

Undoing structural racism in architecture – the urgent task to which this journal issue aims to contribute – entails much more than rewriting history. Anti-racist and anti-colonial activists teach us that such work cannot just be a matter of addressing the historical traces and contemporary expressions of racism in architectural discourse, nor does it suffice to include, through affirmative action or other such institutional reform, BIPOC voices into its professional and academic chambers. Undoing racism in architecture would remain futile if it failed to address the racialized hierarchies of power that shape the construction of our planetary lived environments – their spatial divisions, unequal configurations, and ecological interdependencies. As such, the histories we tell do matter. They matter because, like all stories, they conjure up a «we» and in doing so they not only include but also exclude. They matter also because they situate particular experiences in relationship to the world at large. And they matter because in orienting us towards historical difference, they show that the present is not the inevitable outcome of the past, and therefore another future may be forged. One such history – which has been key to the long-standing evasion of racism in architecture and therefore requires rewriting – is that of architectural modernism.

In 1926, the German landscape architect Leberecht Migge claimed that the vast modern housing estates being built across Weimar Germany were a strategic re-orientation of colonialism. In the prewar period, the «human struggle for existence» had led to overseas colonization and ultimately to war, he proposed. Space itself could explain these destructive developments: «When people push on people, we experience this movement in its extremely destructive form as war; when one social class pushes another, we experience this in its organic consequence as social war, as «colonization»».¹ Migge was referencing a geopolitical logic that had been proposed by the geographer Friedrich Ratzel in the late nineteenth century and that was adopted by Nazi ideologues to legitimize their racist expansionist policies. It suggested that a people (*Volk*) needed to expand its territory to survive. The war, and Germany's subsequent loss of its colonies as a result of the 1919 Versailles Treaty, had reduced European *Lebensraum*, Migge claimed, and would now need to be «expanded at all cost» in order to maintain European life.²

Yet for Migge, colonial expansion was not the only solution. In contrast to calls for re-establishing German overseas empire, Migge argued that Germans should concentrate their ambitions inward, and intensify the settlement and agricultural productivity of their domestic territories. This new kind of colonialism would no longer be based on the occupation of land overseas, but rather on the «technologizing of the German soil».³ In contrast to bourgeois reformers' longings for a return to a supposedly more natural way of life, Migge proposed a radical design project,

in which the earth would be transformed into a vital and functional complement to humanity. Migge coined this approach 'domestic colonization' [*Binnenkolonisation*], likely to distinguish it from the internal colonization [*Innenkolonisation*] policies of imperial Germany that had been in place since the late nineteenth century.

Migge was not writing this from the sidelines. By 1926, he had designed allotment gardens and 'green' urban extension plans for several German cities, and was working with leading architects such as Bruno Taut to build mass housing estates in Berlin, Frankfurt, Dessau, and other cities. In response to urgent housing needs after the war, social democratic city governments had launched ambitious housing programs, building thousands of new units on greenfield sites at the urban periphery. These estates are celebrated today as a progressive achievement of architectural modernism, fusing typified housing, landscape design, and urban planning to build a new kind of society, even a new kind of human. Migge's own modernist ambitions were focused less on housing than on allotment gardens, which he took as the starting point for a new ecological urbanism centered on the figure of the food-producing settler [*Siedler*]. In this context, Migge has been hailed as a pioneering 'green modernist', who translated avant-garde ecological principles into functionalist designs.⁴

Focusing on Germany, this article, and the forthcoming book *The Earth that Modernism Built* from which it draws, accounts for the colonality of architectural modernism by exploring its environmental logics. Modernism is not strictly defined by an aesthetic language, a self-proclaimed avant-garde, or a set of institutions. Rather, I build on a strand of scholarship that characterizes modernism as a belief that the future can be forged by aesthetic, technological, and intellectual means, rather than through political organization or collective action. In Germany as elsewhere, this belief crossed the political spectrum, mixed optimism and fear, and confounded clear distinctions between progressive and conservative ideals.⁵ Foregrounding the role of conflicts over land in colonial Africa and central Europe, I seek to understand how modernism was shaped by an imperial worldview in which land became increasingly recognized as a limited resource on our planet. Prompted by global competition for territorial expansion in the late nineteenth century, land received new import as an instrument of governing. Its control and transformation were not just a matter of geopolitics or political economy: land also became a biopolitical instrument. In other words, land was not only a technique of sovereignty or the goal of colonial conquest. It became an instrument of power focused on the racialized management of human life. While state institutions, reformers, and artists established 'colonies' in the countryside as a path to reform or build a new, at times emancipatory space, colonialists presented overseas land as an opportunity for white settlement that would avoid or resolve the tensions of industrial capitalism. In these and other projects, land – from its materiality and ownership to its cultivation and preservation – held promise as a means to shape the social. And because land was invested with such agency, the transformation of land by technical and aesthetic means – through architecture, planning, and other modes of design – carried extraordinary promise.

At first sight, Germany might seem an unlikely case for such an exploration. Germany's overseas empire was established only in 1884 and forcibly seized in 1919. Its colonial architecture and planning is less substantial, and widely regarded as much less significant, than that of some other European colonial empires. There

are few master plans or colonial buildings designed by well-known architects in its colonies, and the ostensibly 'postcolonial character' of the Weimar republic complicate efforts to locate its modernist experimentation on colonial ground. At the same time, as it has now become standard for historians to emphasize the continuities between the imperial and Weimar periods, there is growing evidence that German modernism did not deviate far from the imperial worldview from which it derived. Historians of the *Deutscher Werkbund* (the association of architects, designers and industrialists that were foundational to the creation of the Bauhaus), have long demonstrated the importance of imperial politics to the development of modern, industrial design before, during, and following World War 1.⁶ But in this groundbreaking scholarship, colonialism often remains a mere footnote. Race is analytically absent, and empire is usually discussed as Germany's European territorial footprint and in terms of its economic and military power, rather than an unstable project shaped by colonial violence and racialized dispossession.⁷ The longstanding treatment of colonialism as marginal to modern architecture in Germany has most recently been challenged in a pioneering study by Itohan Osayimwese, who shows how German architects were influenced by a public culture thoroughly imbued with representations of the colonial world and its inhabitants.⁸

Instead of focusing on modern architecture in the colonial world or on the role of colonial representations in the metropole, I propose situating the rise of modernism at the nexus between land and life as objects of governing. By this, I mean the ways in which the objectification, control, and transformation of living landscapes came to intersect with the management of populations as living bodies. Asking how architecture, landscape design, and settlement planning became discursively and practically imbued with the power to reorder the social world does not mean privileging the influence of an artistic avant-garde or limiting the inquiry to the operations of the state. A new rendering of biopolitics, and its closely related concept of governmentality, has prompted a shift in analytical focus. Instead of authoritarian or disciplinary power, it foregrounds the more subtle and everyday ways in which human life is regulated through both state and non-state institutions – ranging from public health and social insurance to scientific management and modern body culture.⁹ Significantly expanding the range of actors and agents of modernism, such analysis has engendered new narratives of how architecture, planning, landscape and industrial design serve in the shaping and governing of social life.

Extending the analytical focus on biopolitics, my intention is to explore its intersection with geopolitics – the dynamics of power over and through land. This shifts the primary analytical framework of modernism to include the colonial hierarchies of power to which both notions in fact owe at least part of their origin. The terms geopolitics and biopolitics were coined around 1900 as part of a German-centric intellectual tradition centered on the state as a living organism.¹⁰ This tradition, in which Ratzel's work was crucial, posited that government should be based in the biological constitution of the people (*Volk*) and its relationship to the land, rather than on statistical, 'dead' notions of population and territory. While biopolitics concerned the inner workings and health of the 'state organism', geopolitics dealt with its spatial and racial disposition in relationship to other such 'organisms' on the planet. Derived from an older way of thinking about the determining influence of the earth on humanity, both notions marshaled biological, racist thinking to naturalize capitalist empire and legitimize colonial rule.

Germany is at the center of this inquiry not because of its much-proclaimed pioneering role in the development of architectural modernism, but rather because colonialism still remains marginal to its dominant narratives.¹¹ Scholars have long insisted that we recognize colonialism as the shadow side of our global modernity, rather than relegating its effects to (formerly) colonized parts of the world.¹² Race – as biological fiction and mental reality undergirding the violent establishment of colonial hierarchies of power – should accordingly be analyzed as a key mode of making human and geographical difference in the modern world. Such a framework compels historians to account for racialization as a structural aspect of modernity, rather than studying racism as an ideology that can be circumscribed within specific movements – whether conservative, colonial, or fascist. Despite scholarly efforts to reveal modernists' racist ideas, German architectural modernism has thus far not been subjected to such structural analysis.¹³ Architectural historians are only recently beginning to account for the centrality of race in the development of modern architectural discourse and practice.¹⁴ Analyzing how colonial and racial logics shaped the territorial purview and biopolitical aspirations of modern architecture, landscape design, and settlement planning during the Kaiserreich and Weimar periods may contribute to a better understanding of the whiteness of modernism. Foundational for such a study is the wealth of recent scholarship on German colonialism, spurred by a wider transnational turn. Shifting the focus away from the nation-state as primary methodological framework, this scholarship analyzes the ways in which Germany was transformed by global connections at a time of imperial capitalist expansion.¹⁵

Land became a crucially important resource in the rapid course of Germany's industrialization, urbanization, and agricultural modernization in the late nineteenth century. This made the bourgeoisie keenly aware of the need to preserve natural landscapes and traditional rural architecture, spurring the establishment in 1904 of a pioneering environmental movement, the *Heimatschutzbewegung*, literally 'home-land protection movement.' In addition to landscape preservation, it was also concerned with the preservation of townscape, architectural style and rural planning, traditional customs and folklore, tourism, local history, and regional identity. An extensive body of scholarship has situated this environmental movement in German modernity, and analyzed it within the complex ecosystem of Wilhelmine reform.¹⁶ Many of these studies, however, neglect the fact that land also became important in the context of Europe's colonial project. Even though its own overseas colonies remained of limited economic and social importance, the German Empire was shaped by a global race to colonize the world and bring peripheral areas into in a subservient relationship to imperial centers. With these incursions came new challenges of how to control land, how to settle European populations and assure their safety, and how to dispossess existing polities from their land. This raised new questions, not only about the logistics of extraction and control and the social and sexual reproduction of settlers and laborers, but related to this also, questions about the appropriate form of settlement, the relationship between urban centers and agricultural hinterlands, and the production of suitable homes adapted to their environment. In short, colonialism raised new questions and engendered practices of planning and design across scales – from the domestic sphere to the planet at large.

Yet the occupation and settlement of overseas territories was only one mode – and not the most important one – of German colonialism. Germany's colonial drive

was very much focused within Europe. In addition to such continental aspirations, colonialism also gave new impetus to older practices of agrarian improvement and planned settlement, under the rubric of 'internal colonization'.¹⁷ Efforts to territorialize the national body were particularly important for Germany's imperial borderlands, and they coincided with efforts to unsettle other ethnic groups and unruly populations.¹⁸ Yet projects of settlement reshaped not only imperial borderlands; they also informed planning on the outskirts of German cities such as Berlin or Frankfurt, as Migge's work suggests.

The belief that Germans have a unique relationship with the land, as their *Heimat* (homeland), has long been studied as a staple of romantic nationalism.¹⁹ Yet the significance of this discourse for modernism is better understood if approached from more recent scholarly frameworks of settler colonialism.²⁰ A staunch advocate of imperial expansion, Ratzel theorized the relationship between people and land not as statically determined but rather as the result of a dynamic process of colonization. This process, he claimed, was based in the cultivation of land. With his conceptualization of the term *Lebensraum* around the turn of the century, he asserted that rather than by any indigenous claims to territory or mercantile control, it was by turning land into productive agricultural landscapes that a people would gradually become more rooted in the soil and thus legitimately claim a territory. This theory was meant to legitimize settler colonialism, and it obscured existing stewardship of the land and the fact that agricultural work was largely done by migrant or coerced laborers rather than white settlers. The analysis of the built environment – ranging from domestic interiors and roof shapes to the layout and land use plan of a village or a valley – unfolds theories of settlement.²¹ Knowledge of what we would now call 'vernacular architecture' was marshaled as evidence for people's relationship to the land theories that informed not only the *Heimatschutz* movement but also German colonial planning. Focusing on coloniality reveals not only the territorial and expansionist dimensions of German architecture and planning, but also the ways in which geopolitical theories were legitimized by creating and analyzing architectural 'facts on the ground'.

This geopolitical and architectural analysis reveals how Germans increasingly framed land – and its transformation through agriculture, architecture, planning, and other means – in racial terms. A well-known example is Paul Schultze-Naumburg who became a member of the Nazi party in the 1920s and published his influential racist diatribe, *Kunst und Rasse*, in 1928.²² Placing Schultze-Naumburg's turn-of-the-century calls for architectural and cultural reform in an imperial context shaped by colonial ways of knowing and doing allows to better understand how race shaped German modern architecture. Rooting Germans not into 'their soil' but into foreign soil overseas, architecture obscured what Patrick Wolfe has termed the annihilative logic of settler colonialism.²³ In this context, architecture served as a political technique based on the racialized production of affective connections between people and land. Such racialization shaped settlement projects in the borderlands of imperial Germany, even as indices of racial identification differed and remained contested.

What can be gained from this particular way of foregrounding coloniality in the history of architectural modernism? Considering the fact that Bauhaus-centric narratives of modernism continue to be taught at professional architecture, planning, and design schools around the world, it is imperative that these narratives account

for the ways in which colonialism and racism have shaped some of its dispositions, even where this influence has remained implicit. Yet this does not mean that colonial politics of land and race determine all of modernism's myriad manifestations or political repercussions. Even though its epistemological underpinnings of human ecology derived at least in part from late-nineteenth century imperialist and racist geography, architectural modernism also exceeded these foundations, as colonial ways of thinking and doing were refashioned and sublimated into modernist visions with a diverging and unpredictable set of outcomes.

- 1 Leberecht Migge, *Deutsche Binnenkolonisation: Sachgrundlagen des Siedlungswesens*, Berlin 1926, p. 16–17.
- 2 *Ibid.*, p. 18.
- 3 «Die Technisierung des deutschen Bodens». *Ibid.*, p. 13
- 4 David Haney, *When Modern Was Green: Life and Work of Leberecht Migge*, London 2010; Lutz Oberländer, *Der Aufbruch in die Moderne: Die Siedlung «Neu-Jerusalem» von Erwin Gutkind und Leberecht Migge*, Hamburg 2016; Martin Baumann, *Freiraumplanung in den Siedlungen der zwanziger Jahre am Beispiel der Planungen des Gartenarchitekten Leberecht Migge*, Halle 2002; Corinne Jacquand, Leberecht Migge et la colonie agricole évolutive «selon les principes biologiques», in: *In Situ*, 2013, [Online], 21, <https://journals.openedition.org/insitu/10370>, last accessed on 2 August 2021. See also the recent exhibition project and associated publication: *Licht Luft Scheiße: Perspektiven auf Ökologie und Moderne*, ed. by Sandra Bartoli et. al., Hamburg 2020.
- 5 In rejecting such distinctions, I follow scholarship that conceptualizes modernism as including reactionary and conservative tendencies. For a recent historiographic discussion, see the introduction and chapters by Geoff Eley and Jennifer L. Jenkins in: *German Modernities From Wilhelm to Weimar*, ed. by Geoff Eley, Jennifer L. Jenkins, and Tracie Matysik, London 2016. See also: Edward Ross Dickinson, Biopolitics, Fascism, Democracy: Some Reflections on Our Discourse about «Modernity», in: *Central European History*, 2004, Vol. 37, No.1, p. 1–48.
- 6 See the final chapter 7 on the Werkbund's «Weltpolitik» in John Maciuka, *Before the Bauhaus: Architecture, Politics, and the German State 1890–1920*, Cambridge 2008. For a more recent analysis of the Werkbund's imperial vision during the Weimar period, see: Jennifer L. Jenkins, *The Werkbund Exhibition «The New Age» of 1932*, in: Eley/Jenkins/Matysik 2016 (as Note 5), p. 283–300.
- 7 See for example: Didem Ekici, From Rikli's light-and-air hut to Tessenow's Patenthaus: Körperkultur and the modern dwelling in Germany 1890–1914, in: *The Journal of Architecture*, 2008, Vol. 13, No. 4, p. 379–406.
- 8 Itohan Osayimwese, *Colonialism and Modern Architecture in Germany*, Pittsburgh 2017.
- 9 While some have analyzed the hospital as an early architectural manifestation of this biopolitical regime, architectural and urban historians now study a wide range of twentieth-century practices, techniques, institutions, and movements through this lens. For an account of the hospital as biopolitical architecture, see: Sven-Olav Wallenstein, *Biopolitics and the Emergence of Modern Architecture*, New York 2008. Although it does not explicitly frame this ambition as «modernism», this volume focuses on «governing by design» as a key lens for understanding twentieth-century architecture: Aggregate Collective, *Governing by Design: Architecture, Economy, and Politics in the Twentieth Century*, Pittsburgh 2012. My own interest in Foucauldian notions of governing informed the following publications: Kenny Cupers, *Governing through Nature: Camps and Youth Movements in Interwar Germany and the United States*, in: *Cultural Geographies*, 2008, Vol. 15, No. 2, p. 173–205; Kenny Cupers, *The Social Project: Housing Postwar France*, Minneapolis 2014. Historians of imperial Germany have studied how domestic and industrial design intersected with emerging social welfare policies, thus framing modernism as a movement that aims to «shape the social». See: Jenkins: Introduction: Domesticity, Design, and the Shaping of the Social, in: *German History*, 2007, Vol. 25, p. 490–516. Special issue titled «Modernity Begins at Home». The question about the role of modern design, architecture, and planning in the development German welfare state is far from settled, as is historical scholarship on the welfare itself. For an overview of current scholarship on the history of German welfare, see: Young-sun Hong, Neither Singular nor Alternative: Narratives of Modernity and Welfare in Germany, 1870–1945, in: Eley/Jenkins/Matysik 2016 (as Note 5), p. 31–58. For an original account, outside the discipline of German history, of how modernism intersected with the eugenics movement, see: Marius Turda, *Modernism and Eugenics*, Basingstoke 2010.
- 10 The term «geopolitics» was most likely coined in 1899 by the Swedish political scientist Rudolf Kjellén. Rudolf Kjellén, *Studier öfver Sveriges politiska gränser*, in: *Ymer* 19 (1899), p. 283–331; p. 283.
- 11 The recent centenary of the Bauhaus has produced a slew of largely celebratory accounts focused on the transformative power assigned to design, ranging from the shaping of new lifestyles to the making of a «new world», with scant reference to colonialism. An exception to this may be the *Bauhaus imaginista* exhibition at the Haus der Kulturen der Welt, which acknowledges the colonial context of some Bauhaus projects. See: Kathleen James-Chakraborty et al., *Reviews Fall 2019 – Special Issue on Bauhaus Centenary*, in: *Architectural Histories* 2019, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 1–9.
- 12 Particularly influential in this regard has been the work of Latin-American scholars Anibal Quijano and Walter Mignolo. See: Anibal Quijano, Coloniality of power and Eurocentrism in Latin America, in: *International Sociology*, 2000, Vol. 15, No. 2, p. 215–232; Walter Mignolo, *Local*

histories/global designs: Coloniality, subaltern knowledges, and border thinking, Princeton 2012.

13 For example, Ludwig Mies van Rohe's fascist orientation has been well documented, as has Ernst May's work in colonial Africa.

14 Pioneering in this regard is: *Race and Modern Architecture: A Critical History from the Enlightenment to the Present*, ed. by Irene Cheng, Charles L. Davis, and Mabel O. Wilson, Pittsburgh 2020. Foundation to my understanding of race and the built environment has been the work of, and my intellectual exchanges with Prita Meier. See: Prita Meier, *Swahili Port Cities: The Architecture of Elsewhere*, Bloomington 2016.

15 *Das Kaiserreich transnational. Deutschland in der Welt 1871–1914*, ed. by Sebastian Conrad and Jürgen Osterhammel, Göttingen 2004; *Transnationale Geschichte. Themen, Tendenzen und Theorien*, ed. by Gunilla Budde, Sebastian Conrad and Oliver Janz, Göttingen 2006; Sebastian Conrad, *Globalisation and the Nation in Imperial Germany*, Cambridge 2010; Jürgen Osterhammel, *The Transformation of the World: A Global History of the Nineteenth Century*, Princeton 2014 (German edition 2009); Andrew Zimmerman, *Alabama in Africa: Booker T. Washington, the German Empire, and the Globalization of the New South*, Princeton 2010. For a recent overview, see: *German Colonialism in a Global Age*, ed. by Bradley D. Naranch and Geoff Eley, Durham / London 2014.

16 Andreas Knaut, *Zurück zur Natur! Die Wurzeln der Ökologiebewegung* (Greven: Kilda Verlag, 1993); Matthew Jefferies, *Politics and Culture in Wilhelmine Germany* (Oxford: Berg, 1995); William H. Rollins, *A Greener Vision of Home: Cultural Politics and Environmental Reform in the German Heimatschutz Movement, 1904–1918* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997); Kevin Repp, *Reformers, Critics, and the Paths of German Modernity: Anti-Politics and the Search for Alternatives 1890–1914* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000); Matthew Jefferies, «Lebensreform: A Middle-Class Antidote to Wilhelmism» in: Geoff Eley and James Retallack, eds., *Wilhelmism and Its Legacies. German Modernities, Imperialism, and the Meanings of Reform, 1890–1930* (New York: Berghahn, 2003); Thomas Lekan, *Imagining the Nation in Nature: Landscape Preservation and German Identity 1885–1945* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004); Maiken Umbach and Bernd Huppau, eds., *Vernacular Modernism: Heimat, Globalisation and the Built Environment* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005); Sigfrid Hofer, *Reformarchitektur, 1900–1918: Deutsche Baukünstler auf der Suche nach dem nationalen Stil* (Stuttgart: Axel Menges, 2005); Jennifer L. Jenkins, «Heimat Art, Modernism, Modernity,» in: David Blackbourn and James Retallack, eds., *Localism, Landscape, and the Ambiguities of Place: German-speaking central Europe, 1860–1930* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), 60–75; Jennifer L. Jenkins, «Particularism and Localism» in: Mat-

thew Jefferies, ed. *The Ashgate Research Companion to Imperial Germany* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2015).

17 On Prussian internal colonization, see the first chapter «Conquest from Barbarism: Prussia in the Eighteenth Century, in: David Blackbourn: *The Conquest of Nature: Water, Landscape, and the Making of Modern Germany*, New York 2006; Elizabeth B. Jones, *The Rural 'Social Ladder': Internal Colonization, Germanization and Civilizing Missions in the German Empire*, in: *Geschichte und Gesellschaft: Zeitschrift für Historische Sozialwissenschaften*, 2014, Jg. 40, Heft 4, p. 457–492; Sebastian Conrad, *Internal Colonialism in Germany*, in: Eley/Naranch 2014, p. 246–265.

18 See Zimmerman 2010; Dörte Lerp, *Imperiale Grenzräume: Bevölkerungspolitiken in Deutsch-Südwestafrika und den östlichen Provinzen Preußens, 1884–1914*, Frankfurt 2016.

19 Celia Applegate, *A Nation of Provincials: The German Idea of Heimat*, Berkeley 1990; William H. Rollins, *A Greener Vision of Home: Cultural Politics and Environmental Reform in the German Heimatschutz Movement, 1904–1918*, Ann Arbor 1997; Barbara Miller Lane, *National Romanticism and Modern Architecture in Germany and the Scandinavian Countries*, Cambridge 2000.

20 The following scholarship has reframed *Heimat* in an imperial context: Nancy Ruth Reagin: *The imagined Hausfrau: national identity, domesticity, and colonialism in imperial Germany*, in: *The Journal of Modern History*, 2001, Vol. 73, p. 54–86; *The Heimat Abroad: The Boundaries of Germanness*, ed. by Krista O'Donnell, Renate Bridenthal and Nancy Reagin, Ann Arbor 2005; Umbach/Huppau 2005.

21 Key scholarship on Ratzel includes: Ulrike Jureit, *Das Ordnen von Räumen: Territorium und Lebensraum im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, Hamburg 2012; Mark Bassin, *Imperialism and the Nation State in Friedrich Ratzel's Political Geography*, in: *Progress in Human Geography*, 1987, Vol. 11, p. 479–489; *Lebensraum and its Discontents*, special issue of the *Journal of Historical Geography*, 2018; Woodruff D. Smith, *Politics and the Sciences of Culture in Germany, 1840–1920*, New York 1991; Woodruff D. Smith, *Friedrich Ratzel and the Origins of Lebensraum*, in: *German Studies Review*, 1980, Vol. 3, No. 1, p. 51–68.

22 The standard reference work on Schultze-Naumburg is: Norbert Borrmann, *Paul Schultze-Naumburg, 1869–1949: Maler, Publizist, Architekt; Vom Kulturreformer der Jahrhundertwende zum Kulturpolitiker im Dritten Reich*, Essen 1989; cf. Hans-Rudolf Meier and Daniela Spiegel (eds.), *Kulturreformer. Rassenideologe. Hochschuldirektor: Der lange Schatten des Paul Schultze-Naumburg*, Heidelberg 2018, <https://doi.org/10.11588/arthistoricum.352.486>, last accessed on 2 August 2021.

23 Patrick Wolfe, *Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native*, in: *Journal of Genocide Research*, 2006, Vol. 8, No. 4, p. 387–409.