their own personal character development that sets the moral tone of the novel for their young and old German readers. When Hassan begins to suspect that Whitebeard has killed Aka, he immediately returns to the Cave of Spirits to search for Aka’s body—not because he needs verification that Aka is indeed dead, but because he wants to judge Whitebeard for his sin as a way to atone for his own crime back in France. “I examined the corpse as carefully as though I were a judge, examining a crime scene to indict the perpetrator . . . . The corpse had not decayed, it had become a mummy in the cave environs, and I found the wound in the chest—found the spanned bow in the hand of the dwarf” (126-7). Hassan is luckily able to examine Aka’s body, because it has mummified while in the cave. But Hassan finds he cannot condemn Whitebeard for the murder of Aka as he condemns himself. The body of Aka reveals that Aka was about to strike Whitebeard: incredibly, the bow is still taut in Aka’s dead hands, as if he were about to let an arrow fly! Whitebeard’s killing of Aka is justified in the name of self-defense.

But what impacts Hassan the most from this evidence is his reflection on Whitebeard’s character and behavior since the shooting. Whitebeard has continued to

---

help others and sacrifice himself, despite having committed the sin of killing someone. He saves Hassan’s life from the marauding Dinkas by helping him through the Gateway of Death, even though Hassan had previously forced Whitebeard to work for him by threatening the life of his beloved servant, Leo. But instead of hating Hassan, and instead of devolving into self-hate because of the killing of Aka (such as perhaps Hassan has done since fleeing France), Whitebeard chooses to seek redemption for his sins by sacrificing himself, helping others, and even forgiving Hassan the error of his own ways. The paralleling of Hassan’s development with that of Whitebeard’s emphasizes the importance of life choices in creating the character of an individual.

In fact, Hassan is so moved by Whitebeard’s behavior that he is immediately motivated to turn his own life around. He helps Whitebeard by setting up their camp-refuge in the Cave of Spirits while Whitebeard learns what he can of the damage to the village. When Whitebeard returns and learns that Hassan left the camp to find food, he is angry with Hassan for risking his life foolishly. But Hassan tells him: “I always wanted to sacrifice my life for others once; and if an accident were to befall me, I would die willingly and peacefully” (144). Hassan has come full circle in this text, from taking other people’s lives randomly and without thought, to deciding to sacrifice his own life for others. Sharing and comparing his sins with Whitebeard has given Hassan a different perspective on life and death.

Thus the cave journey is a trial of character for Anglo-Europeans themselves—those who manage to learn the lessons that closeness to death teaches will not only survive death, but learn how to live better. Hassan initially comes to the Cave of Spirits,

146 „Aber ich wollte auch einmal mein Leben für andere opfern, und wenn mir ein Unglück zugestoßen wäre, ich wäre gern und ruhig gestorben“ (144).
after all, because he thinks that Whitebeard or the Dinkas are hiding ivory there. But instead of finding the bone treasure he seeks, Hassan finds only the bones of countless bodies, which has the opposite effect of awakening in him an awareness and appreciation for the cycle of life. He comments: “I strove after treasure and I found [instead] the mark of earthly transistoriness, death at work” (126).147 Ivory, the coveted, marketable product worth money, has transformed into bones of bodies that once lived. Hassan, unlike Quatermain who squirrels away some gems in his pocket and finances his son’s education, has gained a broader and deeper appreciation for natural resources that causes him to lose desire for the ivory and for the killing and pillaging necessary to collect “black ivory.” After all, the ivory has done nothing for all the humans whose bodies remain strewn around the cave. Ivory has not helped them to fight off the effects of aging or to escape death. The cave has transformed Hassan from viewing natural and animal products as objects to be manipulated to recognizing and appreciating these objects as a stage in the never-ending cycle of life.

Whitebeard’s spiritual and Christian perspective gives him a wider sense of life and death that allows for forgiveness and rebirth. Life thus has meaning to Whitebeard only when it is conducted according to these Christian principles—life is not just the opposite of being physically dead. Traveling through the cave means developing this broader sense of time that does not end with physical death—not only because there is the Christian hope for life after death in heaven, but also because spiritual death (Hassan’s death through most of the novel) can be forgiven and a new life begun. While Quatermain and other sub-Saharan African adventurers uphold Christian values, it is in

name only. Whitebeard, however, is a Christian in practice and in perspective—he is the ultimate spiritual adolescent by keeping a youthful, life-centered way of life that is not dependent on physical age (and in fact encompasses all physical ages.) It is a life-centered way of life that is also not guided by fear of death. In this sense, Whitebeard achieves what Gagool already embodies—and thus provides the possibility that black and white, Anglo-European and African, are not so different after all.

**Coda: The Promise of the Cave, or What Lies on the Other Side**

The cave structure of King Solomon’s mines ultimately leads Quatermain and his group back to the beginning (they end up at the bottom of the pits at the front of the entrance), thus reinforcing the apparent circular nature of the Kukuana’s quagmire and perhaps Africa as a whole. Logan (1999) reminds us of how the overall cycle of journeying to Africa and then ultimately returning back to England sets the general imperialistic tone of the novel: “Since his heroes always go back to England after acquiring material wealth, we are led to conclude that colonization is aimed at nothing but exploitation” (107). Monsman (2000) describes the results of Quatermain, Sir Henry, and Good’s journey as follows:

> In the romance, their [Quatermain’s group] entry into the chamber of the mine-pit may be a sexual penetration (Boccaccio’s gates of hell or the devouring female pudenda); but the trio’s exit is certainly of the earth, earthy. Haggard’s phallic and anal amalgamation, together with his multiple references to the ‘bowels’ of the earth, clearly indicate that whatever sort of symbolic engendering their entrance into the cave may be, the trio is sexually devoured and shat out like lumps of excrement. This is an ironic rebirth at best, a parody of renewal (295).

But Falkenhorst’s Cave of Spirits fulfills its promise as a transitional passageway by leading to another, secret world away from Seriba, the slave trade, and the Dinka
rebellion. Falkenhorst’s Cave of Spirits suggests that there may be much about sub-Saharan Africa from which the characters and the natives need to escape, but it also suggests that another world can be rebuilt on the other side with time and hard work.

Instead of minerals and ivory, then, the reward that the Cave of Spirits promises to Whitebeard and the reformed Hassan (besides escape) is the bounty of the land. Whitebeard initially revels that he has found a “new world” on the other side of the Cave of Spirits (72). This “promised land” achieves its promise by providing all the necessary resources for a sustainable—even enjoyable—life (139). The small sea promises fish and crabs to eat, and nearby grassy fields provide a perfect spot to shoot antelope. There are palm trees for oil and wine, and yams for potatoes (140)! The paradise at the other side of the cave suggests to Whitebeard that escape might not be the only solution to his problems—the geography of the land beyond the cave provides protection, and it is waiting for someone to take command. “This quarter square mile of land is our indisputable property, and is no prison, like the jaws of death” Whitebeard explains (153).

For the British, the cave leads to treasure that helps the British to ultimately leave Africa, while for the Germans, the cave provides the metaphor for why Anglo-Europeans should stay. The process of going through the cave to get to the land of promise suggests that sub-Saharan Africa can be the land of promise if Anglo-Europeans are persistent in their efforts to combat the problems of the region. But to Germans this effort must not be a superficial one, for as much as the metaphor of the cave in Weißbart, Weichherz implies that Africans must develop themselves both economically and spiritually, it also

---

148 „Diese Viertelquadratmeile Land ist unser unbestreitbares Eigentum, und es ist kein Gefängnis, wie die Schlucht des Todes“ (153).
suggests that Anglo-Europeans must also hold *themselves* to a higher standard.

Whitebeard, by being the model to which Hassan compares himself, sets that moral tone by representing a higher, Christian standard. He looks beyond the here and now of treasure and profit to the challenge of maximizing what Africa can provide through farming and sustainable industry, not just for today, but into the future. This is the place in the colonial world of Africa that Germans are trying to carve for themselves in the late nineteenth century—for while Whitebeard’s message was one that was readily received by a Frenchman, it was also a message intended for all Anglo-Europeans.
CHAPTER V

Conclusion

The analysis of the preceding chapters has illustrated how the rites of passage of white adolescents in adventure novels reflects central “ways of knowing” in Victorian and Wilhelmine culture that shaped their image of the domestic and the foreign realm. In the first chapter, I proposed adolescence as the transition period from a “wild boy” to a “civilized adult.” The adolescent’s training in how to behave with animals through both natural science and hunting reveals a post-Darwinian society’s fears about man’s relationship with animals and their desire to remain separate and superior to all other creatures. But the adolescent as simultaneous object and developing subject also provides the protagonists, and the active reader, with enough distance to be critical of the adult’s decision-making and hunter ethics—such as that used to kill baby and human-like animals.

The second chapter demonstrates how the figure of the Anglo-European adolescent is the intermediate between the “white father” and the “black child,” thereby supporting the colonial power structure by maintaining the separation between the two. I proposed, however, that the apprenticeship of the white adolescent in native relations also reveals a fundamental reliance on the black African native that questions whether the colonizer can ever really consider himself completely different from, or independent of, the colonized.
In the final section, chapter three, I suggested that “spiritual adolescence” is the working out of supposed temporal conflicts (set up by a linear progressive structure) between past and present, young and old, and birth and death. The protagonists of H. Rider Haggard’s *King Solomon’s Mines* (1885) and Carl Falkenhorst’s *Weißbart, Weichherz* (1888) achieve this “spiritual adolescence” through the cave journey, the epic rite of passage. However, for Falkenhorst, this journey is much more personal and spiritual than for Haggard, whose feminized “bodyscape” and search for treasure suggest that the Victorians imagined Africa more through a sexual and capitalistic prism than the Germans in the 1880’s.

This dissertation leaves scholars with some fruitful areas of study to explore for the future. First, the different anthropological perspectives of the British and the Germans on the African native revealed in this study suggests a need for the closer examination of the relationship between late nineteenth century anthropological discourse and these adventure novels. Developments in the social sciences were particularly important to Wilhelminians, because these academic theories were another way Germans could fashion the national identity they were seemingly so long without. But how did the difference in these British and German anthropological theories translate to the image of the African in these texts, and the ways in which Germans should interact with them, perhaps differently than from the British? Did the German scientists’ slower and less widespread acceptance of Darwin’s theory of evolution impact those representations? This project provides some in-roads into these topics, but more could be flushed out here.

Secondly, the analysis of Carl Falkenhorst’s, Eginhard von Barfus’s, and some of Otto Felsing’s texts for this project has revealed the relative lack of sexual metaphors or
the overt feminizing of African landscape, despite the overwhelming popularity of H. Rider Haggard’s novels. However, do the other German adventure novel writers later on continue this trend? Or do Falkenhorst’s, Barfus’s, and Felsing’s interest in other metaphors regarding Europe-Africa relations represent simply an early stage of Germany’s image of Africa during this time?

This dissertation points to the need for an extended study of these adventure novels, one that goes beyond the limited scope of this project to consider all the novels listed in the Appendix, and which also factors in those published in the period before World War I. Such a project would be able to factor better the shifting nature of colonialism and the image of the adolescent with the individual personalities of the writers during the entire period of African colonialism without limiting itself to just the first several decades. This project also does not consider a considerable number of novellas and short stories published by imperial-minded German writers both individually and in youth magazines. A comparison of these stories in relation to the plethora of British youth magazines would provide interesting insights into the image of Africa and the adolescent in this different medium.

The comparison of the British and German texts of this project also opens up the parameters of adventure novel research by demonstrating the limitations of focusing on only one national tradition. Without opening up the study of adventure novels beyond the conventional, or most popular, canons we risk cutting ourselves off from the plurality of minority voices. These lesser-known adventure novel traditions provide needed context that will both broaden and deepen our understanding of cultural tropes that are
still fundamental to popular discourse. Hopefully this study will encourage future
adventure novel scholars to broaden their research approach.

One of the central goals of this project has been to bring to the attention, primarily
of English, readers the lesser-known canon of German adventure novels that were
published during the height of colonialism in the late nineteenth century. This project
highlights the need for additional research on these important German writers, who are
virtually unknown to most scholars, let alone those of British or German adventure
novels. Because these German writers’ popularity at the time did not match those of the
British, who were read widely abroad, little is known of their biographies or
correspondence with other important figures, nor are copies of their texts available for
study at more than just the national archival libraries of Germany. One hopeful outcome
of this study would be the republication, and wider distribution, of these texts.
Considering the surge of scholarly interest in colonialism and postcolonialism in the last
few decades, particularly in German colonialism, there is no better time for wider
distribution of the works of these writers than the present.

By paying attention to the figure of the adolescent in these novels, this project has
also brought the focus back to these texts as Bildungsromane. While the previous
analyses of adventure novels as vehicles of imperialistic propaganda have been
profitable, studies such as this one suggest shifting focus to investigate more closely the
image of the young adult that is presented in these texts. The fact that this study centered
on many highly didactic novels yet still found ways of fruitfully discussing this image
demonstrates that even adult-written texts that espouse the “model theory” of
development reveal interesting aspects of a culture’s image of youth. Hopefully future
studies will expand on this project by analyzing other Victorian and Wilhelmine texts for its image of youth. In particular, critics need to reconsider the field of young adult literature as a whole during this period. Too often adventure novels have been relegated as “non-psychological,” unrelated to the youth identity-crisis texts of the turn-of-the-century. But reexamining the trend of novels about young adults during this period, particularly in light of the scientific discourse of adolescence connecting the physiological with the psychological, is one way we may be able to consider these traditions instead as offshoots of the same branch.

My most important objective of this project, however, has been to demonstrate the complexity of the role of the young adult in these novels, and in novels in general. For too long the tendency of scholars has been to consider young adults either as passive and naïve as children, or as simple adult lackeys. This project suggests that their role is much more involved, and is in fact central to adults’ and a culture’s general understanding of itself. This attitude may be more apparent in Victorian and Wilhelmine culture, when the approaching turn-of-the-century and heightened competition caused by industrialization and colonization provided more impetus to worry about the future; yet hopefully studies like this one will cause scholars to consider the complexity of the image of youth during other less-anxious periods.

This dissertation opened up to analysis not just the young adult in the text, but also the rhetorical situation of the novel. The first chapter on animals examined the way in which Robert Michael Ballantyne’s multi-faceted description of the hunting of baby gorillas called upon the participation of the reader in interpreting the ethics of the hunters. The awareness of the implied reader also registered in Karl Müller’s guilt over hunting
gorillas in The Gorilla Hunter (1881). The importance of the readership also arose in the third chapter—as the construction of “spiritual adolescence” does not remain in the text, but also occurs in the shared space of young and old readers who are meant to participate in the bridging of past and present, birth and death, and beginning and end through the narrative of the cave journey. Along these lines, I would like to conclude by proposing that future analyses of adventure novels directed at a young adult audience consider not just the figure in the text, but also the implied and real readership of these books. I would suggest that, much as the analysis of the texts in the previous chapters has demonstrated that young adults play an active role in the text, so too are young adult readers capable of actively engaging with the images presented in these novels.

Adventure novels are, in fact, all about imagining and refashioning a cultural and individual future through the shared rhetorical space of adventure. This concern for the future of Anglo-European culture means that the primary focus of most adventure novels is on the education of the Anglo-European young adult, and not necessarily the young adult in the text, but the one who reads the novel. The implied young adult reader, although he may not be the only type of reader the author imagines as he writes the novel, is the most central to his educational purpose, to instruct as well as to entertain. In fact, because of the educational imperative, or because authors believe they have to “work harder” to gain the attention of young adults, writers of young adult and children’s fiction make perhaps a more concerted effort to cater to this perceived audience than in other genres, and this approach is usually apparent in the text itself. It is therefore in this interaction between the text and the reader that the most important “growth” occurs in the rhetorical situation. Garrett Stewart (1996) writes: “Literary fiction is in this always
multiple sense ‘obliging,’ pretending to necessitate the narrative attention for which it
connives and to which it panders. Here is the traditional captive audience as a local
rhetorical ploy, a tactical adjunct as well as an ultimate goal of the captivating tale” (4).
It is the site where the young adult reader inserts himself into the adventure by imagining
he is the protagonist, and where the text, in return, shapes his perspective based on the
narrative circumstances.

Yet even those critics who have suggested that we read into these novels the
possible resistance of black African natives that is denied or ignored by the imperialistic
impulse in the narrative, have continued to view the white young adult reader as either a
generic imperialist or a casualty of adult pedagogy. Logan (1999) suggests: “The child
who associates Africa with negative images will find it difficult to look beyond those
stereotypes even as an adult” (182). Such an analysis does not consider the various ways
in which a young adult readership was able to react to, even resist, these novels both
within and without the text.

Part of the reason why critics have approached the role of the young adult from
bifurcated positions is simply due to the nature of the texts themselves as works of
popular fiction. Jane Radway (1984) argues here that in “mass-culture studies,” “Most
critics assume initially that because these popular genres appear to be formulaic, all
differences and variations exhibited by particular examples of them are insignificant” (5).
Critics assume: “Because the text is fixed and already given when the reader encounters
it, all he or she can do is swallow it whole, to incorporate its ideological content in
unaltered form” (7). This fixed notion of both the author’s/text’s impact on the
readership and the reader’s inability to react against this impact provides critics,
according to Radway, with another opportunity to now deride the form itself as perpetrator of this limited interaction. “The form itself is subsequently deplored, then, because most mass-culture critics can show how the consciousness created by popular literature reconciles readers to a social order dominated by others” (6).

I would argue that we need to read these texts instead with the assumption that the implied young adult readership is an active population. In fact, the writer’s own awareness of this population can at times reveal an uncertainty about the audience and in particular and uncertainty about the success of the author’s pedagogical intentions. Examining the text-reader interaction can break down the mimetic nature of the “model” theory. Garrett Stewart writes: “It is not the mimetic model, therefore, which best grasps the relation between a text and its time but rather the rhetorical one: the model that covers exactly the space between, its negotiated traversals, its bizarre interchanges. In that space is textual subjectivity spawned and disseminated” (6). In this sense, the text-reader relationship in novels for young adults could challenge the “model” theory, because adolescents are already questioning adult actions for the values that they will adopt themselves. They are already interacting, and even at times resisting, the narrative as part of the coming of age process.

Radway suggests that cultural studies critics must learn to incorporate the rhetorical situation in their analysis. “The analytic focus must shift from the text itself, taken in isolation, to the complex social event of reading” (8). Likewise, critics of young adult adventure fiction must examine more than just the fictional portrayal of young adults, but also the role of the implied young adult reader in helping to shape the form, content, and cultural context of the text. Examining the text-reader interaction may
reveal that the young adults, both in the text and without, were not simply mouthpieces of the adults, nor passive victims.

It is possible, if not likely, that young adults, both real and implied, held a wide range of views regarding the ideology suggested in these adventure novels, including an attitude of resistance. When analyzing the adventure novel, then, we must consider the possibility that young adults were capable of resisting that adult pedagogy. We must consider that the young adult is as a critical thinker who does not always accept what he is being told by the adults. We can find the cracks of pedagogy and the writer’s awareness of those cracks, in gaps in the text and places where the author directly references or addresses the implied readership.

In their portrayals of sub-Saharan Africa and its natives, as well as in the ways in which the Anglo-European protagonists interact with this environment, these authors reveal a deep anxiety about themselves and the future that they project onto young adults. Daphne Kutzer (2000) writes:

> adults may be aware that a long-accepted cultural code is crumbling, that the world is shifting in unnerving and poorly understood ways, but they want both to shield children from these changes and encourage them to continue believing in and practicing cultural beliefs and codes that are no longer unquestioned in the adult world, perhaps in an unconscious desire to maintain those earlier cultural codes. (xvi)

The adult writers of these adventure novels were, in fact, by no means certain of their “captive audience,” as much as they were anxious about their ability to really “control” other people or colonize other lands. It is this uncertainty that fuels a fundamental insecurity in their own conception of self—an insecurity that makes them as adolescent as their own readership.
APPENDIX

List of British and German Adventure Novels for Young Adults about Sub-Saharan Africa Published Between 1870 and 1905
(excludes Erzählungen and short stories)

Allen, Willis Boyd The Lion City of Africa (1890)
Ballantyne, Robert Michael Gorilla Hunters (1861)
Hunting the Lions (1870)
Black Ivory (1873)
Blue Lights, or Hot Work in the Soudan (1888)
Barfus, Eginhard von Vom Kap nach Deutsch-Afrika (1888)
Deutsche Marine am Kongo und in der Südsee (1892)
[Unsere Marine . . 1900]
Am Elefantensee (1896)
Bindloss, Harold True Grit (1904)
Bruneck, Otto von (real name: Otto Elster) In den Schluchten des Kilima-Ndjaro (1905)
Burmann, Karl Im Herzen von Afrika (1878)
Burrage, E. Harcourt The Slave Traders of Zanzibar (1896)
White Ivory and Black (1899)
Collingwood, Harry (real name: William Joseph Cosens Lancaster) Congo Rovers (1886)
Evelyn, J (real name unknown) The Pirate Slaver (1895)
A Warrior King (1890)
Falkenhorst, Carl (real name: Stanislaus von Jezewski) In Kamerun (1887)

Der Zauberer vom Kilima-Ndjaro (1888)
Ein afrikanischer Lederstrumpf:
1. Weißbart – Weichherz (1888)
2. Der Löwe von Tanganyika (1888)
3. Raubtier-Araber (1889)
Der Ostafrikaner (1890)
Am Viktoria-Njansa (1893)
Jung-Deutschland in Afrika
1. Der Baumtöter (1894)
2. Der Sklave des Haussa (1894)
3. Unter den Palmen von Bagamojo (1894)
4. Der Kaffeepflanzer von Mrogoro (1895)
5. Der Fürst des Mondlandes (1895)
6. Die Tabakbauer von Usambara (1895)
7. Zum Schneedom des Kilimandscharo (1896)
8. Das Kreuz am Tanganjika (1897)
9. *Im Togoland* (1897)
10. *Pioniere der Kultur in Deutsch-Südwestafrika* (1900)

**Felsing, Otto**
- *Der blaue Diamant* (1902)
- *Mit Büchse und Falle* (1904)
- *Rote Männer in Ruanda* (1905)
- *Die Goldene Schlange* (1907)
- *In Sturm und Wettern* (1908)
- *Gefahrvolle Fahrten* (1909)
- *Wilde Gewalten* (1910)
- *Der Rächer* (1911)

**Fenn, George**
- *In the Mahdi’s Grasp* (1899)
- *Off to the Wilds* (1880)

**Foehse, Ludwig**
- *Abenteuer in den Deutschen Kolonien Ostafrikas* (1891)
- *Unter Wilden und Seeräubern* (1891)
- *Die Ansiedler am Rufidschi* (1895)

**Graydon, W. Murray**
- *Lost in the Slave Land* (1890-99?)
- *The River of Darkness, or Under Africa* (1902)
- *The White King of Africa* (1900-09?)

**Haggard, H. Rider**
- *King Solomon's Mines* (1885)
- *She, a History of Adventure* (1887)
- *Allan Quatermain* (1887)
- *Elissa: The Doom of Zimbabwe* (1900)
- *Ayesha: The Return of She* (1905)
- *Benita: An African Romance* (1906)
- *The Yellow God, an Idol of Africa* (1909)
- *People of the Mist* (1894)
- *Maiwa’s Revenge* (1888)

**Henty, George Alfred**
- *By Sheer Pluck: A Tale of the Ashanti War* (1880)
- *The Dash for Khartoum: A Tale of the Nile Expedition* (1890)
- *With Kitchener in the Soudan: A Story of Atbara and Omdurman* (1902)

**Keil, R.K.**
- *Von der Schulbank nach Afrika* (1885)

**Kingston, William Giles**
- *The African Trader: Or, Harry Bayford's Adventures* (1872)
- *In the Wilds of Africa: A Tale for Boys* (1872)
- *The Two Supercargoes: Or, Adventures in Savage Africa* (1878)
- *Ned Garth: Or, Made Prisoner in Africa* (1878)

**Mattias, Karl**
- *Kampf und Schrecken im Reiche des Mahdi* (1898)

**May, Karl**
- *Die Sklavenkarawane* (1893)
- *Der Karawanewürger* (1900)

**Mensch, G**
- *Der Kabaka* (1880)

**Miller, Thomas**
- *Fred and the Gorillas* (1870)

**Müller, Karl, Dr.**
- *Der Gorilla-Jäger* (1881)

**Scipio, Rudolf**
- *In Deutsch-Ostafrika* (1893)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stables, Gordon</td>
<td>Stanley Grahame</td>
<td>1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harry Milvaine</td>
<td>1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With Cutlass and Torch</td>
<td>1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steuart, J.A.</td>
<td>Self-Exiled</td>
<td>1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strang, Herbert</td>
<td>Tom Burnaby</td>
<td>1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samba</td>
<td>1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werner, Reinhold</td>
<td>Drei Monate an der Sklavenküste</td>
<td>1885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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