Ausgestellt: The ethics of human exhibitions in early imperial Germany

Stahmer, Bjarne

Leiden University
Faculty of Humanities
Colonial and Global History
MA Thesis
Supervision: Prof. Dr. Marieke Bloembergen
Submission 07.08.2023

Ausgestellt

The ethics of human exhibitions in early imperial Germany

Bjarne Stahmer
b.stahmer@umail.leidenuniv.nl
M.A. (res.) Colonial and Global History
4. Semester
S3346676

Table of Contents

Introduction..... 2
Chapter 1: How to unhumanise 16
Chapter 2: Between Animals and Anthropologists 27
1. Contracted..... 28
2. Exhibited 34
3. Examined..... 37
4. Infected 46
5. Aftermath..... 49
Chapter 3: Boundaries of Collecting 53
Conclusion 61
Bibliography 69
1. Sources..... 69
2. Literature..... 70

Introduction

On the 7th of November 1880, members of the Berlin Society of Anthropology, Ethnology, and Prehistory[1] gathered in the zoological garden of Berlin. The reason for the meeting at this place were eight Inuit who had been brought to the zoological garden and were exhibited as an attraction for the inhabitants of Berlin. Responsible for this exhibition was the businessman Carl Hagenbeck, who was selling captured animals to zoos and had people from all over the world being brought to central Europe to be exhibited for entertainment. The members of the Berlin Society used this exhibition for reasons beyond pure entertainment. For the chairman, Rudolf Virchow, these exhibitions constituted a chance for anthropologists to get closer to their subjects of investigation, whose actual residence was far away from the scientists interested in them. During the aforementioned assembly, Virchow presented the results of his assessments of the Inuit right where they were to live during their time in Berlin: the zoological garden. After Virchow's lengthy presentation right next to the two Inuit families, he continued to do something he rarely did: He addressed a newspaper article in the *Magdeburger Zeitung*[2] where the exhibiting of people in general, as well as the exhibiting of them in zoos, had been criticised just two weeks prior. The author did state that even if these "*interessanten Menschenexemplare nun schon ausgestellt werden, dann müsste schon das Gefühl für ‚Rassenanstand' davor bewahren, unseres Gleichen in Thiergärten sehen zu lassen*".[3] Such a viewpoint on human exhibitions was rarely found in newspapers. The exhibitions, called "Völkerschauen" by their initiators, such as Carl Hagenbeck, were highly popular with the German public, who flocked into the zoos in tens of thousands every time an exhibition was in town. This article, however, shows that the understanding of the legitimacy of these exhibitions, especially in zoos, was not completely uniform within German society.

Virchow fiercely tried to denote the allegations but did not tackle the issue of the exhibitions being in zoos. He solely reacted to the word "interesting", which he discerned as the general problem of journalists writing about the exhibitions: In his eyes, reporters tried to downplay

[1] Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Frühgeschichte; hereafter only referred to as Berlin Society for Anthropology or simply Berlin Society.
[2] Magdeburger Zeitung 21st October 1880, Nr. 493, page unknown.
[3] Eng.: interesting human specimens have to be exhibited, then a sense of 'racial decency' should prevent us from allowing our peers to be seen in animal gardens; cited after Verhandlungen für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte (1880): Sitzung vom 7. November 1880, p. 270.

the importance of "Völkerschauen", degrading them to sheer entertainment events without scientific value, neither for researchers nor the German public. Virchow, however, considered these exhibitions to be of outmost importance, since they allegedly would enable scientists to understand the development of humankind and therefore help solve "*die wichtigsten und größten Fragen, welche das Menschengeschlecht überhaupt aufwerfen kann*".[4] His response does not only show his appraisal of the exhibitions but also gives a glimpse of his conviction concerning the rightfulness of the entire enterprise. For him, the only obvious criticism that needed attention was the questioning of its scientific value, not the moral issue of exhibiting people in constructed settings, or even more so at zoological gardens. Virchow argued that there was simply nothing wrong with showcasing human beings at a zoo, taking measurements of them, and giving speeches about their bodily features and intelligence in their presence. Virchow's understanding of the expositions raises questions not only about the general concept of human exhibitions, but especially about the ethics of the actors like Virchow related to them. How can these ethics be defined? Was there a difference between ethical guidelines, the ethics of the producers of the exhibitions, the German public, and the scientists dealing with them? This thesis therefore focuses on how this understanding of the exhibitions both internally by all the actors of the exhibitions and externally by the German public came together and what the consequences of these ethics were for the exhibited.

When Virchow gave his speech in Berlin's zoological garden in 1880, the human exhibitions in zoos were still new to the German metropoles. Although people from different parts of the world had already been exhibited for centuries, Carl Hagenbeck had claimed to be the inventor of "authentic exhibitions" in 1875, when he had six Sámi brought to Hamburg together with reindeer he had bought from them.[5] The real innovation in the German context, however, was the cooperation of businessmen like Hagenbeck with anthropologists like Rudolf Virchow. This gave the exhibitions an academic touch on the one hand, and made people being assessed by physical anthropologists and their objects being taken by ethnologists possible on the other.[6] This concept was also not entirely new, since the world exhibitions had already introduced

[4] Eng.: the most important and biggest questions, which the human race can raise at all; Verhandlungen für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte (1880): Sitzung vom 7. November 1880, p. 270.
[5] Wolter, Stefanie (Diss.) (2005): Die Vermarktung des Fremden. Exotismus und die Anfänge des Massenkonsums, Frankfurt, p. 103.
[6] Rothefels, Nigel (2002): Savages and Beasts: The Birth of the Modern Zoo, Baltimore, p. 106.

them[7] and inspired Hagenbeck, and other zoo directors, to host human exhibitions in German zoos. After defending the necessity of these shows, Virchow gave a shout-out to Hagenbeck, urging him not to stop but, on the contrary, to even get more and more people to Germany in order for them to be exhibited.[8]

Hagenbeck became a member of the Berlin Society for Anthropology in 1878[9], and, as Andrew Zimmerman has elaborated, Virchow even used his political connections to influence Egyptian and Chilean officials in his favour.[10] This shows how close the ties between the business of the animal trader and the field of the anthropologist had become over the matter of human exhibitions. Indeed, research carried out by German anthropologists during the later 19th century was often solely based on the human exhibitions, which decisively influenced the scientists' view on the world and their perception of people outside of the Western imperial world. In fact, many works by influential scholars were written based on the mere experience of these exhibitions, like Friedrich Ratzel's "Völkerkunde" or Johannes Ranke's "Der Mensch"[11], as well as the early work of Franz Boas on the Nuxalk, whom he met during the "Bella Coola" tour in Berlin in 1886.[12] All these authors, except for Boas, did not question this approach towards anthropology, which would only change from around 1900 onwards, when field research would become more accessible and popular.

As a result, combining the human exhibitions with physical anthropology and ethnological collecting while situating everything in zoological gardens and museums created a dense web of people with different interests who supported the creation of the displays. But did they operate within an ethical regime? And what did it consist of? What were their limits and what did they deem as acceptable? These questions are crucial to further understand their motivations, but also the longevity of the exhibitions in imperial Germany. Analysing ethical regimes has increasingly interested historians of science in order to understand motivations and beliefs of scholars, especially medical doctors, who conducted research and experiments on human beings. Fenneke Sysling has moreover deployed this concept of the ethical regime

[7] See Rydell, Robert (2005): Buffalo Bill in Bologna. The Americanization of the World, 1896-1922, Chicago.
[8] Verhandlungen für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte (1880): Sitzung vom 7. November 1880, p. 270-271.
[9] Given in the member registry at the archive of the Berlin Society for Anthropology, Ethnology, and Prehistory, Hagenbeck became a member on the 16th November 1878 with the member number 459.
[10] Zimmerman, Andrew (2001): Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany, Chicago, p. 256.
[11] Bruce, Gary (2017): Through the Lion Gate: A History of the Berlin Zoo, Oxford, p. 57.
[12] Kramer, Jennifer (Diss.) (2003): Switchbacks: Art, Ownership, and Nuxalk National Identity, Vancouver, p. 73.

in her research project "Human Subject Research and Medical Ethics in Colonial Southeast Asia", which has been an important inspiration to this analysis.[13] The actors responsible for the exhibitions can be so divided into distinct groups that have already been assessed by historians of ethics without addressing the human exhibitions in particular.

First, scholars like the physical anthropologist Rudolf Virchow or the ethnologist Adolf Bastian examined the exhibited people and collected their belongings together with other objects brought by collectors from the colonies. Anthropology, as will be discussed, was still a very young discipline, and as such, most members of the Berlin Society were not learned anthropologists but medical doctors or businessmen who saw anthropology as a hobby. Indeed, the physical examinations of exhibited people were conducted like medical examinations and, as will be shown, the people were often treated like patients of a psychiatric ward. As a result, the anthropologists' actions could be assessed in the light of the history of medical ethics. This approach offers great promises, since the institutionalisation and professionalisation of modern medicine in the young German Empire had just begun. Moreover, medical practitioners had to be state-authorised by the Chamber of Physicians and regulations and guidelines were issued to control medical conduct. However, Andreas-Holger Maehle and Ulrich Tröhler have shown how these guidelines were less directed at doctor-patient interactions but at the conduct of business and competition between medical practitioners.[14] As a result, most violations that were brought to court primarily concerned intraprofessional competition such as issues concerning advertisement or payment. Only sexual misconduct of physicians towards female patients was tried in court. Furthermore, the judiciary did not have the power to revoke the title of physician, something that remained exclusively in the hand of the state, who, on the other hand, would only act if a criminal offense was committed.

So, while there was an ethical code for physicians, they mostly did not have to fear repercussions if they did not follow it. As a result, the training of medical doctors primarily focussed on practice and not on proper conduct, in order to gain reputation to survive in an open market economy where they competed with unlicensed health practitioners.[15] Alfons

[13] See Sysling, Fenneke (2022): Human Subject Research and Medical Ethics in Colonial Southeast Asia, Leiden.
[14] See Maehle, Andreas-Holger; Tröhler, Ulrich (2012): The discourses of Practitioners in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Germany, in: The Cambridge World History of Medical Ethics, pp. 432-438.
[15] Idem.

Labisch has shown how this contesting climaxed in the 1880s, when social health insurance became mandatory in the German Empire and, more importantly, during the early phase of the human exhibitions.[16] It was only after this that German physicians developed collective professionalism and therefore new ethical guidelines. And one of the fiercest enemies of such regulations was Rudolf Virchow. He argued that "explicit codes of professional conduct were superfluous" and that disciplinary courts would be futile.[17] On the other hand, according to Hilary Howes' analysis, it was also Virchow who tried to establish specific guidelines on how researchers should assess and measure people, creating the very thing he had argued against.[18]

When looking at the treatment of exhibited people as well as debates within the anthropological societies, the blind spots of the historiography of medical ethics become evident. The first problem is the doctor-patient relationship. While physical anthropologists were mostly medical doctors assessing people, they did not treat exhibited people like their patients: there was no formal doctor-patient relationship since exhibited people were not examined for pathological sickness but systematic othering. Othering has played an important role within the historiography, with scholars such as Wendy Mitchinson pointing out the role of gender in medicine in Victorian Canada[19] or Rana Hogarth discussing the consequences of the racialisation of medicine in late 18th and early 19th century North and Central America.[20] For exhibited people, however, the act of assessment has so far not been addressed. These assessments could be qualified as medical experiments, which were hardly restricted in late 19th century Germany, as long as there was no criminal offense. Medical doctors could thus experiment and examine even without the consent of the patient. This changed around 1900, when high court rulings demanded the patients' consent, tackled by ethical discussions by prominent physicians about its importance in medical experimentation.[21]

---

[16] See Labisch, Alfons (2013): From Traditional Individualism to Collective Professionalism: State, Patient, Compulsory Health Insurance, and the Panel Doctor Question in Germany, 1883-1931, in: Berg, Manfred; Cocks, Geoffrey (Ed.), Medicine and Modernity. Public Health and Medical Care in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Germany, Cambridge, pp. 35-54.

[17] Maehle, Tröhler 2012, p. 434.

[18] See Howes, Hilary S. (2013): The Race Question in Oceania. A.B. Meyer and Otto Finsch between metropolitan theory and field experience, 1865-1914, Frankfurt.

[19] See Mitchinson, Wendy (1991): The Nature of their Bodies. Women and their Doctors in Victorian Canada, Toronto.

[20] See Hogarth, Rana (2017): Medicalizing Blackness: Making Racial Difference in the Atlantic World, 1780-1840, Chapel Hill.

[21] Maehle, Tröhler 2012, p. 435.

However, this classification would also fall short for the assessment of exhibited people. At least as for the known sources, there were no following procedures to the physical assessments. This might be different in cases where exhibited people needed medical attention, as will be discussed in the case of the Inuit exhibition of 1880/1881 or the colonial exhibition of 1896. Additionally, the history of medical ethics does not cover the assessment of exhibited people by ethnologists which was distinct from that of physical anthropologists. Historiography also limits the scope only to the assessment of people. Taking away the possessions of the exhibited and using the objects to further denote them and their culture into fabricated classes was just as much part of the human zoo as the exhibition of living bodies.

Next to the group of scholars there is the group of businessmen like Carl Hagenbeck, who captured and traded animals as well as contracted people for exhibitions in Europe. Historians of animal-ethics have analysed the ethical code and understanding of human-animal relationships of these businessmen as well as their hunters and traders. Catching animals, transporting them, and confining them in zoos in a business-oriented context still was very new to Europe in the 19th century. Gary Bruce has argued how zoos in their early stages during the 19th century were not built for the animals' well-being but purely for visitors. Animals were only kept alive for prolonged periods when it was more difficult to acquire new ones for the zoo.[22] Nigel Rothfels has also shown how the elephant Toto of the Roman zoo, bought and sold by Hagenbeck's company, saw five of the six elephants die that he accompanied in captivity.[23] This death accompanying zoo keeping was not only limited to the zoo, with dozens of animals being killed for only one to get captured in the wild.[24] Nevertheless, Abigail Woods[25] and Violette Pouillard[26] have argued that especially animals, as the core of the entire business, have often been overlooked by historians in favour of scientists and entrepreneurs who gained fame through the animal's captivity. It was also Woods who more closely discussed the zoo as a common ground for medical and animal ethics, since physicians also acted as veterinarians in many 19th century zoos. There they could deploy different ethical standards as death was

[22] Bruce 2017, p. 21.
[23] Rothfels, Nigel (2021): Elephant Trails: A History of Animals and Cultures, Baltimore.
[24] See Rothfels 2002, Chapter 2 Catching Animals.
[25] See Woods 2018.
[26] Pouillard, Violette (2020): Structures of Captivity and Animal Agency. The London Zoo, ca. 1865 to the Present Times, in: Mengozzi, Chiara (Ed.), Outside the Anthropological Machine. Crossing the Human-Animal Divide and Other Exit Strategies, London, pp. 40-57.

more prevalent and neglectable.[27] Animals could also be used for medical experiments without any restrictions: their pain, or even death, was not a criminal offense and therefore legal as an outcome of animal testing. While this perception of animals might, speaking with Bernard Rollin,[28] not be too surprising, there already were discussions concerning animal wellbeing back then. The British Cruelty to Animals Act of 1876 heavily regulated these experiments in the British Empire and led to an attempt to enact a similar law in the German Empire. According to Maehle and Tröhler, it was yet again Virchow, and other prominent scientists like Rudolf Heidenhain, that defended animal experiments, breaking the act down to the obligation to use anaesthetics on larger animals during experiments.[29] Animal protection movements developed much slower and had a lower impact in imperial Germany than in Britain. When the first Inuit were exhibited in Berlin together with their sled dogs, the Animal Protection Society did mention their concerns for the dogs, but the conceptualisation of both zoo and human exhibitions was not questioned.[30] Thus, animals were ranked and a price tag was put on their lives, the question of death just a mere business decision by European zoo directors and medical doctors.

The zoo was therefore not simply a place for animals to live at. Cultural historians like Stefanie Wolter have discussed how, due to the consumer revolution, the zoological gardens of the 19th century were designed for Western metropolitan citizens, in contrast to the previous royal menageries which were exclusively used for aristocratic entertainment. They were supposedly a place where science and consumerism came together, where researchers could work on animals while the metropolitan public could be educated and entertained.[31] This educational connotation served as a differentiating factor between exhibitions and other places of display like fairs or traveling menageries. They followed the same narrative, with organisers presenting the German public a “scientific” understanding of what people around the world looked like, while justifying the anthropologists’ world view through the orchestration of uncivilized people to be watched for entertainment. This development was not exclusive to the zoo.

[27] Woods 2018, p. 34.
[28] Rollin postulates that many medical scientists still argue for animals not feeling pain or at least a having a different understanding of pain in contrast to obvious reasons to acknowledge animal pain, see Rollin, Bernard (2019): Progress and Absurdity in Animal Ethics, in: Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics (32), pp. 391-400.
[29] Maehle, Tröhler 2012, pp. 434-435.
[30] Bruce 2017, p. 59.
[31] Wolter 2005, p. 112.

Ethnological museums, like the Royal Ethnological Museum of Berlin under Adolf Bastian which opened in 1886, also opened in many German cities. This was due to the public interest but also because the imperial administration was looking for "honour, image, and prestige".[32]

While this might explain some reasoning behind the human exhibitions, both the history of medical and of animal ethics have so far left a gap regarding human exhibitions, which often challenge the boundaries of these fields of research. Only cultural historians analysing the development of these shows have so far concentrated on the ethics of human exhibitions.

Both Hilke Thode-Arora[33] and Nigel Rothfels[34] have performed extensive research around exhibitions, especially the ones produced by Carl Hagenbeck. They have discussed the link between Hagenbeck and the Berlin Society, as well as their operations of the exhibition, such as contracting and transport. They list many atrocities committed by Western scientists and give reasons for certain developments. A particular insight into the actors' ethical regime is mostly missing in their works. As mentioned before, some research focussed on the importance of the human exhibitions within consumerism regimes of late 19th century Germany, mostly analysing financial or ideological reasons behind the shows, assessments, and collections, but disregarding the actors.[35]

The Inuit exhibition of 1880 presented at the beginning, however, reveals a debate about the exhibitions' moral legitimacy. Besides Vichow's cited newspaper in the Magdeburger Zeitung, the only publication explicitly dealing with the ethics of exhibitions in imperial Germany is the diary of Abraham Ulrikab, one of the exhibited Inuit.[36] The document is one of the few egodocuments of exhibited people thus far discovered by historians and offers an insight into the Inuk's thoughts, beliefs, and fears. It is one of the only direct ways of understanding the difference between normative codes and their factual application. Based on this analysis, Hartmut Lutz argues that for Virchow and Hagenbeck the exhibited people were mere objects,

[32] Penny, H. Glenn (2002): Objects of Culture: Ethnology and Ethnographic Museums in Imperial Germany, pp. 46-49.
[33] See Thode-Arora, Hilke (1989): Für fünfzig Pfennig um die Welt: die Hagenbeckschen Völkerschauen, Frankfurt.
[34] Rothfels, Nigel (2002): Savages and Beasts: The Birth of the Modern Zoo, Baltimore.
[35] See See Dreesback, Anna (2005): Gezähmte Wilde: Die Zuschaustellung „exotischer" Menschen in Deutschland 1870-1940, Frankfurt; see Wolter, Stefanie (Diss.) (2005): Die Vermarktung des Fremden. Exotismus und die Anfänge des Massenkonsums, Frankfurt; see Ciarlo, David (2011): Advertising empire: race and visual culture in imperial Germany, Cambridge.
[36] See Lutz, Hartmut (Ed.) (2007): Abraham Ulrikab im Zoo. Tagebuch eines Inuk 1880/81, Greifswald.

controlling them beyond the normal ethical standards applied to human beings. While Hagenbeck was economically motivated, Virchow could assert his ideological dominance in institutionalizing anthropology.[37] According to Lutz, Virchow also tried to severely subdue the Inuit, but they occasionally were successful in evading commands, overcoming or at least fighting the power discrepancy they faced. As a reaction, Virchow discredited them as objects or lesser creatures.

Lutz's analysis offers a great approach towards the history of ethics concerning early human exhibitions in late 19th century Germany. But while the publication, an edition of Ulrikab's diary, goes further than most human exhibition research, it limits its view to only one exhibition. Moreover, there is no overall analysis of the ethics of human exhibitions in early imperial Germany, that would explain the scope of the ethical boundaries of the people responsible for the exhibitions, the reasons for their behaviour and would outline continuities into the present. Therefore, this thesis focuses on a more general understanding of the ethical regime of human exhibitions in imperial Germany in the late 19th century. What were the ethical guidelines by the organisers, contractors, and anthropologists who made the exhibitions possible and promoted them during the early phase of the exhibitions in late 19th century Germany? What were their moral guidelines while interacting with exhibited people, examining and displaying them while collecting and classifying their belongings? How did their ethics by practice look like? And did these ethics by practice result in a homogenous ethical regime among the actors responsible for the exhibitions? And how might their ethics by practice have been different to the German public or the German state?

I argue that, in contrast to later developments in the early 20th century, there was no official ethical code which organisers, contractors, or anthropologists followed. However, they developed a general understanding by practice of what they deemed acceptable during their operations and regarding what transpired to the German public. Ethics by practice that only become visible in the actors' behaviour and thought, can therefore be seen in contrast to official ethical guidelines which were collectively formulated and public. A better understanding of this ethical regime also explains why it has neither been addressed by the historiography of medical ethics or of animal ethics. Ethics by practice meant that while there were no official guidelines, people still followed a certain regime, unspoken guidelines, that

[37] Lutz 2007, p. 115-119.

can be seen in their regular practices. Through the execution of power over mostly colonised people, anthropologists and show producers treated the exhibited people as something transcending the realm of humans and animals, allegedly filling the developmental bridge between the two. But the reactions of the exhibited people, as the following analysis will show, gave them more agency and leverage than most researchers have so far acknowledged. It was not always the ethical regime of producers, contractors, and anthropologists limiting their actions, but also the actions of the exhibited people themselves. They sometimes successfully evaded the objectification, showcasing that the imperialists were not as omnipotent as they stated and that there was an ethical guideline by practise.

To gain insights into my research questions and analyse the ethics by practice, I will explore different case studies of human exhibitions, which will offer different perspectives on contracting, exhibiting, collecting, and assessing within early human exhibitions in imperial Germany. For this analysis it is important to highlight the situation of the German Empire and its colonial network during the beginning of the exhibitions. While people like Hagenbeck would operate throughout the German lands already during the early 19th century, Germany only became united in 1871 and would officially start its colonial enterprise by 1884. Very quickly, the German empire would claim German New-Guinea, German Samoa, German South West Africa, German East Africa, Togoland, and Cameroon. Takashi Ito has discussed how these formal colonial borders do not pay due diligence to the colonial reality producers, contractors, and anthropologists. Hagenbeck did not simply rely on the German colonies to catch animals and humans, his business operated longer than the German colonial empire existed. German businesses had spread over the globe much before the borders had been painted on maps. Therefore, while the German Empire defines the setting of the early human exhibitions in Germany, they need to be understood beyond national imperial history. In this sense, we are dealing with transnational networks that took place in the imperial world, rather than in a specific nation's colonial sphere.[38]

Therefore, the first case study will be of Johann Adrian Jacobsen's led exhibitions between 1880 and 1886 where he contracted several people for Carl Hagenbeck. Jacobsen also worked for Adolf Bastian and was supported by Rudolf Virchow. Jacobsen's case highlights the

[38] Ito, Takashi (2021): History of the Zoo, in: Roscher, Mieke; Krebber, André; Mizelle, Brett (Ed.), Handbook of Historical Animal Studies, Berlin, Boston, p. 442.

transnational nature of the human exhibitions, a Norwegian, working for Germans, operating in a non-German colonial world. His enterprise is well suited for a case study since they feature the richest sources material available, situated within Jacobsen's bequest at the MARKK[39] Hamburg. Also available are sources regarding Hagenbeck's thoughts and motivations during the exhibitions beyond his biography, written nearly 20 years later in 1908 for commercial publishing. Especially for the exhibitions led by Jacobsen there are also sources available that have been either directly written by the exhibited or give, through critical assessment, insights into their actions.

The second case study is that of the Great Industrial Exhibition of 1896, which was a world exhibition under a different name.[40] This was one of the only times were people directly from the German colonies were exhibited. The exposition would create a discussion around the ethics of human display, leading to laws that forbade the exhibition of people from German colonies, but not human exhibitions in general.[41] The official medical report as well as the assessments of the exhibited people offer an understanding of the ethical guidelines by practise and the power discrepancy between exhibited and exhibiting people as well as their boundaries.

All these sources originated in a colonial and imperial setting and therefore demand careful interpretation. I selected these sources not only because they offer a general understanding of the events of the human exhibitions, but also because they can be critically assessed to understand the motives and thoughts of their creators. As such, reports and letters will not be used to display the narratives of the 19th century, but to see what the creators of the reports deemed as acceptable to present to the public or what actions the contractors, anthropologists, and producers personally thought of as acceptable. Many of these sources also need to be understood as reactions, either from exhibited people, or the German public. Therefore, I have critically assessed them not only regarding the motives behind these reactions, but also to put a spotlight on the actions of the exhibited in the first place.

[39] Museum am Rothenbaum für Kunst und Kulturen, formerly the Ethnographical Museum in Hamburg.
[40] Meinecke, Gustav (1897): Deutschland und seine Kolonien im Jahre 1896, Berlin.
[41] See Sippel, Harald (1995): Rassismus, Protektionismus oder Humanität? Die gesetzlichen Verbote der Anwerbung von „Eingeborenen" zu Schaustellungszwecken in den deutschen Kolonien, in: Debusmann, Robert; Riesz, János (Ed.), Kolonialausstellungen – Begegnungen mit Afrika?, Frankfurt, pp. 43-64.

This whole examination will be divided in three chapters building on each other and discussing different sets of sources. In the first chapter, a short introduction into the development of German Anthropology and the animal business, focussing on Carl Hagenbeck, is going to allow an assessment of the motivations for the exhibitions and their role in objectifying and classifying animals and people alike. Thus, it will be possible to understand the origin of their moral compass and how they operated before the exhibitions, outlining their ethical compass. In the second chapter, the cases of Inuit from Greenland as well as First Nation's Nuxalk from British Columbia in the exhibitions of 1877/78, 1880/81, and 1885/86 as well as the Great Industrial Exhibition of 1896 will be discussed. There, it will be analysed how the interactions between the exhibited and their contractor Jacobsen as well as Hagenbeck, Virchow, and others came together. Through this, their ethical regime will become visible, showing what their range of action was. In the final chapter, the more implicit consequences of human exhibitions for the exhibited such as the collection of objects and human remains through Jacobsen will be discussed, further showcasing the limits of human exhibitions and their actors.

Understanding the ethical regime regarding human exhibitions of the 19th century will enable the detection of continuities into the present. Cordula Grewe has pointed out how the human zoo is far from being a mere shocking tale of history but is still very much alive, with zoos still using similar themes as in the late 19th century. Furthermore, many classifications and stereotypes of ethnicities in Germany that persist until today have been constructed through the human exhibitions of the late 19th century.[42] There are still actors who deny or downplay their role and their responsibility, like the Hagenbeck Foundation, responsible for Hagenbeck's estate as well as his zoo in Hamburg which is still in operation.[43] Additionally, many objects and possibly even human remains from the exhibitions still remain in German museums, most prominently in the ethnological collection of the Preußischer Kulturbesitz Foundation in Berlin. Many objects are on display in the permanent exhibit, like dancing masks of the Nuxalk who came to Berlin in 1886 with Adrian Jacobsen for Hagenbeck. Jacobsen brought over 7.000

[42] See Grewe, Cordula (2006): Between Art, Artifact, and Attraction: The Ethnographic Object and its Appropriation in Western Culture, in: Grewe, Cordula (Ed.), Die Schau des Fremden. Ausstellungskonzeote zwischen Kunst, Kommerz und Wissenschaft, Stuttgart, pp. 9-43.

[43] Documentary by Seekamp, Mirco; Ruprecht, Anne (06.12.2022): Rassistische Völkerschauen: unsere verdrängte Geschichte, STRG_F (https://www.funk.net/channel/strgf-11384/rassistische-voelkerschauen-unsere-verdraengtegeschichte-strgf-1857853 as of 14th June 2023).

objects to the ethnographic museum in Berlin, [44] and even though most of them were not part of human exhibitions, he was only able to obtain them through said enterprise. Furthermore, descendants of exhibited people often do not know what exactly happened to their ancestors upon arrival in Germany until today. Descendants of the Kawésqar in Tierra del Fuego who were part of the "Feuerland exhibition" of 1881, for example, asked the Hagenbeck Foundation to acknowledge Hagenbeck's responsibility for the human exhibitions. Six out of eleven participants of the "Feuerland exhibition" had died in Europe, their remains have only been transferred to Chile ten years ago.[45] Analysing the ethics by practice of the people responsible for the early exhibitions will show how these ethics have partly not changed.

Especially because of the trauma that still persists with many descendants, it is also highly important to me not to pile more abuse on top of historical injustices simply for the sake of pointing out more and more stories. Dealing with the history of human exhibitions has challenged me in my own work, made me question my own role as a researcher, and I fear that as a German born historian it is especially challenging to find a perspective beyond retelling a great history of great men. As a child that enjoyed going to Hagenbeck's Tierpark in Hamburg and being taught in school how Hagenbeck raised the ethical standards of zookeeping through the cageless diorama in his zoo, has led to constantly questioning my own experience and reflecting on my own understanding of human exhibitions.

However, I hope that this perspective on the ethics of human exhibitions enables me to critically assess the sources on human exhibitions. Reading the, on the first glance, boundaryless power abuse by anthropologists, contractors, or producers, I wanted to tell a story that would make the limitations of that power visible as well as assert the agency of exhibited people. When I held Jacobsen's unpublished manuscript in my hand, where he brags about stealing human skulls out of graves and recruiting people against their will for human exhibitions, all while tricking them into marriages with Westerners, I was eager to simply write a story of atrocities. But then I discovered moments of agency under the exhibited people, even if it was sometimes without sustainable success. For this reason, I will still follow the very

[44] See Foundation Preußischer Kulturbesitz „Über die Sammlung des Ethnologischen Museums" (https://www.smb.museum/museen-einrichtungen/ethnologisches-museum/sammeln-forschen/sammlung/ as of 7th June 2023).

[45] Documentary by Seekamp, Mirco; Ruprecht, Anne (03.11.2022): Menschen ausgestellt im Zoo – Das dunkle Kapitel Völkerschauen, Panorama 3 (https://daserste.ndr.de/panorama/archiv/2022/Panorama-vom-24-November-2022,panoramaarchiv1782.html as of 14th June 2023).

names that have already been analysed by many historians before, but only to expose their role in interactions with exhibited people. Through this, I hope to not just understand their ethics by practise, but also challenge my own understanding of human exhibitions. And at best, also challenge the reader's mind.

Chapter 1: How to unhumanise

When the Inuit of the 1880/81 exhibition were at the Berlin Zoo, human exhibitions produced by Hagenbeck were new in Germany. Likewise, anthropology had just emerged as a new discipline positioning itself against humanistic philosophy,[46] trying to turn the study of human beings into a natural science. In this way, different fields such as physical anthropology, ethnology, or archaeology developed under the name of anthropology. In this chapter, I will discuss the rapid rise of German anthropology and its institutionalisation that led to the foundation of human exhibitions. It will be shown how German anthropologists developed a vast array of instructions for their studies, but no ethical guidelines on how to deal with human beings as research subjects. Furthermore, I will analyse the regime of animal hunting and how Hagenbeck started to not only bring wild animals but also humans to German zoos.

In 1869, Rudolf Virchow and Adolf Bastian, together with the most prominent German anthropologists of that time, established the Berlin Society for Anthropology.[47] They guided and formed this new institution that was met with huge interest by medical practitioners, imperial bureaucrats, and businessmen, despite the adversary of other established disciplines, especially history. There was a fierce competition between anthropologists and historians regarding the ability of natural sciences to explain human development and culture.

Rudolf Virchow aimed at establishing anthropology as the scientific discipline in charge of studying and understanding human development in Germany.[48] Virchow himself became the leading physical anthropologist, measuring humans in hope of understanding their physical and socio-cultural development, character traits, and diseases. His main interest was craniology, measuring skulls. Virchow campaigned for mapping humankind and the nature and hierarchy of races through numbers and colours, with the museum as an archive of objects at its core. Born in 1821, he became a prominent social hygienist and pathologist during the 1840s and 1850s. As a politician who positioned himself as a republican during the revolution

[46] Despite its name, humanistic philosophy denoted humans outside the Western imperial culture at least as much as anthropology, following accounts by Herder, Kant, and Hegel, stating that people outside these nations were incapable of developing certain cultural attributes. This does not mean that they deemed the people outside the western imperial culture as racially fixed, opposing later racial narratives, but that people e.g. had to become German in order to develop into a similar cultural sphere, completely ignoring or undervaluing other cultures; see Zimmerman 2001, pp. 38-41.

[47] Zimmerman 2001, p. 5.

[48] Goschler, Constantin (2002): Rudolf Virchow. Mediziner, Anthropologe, Politiker, Cologne, p. 320.

of 1848. He continued to be a liberal until the end of his life and was a member of the German parliament from 1880 until 1893.[49] Anthropology, like archaeology, was more just another project for Virchow, following his own ideal of the so called "*Universalgelehrte*".[50] Virchow campaigned for mapping humankind and the nature and hierarchy of races through numbers and colours, with the museum as an archive of objects at its core.[51]

Measuring people and institutionalising this practise as a natural science needed methodologies. Physical anthropologists, in Germany under Virchow's lead, constructed arbitrary systems that allowed them to design assessment sheets and measurement tables. However, at the time of the first human exhibitions in the 1870s and 1880s, German physical anthropologists were just arguing about these methods. There was no such thing as a general methodology they could follow, since a uniting institution was missing or, in the case of the Berlin Society for Anthropology, had only just formed. Zimmerman has shown how there already was an agreement on craniometric measurements in 1861, but by the 1870s nearly no one was following it anymore because of the disunity among the German anthropologists regarding methodological standards.[52] Strikingly, it was a zoologist, Herman von Jhering[53], who proposed standardised assessments of skulls that German anthropologists would eventually agree on. However, during the 1870s, Hermann Schaaffhausen suggested a different approach, allowing for a different placement of the skull while measuring. Schaaffhausen was a Darwinist who hoped to find mental properties of races through this assessment, something most German anthropologists, and Virchow, refused. By 1880, this disagreement between Schaaffhausen and the anti-Darwinist community culminated when the latter proposed at the German Anthropological Society's yearly convention to simply exclude Schaaffhausen's ideas and him from the society. Virchow, head of said Society, declined this idea since he was also an anti-Darwinist.[54] It can thus be concluded that, on the one hand, there was still a development inside anthropology for consolidation of central guidelines to methodologies and approaches for the discipline. On the other hand, there was an internal body that was

[49] Goschler, Constantin (2002): Rudolf Virchow. Mediziner, Anthropologe, Politiker, Cologne, pp. 1-2.
[50] Ackerknecht, Erwin (1953): Rudolph Virchow. Doctor, Statesman, Anthropologist, New York, pp. 30-31.
[51] Gingrich, Andre (2005): From the National Birth of Volkskunde to the establishment of Academic Diffusionism: Branching Off from the International Mainstream, in: Barth, Frederik; Gingrich, Andre; Parkin, Robert; Silverman, Sydel (Ed.), One Discipline, Four Ways. British, German, French, and American Anthropology, London, New York, p. 87.
[52] Zimmerman 2002, p. 88.
[53] Sometimes also Herman von Ihering.
[54] See for the entire section of craniology and the German discourse Zimmerman 2001, pp. 88-93.

discussing general issues about scientific conduct that could even lead to expulsion of certain ideas or people all under the lead of Virchow. That does not mean that anthropologists, like physicians, needed a license that could be revoked, but exclusion and isolation from the central institutions would have made research as well as publishing very difficult. This became even more clear after the dispute between Schaaffhausen and the other anthropologists got settled through the *Frankfurter Verständigung* in 1883. In this agreement, the German Anthropological Society generally accepted Jhering's approach as the standardised method, only including some of Schaaffhausen's minor aspects. This presented the first time craniology was standardised in the German Empire. Anthropologists who wanted to stay in the organization had to sign the agreement, which Schaaffhausen did as well.[55] There is no indication of any controlling or punishment systems in the case of agreement breach. However, publishing must have been near to impossible when using a different method than one agreed upon. There were also other discussions about implementing new methods of measurement like photography of the assessed people, as the whole field was still under much change and consolidation.[56]

In contrast to these debates by German physical anthropologists about measuring methodologies, there was no discussion about this practice, or the general conduct towards the subjects. No general code of conduct, no discussion if measuring people in general could, either in Germany or abroad, hold ethical issues or would need special consideration. While most physical anthropologists were physicians anyway, it was not even required to hold a medical license to measure people in Germany, let alone in colonial territories. Any German traveller could, or even should according to the German anthropologists, measure people abroad which might be of interest, even though they were sceptical about the competence of travellers or missionaries in this matter. By 1896, the Society had designed a manual for travellers, or Germans residing in colonies, that explained how and what to exactly measure from people.[57] It was noted however, *"weil die Herren anthropologisch nicht geschult sind, auch nicht aus Gelehrtenkreisen hervorgehen, [seien] […] neben diesen allgemeinen Fragebögen specielle Fragebögen nothwendig […] wenn sie überhaupt einen Nutzen und Erfolg*

[55] Zimmerman 2001, p. 92.
[56] Zimmerman 2001, 79-99.
[57] Ranke, Johannes (Ed.) (1896): Correspondenz-Blatt der deutschen Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Frühgeschichte (XXVII. Jahrgang), Munich, pp. 145-147.

haben sollen".[58] These measurements were very invasive, also assessing and protocoling the appearance of genitalia or making the assessed person pull weights. Such measurements would also be conducted upon people of the human exhibitions upon assessment in Germany. The underlying assumption of all this, since there was not even a discussion about it and therefore not a grain of doubt, is that either people would let anthropologists measure them out of their own will, or that they would have no choice regardless. This implies that pressuring or forcing people into getting assessed was acceptable. It is, however, very difficult to say how these interactions went down in the colonies. It is, for example, unknown how reluctant people were when Otto Finsch, a trained ornithologist traveling to New Guinea from 1879 until 1882 under Virchow's instructions,[59] worked in practice. He tried to measure Papuans and even took plaster casts of their faces, a lengthy and uncomfortable procedure.[60] This situation changes when looking at the interactions between displayed people and anthropologists in Germany, as will be discussed in chapter two. But in general, except for the aforementioned methods, I have not located any sources revealing discussions about the ethics of measuring or even thoughts on the execution of power over colonised people by the anthropologists themselves.

While mainly medicine and physical anthropology were interested in human remains, the disciplinary lines between them and ethnology were not yet clear in the early years. As a result, ethnologists like Adolf Bastian or Felix von Luschan at the Ethnological Museum in Berlin would not only collect objects of colonised people, but also skeletons and skulls.[61] Bastian and von Luschan would establish an entire apparatus that allowed them to order objects for their museum at will. This was not exclusive to the German colonies, Bastian paid collectors who roamed the entire planet, looting everywhere where imperial authorities, not the objects' owners, allowed it. As such, objects from all over the world ended up in the collection of the ethnological museum in Berlin. Furthermore, the imperial navy was ordered to submit to the help of collecting objects within the German Empire to "save" them, the colonial governors even directly "donated" objects to the collections on a regular basis.[62] They acquired an official

[58] Eng.: Because these Gentlemen are not anthropologically trained nor are the of the scholarly circles, these general questionaries will need to be accompanied by special questionaries if they are to at least have any benefit or success; idem, p. 148.
[59] See Howes 2013.
[60] See for the procedure and concepts behind plaster casts Sysling, Fenneke (2015): Faces from the Netherlands Indies: Plaster casts and the making of race in the early twentieth century, in: Revue d'histoire des sciences humaines (Vol. 27), pp. 89-107.
[61] Idem. Many of these objects and remains are still in possession of the Preußischer Kulturbesitz Foundation.
[62] Glenn 2002, pp. 46-49.

monopoly on ethnographica in 1889, so that every object from the colonies had to be presented to Bastian and von Luschan first by federal law, even though it wasn't always followed.[63] Starting with the establishment of the first German colonies from 1883 onwards, buying under unequal conditions or just looting objects became even easier for collectors and the demand for objects in Germany increased significantly with the opening of more and more ethnographical museums. The purpose of these museums, after Bastian's vision, was the archiving and storing of humanity's objects in one place where they could be analysed and classified by researchers.[64] As such, the objects were used to construct classifications for certain ethnicities, sorting and ranking them while creating a constructed image of their cultures. The scope was so significant that just after two decades most German museums were overflowing with ethnographica, while colonised people were robbed of their possessions to be exhibited in German metropoles.[65] For the ethnographica the same dictum was applied as for measurements: no official boundaries. Quite on the contrary, collectors were encouraged to sack everything they could, method did not matter. Open looting was often not practised only due to fear of retaliation by the indigenous people, but also because German authorities relied on their future cooperation, like in the case of German New-Guinea. There, trading companies operated large plantations where they used, sometimes forcefully, contracted labour from the colonies to operate them.[66] Companies, therefore, had a large interest in less unrest and more compliance within the local population. But even then, collectors often found ways to "persuade"[67] them to sell or give up their objects.

The rise of the German museums happened quite simultaneously to the rise of the zoological gardens. While museums, just as the zoos, were designed with scholars in mind to study objects or animals, they quickly had to open their gates to the public in order to finance their expensive venues.[68] As such, visitors acquired agency in deciding what was worthwhile to be shown and what was not. This was true for museums, where collectors could be met with financial loss if the museums decided that the objects were of no interest to the public,[69] as

[63] Aly, Götz (2021): Das Prachtboot. Wie Deutsche die Kunstschätze der Südsee raubten, Frankfurt am Main, p. 107.
[64] Glenn 2002, pp. 27-29.
[65] Gingrich 2005, p. 92.
[66] Masterman, Sylvia (1934): The Origins of International Rivalry in Samoa: 1845-1884, pp. 71, 76.
[67] The meaning of "persuading", its usage, and the connection to the human exhibitions will be discussed in chapter two and three.
[68] Glenn 2002, p. 144.
[69] Glenn 2002, pp. 142-143.

well as for the zoos that depended on public interest.[70] It should therefore be said that the public was just as responsible for maintaining the success of the human exhibitions as the producers and scientists who made them possible, since only their economic viability was the main reason why they would be successful for decades to come. If it were not for the crowds of people from Hamburg during the first show, the human exhibitions produced by Hagenbeck would have probably just been a short-lived side note.

When the Sámi[71] who were portrayed as "Laplanders" were brought to Hamburg in 1874, the public was already used to seeing exhibitions with "foreign looking people". For centuries, so called "freakshows" or fair booths had exhibited people either for their differences to as normal perceived body standards or foreignness to the metropolitan German citizens. Carl Hagenbeck was more successful than other producers in convincing large parts of the German public that the people exhibited in his shows fit the picture of a culture he himself had constructed. Hagenbeck, who claimed to have been the inventor of the human exhibition, did not deny that there had been other shows before, but he claimed that they had not been authentic.[72] In reality, most parts of the shows were constructed, a product of the imagination of the producer, where the displayed didn't have a say. They were to follow certain scripts or perform certain tasks that would allegedly resemble their life at home. Visitors as well as anthropologists did not care about the failing authenticity of the shows. When Hagenbeck wrote about the Sámi in his book, he called them "Laplanders" while writing that they would call themselves Sámi.[73] He therefore openly showed that the terms he used for them had nothing to do with their culture but were only fabricated by him or other German anthropologists who deemed their own terminologies and classification more important than the reality of life of the exhibited people.

The Sámi would stay for nearly a year in Hamburg at Hagenbeck's menagerie, until he took them to Berlin's Zoo run by his business partner Heinrich Bodinus. But Bodinus declined. Too high was the risk that the exhibition would be put into the same category as any other fair

[70] Bruce 2017, p. 72.
[71] There is not much known about the persons being part of the group, not even their exact origin. They probably came from Norway or Sweden and consisted of three men, one woman, one four-year-old girl, and a female baby; Thode-Aurora 1989, p. 168.
[72] Wolter 2004, p. 103.
[73] Hagenbeck, Carl (1909): Von Tieren und Menschen. Erlebnisse und Erfahrungen von Carl Hagenbeck, Berlin, p. 81.

attraction, harming the reputation of the Berlin Zoo.[74] The reasons for this were not ethical, but business-related: he did not want his zoo to become a fairground. At that time, directors of zoological gardens, because of their dual role in science and public, only wanted to showcase exhibits of alleged scientific value.[75] That should have been the difference to earlier menageries and fair booths. There was no official guideline, leaving it to the directors themselves to decide what they deemed as scientific. In practice, they followed a similar thought that was based more on popularity with visitors than they wanted to admit. Only after three years and two shows, Hagenbeck was able to convince Bodinus as well as other directors of the constructed authenticity of his shows. That is even while Bodinus and Hagenbeck were already business partners for a long time. It meant that the zoo directors accepted the human exhibitions simultaneously, without a central organisation deeming them so.

Collecting was something the zoological gardens had very much in common with the ethnological museums. To do their work, researchers demanded a vast amount of animals and European patrons wanted “rare” animals that would bring prestige. Zoos, just as ethnological collections, had a severe, life altering impact on the regions where the animals were abducted and objects looted. On the way to and upon arrival in Germany, many objects were damaged or destroyed, animals died in gruesome rates. While the mortality rate of the London Zoo in the 1850s of 33% does not mean that the mortality rates were alike in German zoos of the 1880s, turnover rates indicate that they were.[76] There were barely any breeding programs established yet and the zoos were places of research and entertainment, not conservation. At the same time, there was no place where animals received more medical attention than the zoological gardens of the imperial metropoles. Animals were taken care of by medical doctors who would come to the zoos to study diseases and anatomy but also to practice medicine. This led to the bizarre situation that some animals, especially the ones that were difficult to replace, received better care than most citizens, while most animals in the zoos kept dying unattended to.[77]

This situation had nothing to do with an ethical view on animal keeping or animal welfare but had either financial reasons or was based on scientists’ interest in the species. With the

[74] Wolter 2004, p. 108.
[75] Wolter 2004, p. 112.
[76] Rothfels 2021, p. 9.
[77] Woods 2018, pp. 39-40.

zoological garden, late 19th century imperialists had created the imperfect confinement to put animals entirely under their will, making animals only as worthy as they could be to the imperialist progression. This view internationally only slightly began to change in the 1870s when an animal-ethical perspective started to form that conceded animals certain rights beyond their profit.[78] But this discourse, while reaching Germany, was not followed in German zoos until the turn of the century.[79] Instead, German zoo directors like Bodinus rather wished they were able to let more animals die, since it would showcase the zoos' structural and financial capability to replace the animals more easily, which the zoos could not afford in the beginning.[80] Dead animals thus did not become a tragedy to them, but a status symbol.

The zoos therefore needed a continuous supply of animals, and Hagenbeck, as an animal trader, was eager to bring them to the imperial metropoles. Carl Hagenbeck was born in 1844 in Hamburg as the son of a fish merchant.[81] His father had already established a small animal trading business, but it was Carl who expanded it drastically in the 1860s.[82] He developed business connections to zoo directors in Germany like Bodinus to sell them the animals they wanted.[83] To get these animals to Germany, Hagenbeck reached out to animal hunters in different colonies of different empires, themselves Europeans with small trading hubs abroad. Ito has stressed that the concept of empire or imperialism, the establishment of dominance over foreign lands and people, was of core importance to Hagenbeck's business, while the business itself also needs to be seen outside of the understanding of national empires. Hagenbeck did not only get animals, nor people, from German colonies, most people employed by him as agents were from different imperial countries, and he delivered animals to zoos in the Americas, Europe, and East Asia.[84] But how is this important to the ethics of human exhibitions?

The first reason for this can be seen in the people dealing with the hunting, trading, and transporting animals from their origin to the zoos. The same people trading animals, like Hagenbeck or agents of his, would later produce the human exhibitions. Animal hunters

[78] Ito 2021, p. 442.
[79] Maehle, Tröhler 2012, pp. 434-435.
[80] Bruce 2017, p. 21.
[81] Hagenbeck 1909, p. 2.
[82] Dittrich, Lothar; Rieke-Müller, Annelore (1999): Carl Hagenbeck (1844-1913): Tierhandel und Schaustellung im Deutschen Kaiserreich, Berlin, p. 15.
[83] Hagenbeck 1909, p. 49.
[84] Ito 2021, p. 447.

became contractors, often enlisting the people while buying animals. It was the network of animal trading and personal connection that had made it possible for Hagenbeck to enlist people in India, Greenland, or Sudan to bring them to Germany in such a short time. The transportation often happened simultaneously with animals and was even advertised by the traders. The ethics of animal trading and keeping therefore have severe implications for how the businessmen thought about their "products".

It was not the zoo alone where death of animals was imminent. The hunt and transport also caused a massive death toll, as Rothfels has shown. To catch a single African baby elephant, an entire herd was shot dead, as was already known in the 1890s.[85] In the 1870s, this process of catching the animals was often done by people living in their vicinity, who then sold them to Western traders, often for much less money than the traders would eventually earn in Europe. In 1876, an elephant would have been purchased for 80-400 Marks in Kassala while being sold in Europe for 3.000-6.000 marks, a rhinoceros for even double the ratio.[86] The animals were either stressfully run down, trapped, or caught by killing the mother before being put into holding confinements at trading hubs. They had been so enormously exhausted and stressed in this process that one third to one half died. After traders like Hagenbeck's had taken over the animals, they would have been escorted to the coastal towns, either on foot or by railway. Only half of the animals usually survived this part of the journey, with even more dying on the ships to the European shoreline and the railways transporting them to their cages in the German metropole.[87]

Rothfels has pointed out that Indigenous people helping the hunters did so by force, under the threat of violence or due to economic reasons. Beatings or gunpoint-threats were even reported in German hunting journals, where they were portrayed as heroic actions rather than inhumane treatment.[88] These accounts also tell stories of dozens of killed animals simply to catch one. Stories of hunters wading through pools of blood, cutting flesh and skin, and, in the case of Hans Schomburgk, even grotesquely riding a bicycle over the corpse of a dead elephant, are also told.[89] It is very difficult to tell how bloody the animal trade really was, since most accounts stem from the boasting of white men who saw their stories as epic tales, while

[85] Rothfels 2002, pp. 60-61.
[86] Rothfels 2002, p. 57
[87] Rothfels 2002, pp. 54-55.
[88] Rothfels 2002, p. 69.
[89] Rothfels 2002, p. 66.

in reality they had only pulled a trigger to end a life. Killing the animals was not considered unethical by them, it was not even questioned, at least not by a large part of the western society. Only by the turn of the century, the public's standards had changed. In a 1902 letter to Carl Hagenbeck, the director of the Bronx Zoo, William Hornaday, asked him to not mention the forty rhinoceroses that had been killed for four rhinoceroses to be brought to the zoo. To him, it would be obvious that the four would be more beneficial than the forty "*running wild in the jungles of Nepal, and seen only at rare intervals by a few ignorant natives*"[90], but, as he argued, the sentimental crowd would not understand it. This was an example of the perceived superiority of the white privileged male gaze over any living soul. Life only being valuable when serving the imperialist world. This was the ethical regime of the zoo directors, the traders, the hunters: Killing animals was not the issue, as long as it was profitable. Hornaday's remarks not only show how he found this outmostly acceptable, but also that something in the public's interested had changed. The financial success of the published hunting stories about blood baths, beaten people, killed mothers, and tortured children is just another proof of that.

Indeed, the framing of the hunt quickly changed around the turn of the century. Hunting the animals, either for pleasure or profit, became rendered by an ethical code, "gentleman's rules" that should make the hunting more exclusive, more "civilized". As Haraway has put it during her analysis of a hunt by Carl Akeley, only white men were supposedly capable of firing the gun and ending a life.[91] This was only thirty years after these same men had solely relied on locals to do so, paying them as little money as possible, hunting and catching as many animals as possible. People like Carl Hagenbeck were aware of the amount of animals that had fallen to the guns of the hunters. But they did not care, for them there were enough animals left in the wild who they deemed to have no purpose there in the first place. It was only by the 1890s when the US "Nature Movement" started to question how many animals had died this way. The consequence was even more killing: now the hunt was not only for profit but also to "safeguard" what was left in the wild.[92] Zoo directors and scientists for the first time understood zoos as places of conservation, facing the dwindling numbers of wild animals that earlier had sparked the interest of the zoos. Around 1900, this understanding had reached

[90] Cited after Rothfels 2002, p. 67.
[91] Haraway, D. (1984). Teddy Bear Patriarchy: Taxidermy in the Garden of Eden, New York City, 1908-1936, in: Social Text (11), p. 51.
[92] Haraway 1984, p. 53.

Germany. It did not change much in the animal world, if even made things worse, but the ethical understanding of the German public, possibly not so much the hunters, had changed.[93]

It can therefore be summarized that there were no written guidelines or ethical codes neither for German scientist and zoos, nor producers of and animal traders during the early days of the human exhibitions. The ethical regime of their work was profit or ideological superiority, not health and well-being of their subjects. Human exhibitions operated under this doctrine just as the business of confining wild animals. Most notable is that both traders and hunters in practice knew no limits to the cruelty and death they caused the animals. Death was tolerable if not even desirable to German hunters, traders, zoo directors, and physicists. The ethics by practice therefore were understanding the animals as mere objects that could be destroyed without any consequences. Hunters easily did not only neglect the direct suffering of animals, but also the impact hunting had to the region the hunters operated in. Traders like Carl Hagenbeck did not only accept that, but they also supported it. Their ethical regime did not change when the German public's mind shifted at the turn of the century. The consequences were not stopping the hunting, abducting, and murdering, but only keeping it secret to the public. The breaking down of the German animal cruelty act by physicians like Rudolf Virchow shows that this was not only for financial reasons, but also because scientists thought their research to be more important than animal well-being.

These were the very same people who produced human exhibitions and used them for research. As has been shown, there were no ethical guidelines for anything that had been part of the making of these exhibitions, neither the capturing and confining of humans, the exhibiting and measuring of humans, or taking the objects and turning them into ethnographica in German museums. But no official guidelines and screening mechanisms in place for human exhibitions are not proof for the actual execution of these exhibitions, of discussions and motivations by the actors and their ethical beliefs. What were the ethics by practice the producers, contractors, and anthropologists followed within the early human exhibitions in imperial Germany.

[93] Rothfels 2002, p. 71.

Chapter 2: Between Animals and Anthropologists

Abraham Ulrikab was around 35 years old when Johan Adrian Jacobsen arrived at his home. He was an Inuk living in Hebron, a missionary settlement on the Labrador Peninsula run by German missionaries.[94] According to his own diary, Abraham Ulrikab[95] went to Berlin with Jacobsen because he was in debt to the German missionaries and intended to pay it back by himself without receiving social benefits. As a converted Christian, he also wished to meet the brothers of Herrnhut in Germany, the monastery of the German missionaries.[96] His wife was Ulrike, who was 24 years old when Jacobsen arrived at Hebron, and they had two children together, the four-year-old Sara and baby Maria. Tobias, a young man related to Ulrike, was also part of their family. It is not known if it was Abraham who had converted to Christianity and therefore lived at the Hebron mission, or if already his parents had become Christians, raising him accordingly. Abraham was able to read and write, use different languages, used to paint, and was the violinist of the mission's church.[97] As a devout Christian and supporter of the German community, he first did not intend to leave Labrador with Jacobsen for Germany but only wanted to assist him in reaching out to Inuit outside the community that would come with Jacobsen. Together with Jacobsen and the crew of the ship *Eisbär*, they went north from Hebron to Nachvak, a small settlement of Inuit where no missionaries other than one British man named Mr. Ford lived, working for the Hudson Bay Company and probably selling products of the local Inuit for his profit.[98] He allegedly not only convinced one Inuit family to go to Europe, but also persuaded Abraham to follow with his family as well.

It had been Jacobsen's task to bring Inuit to Hamburg for another exhibition by Carl Hagenbeck in 1880. Jacobsen was born in 1853 on Risøya in northern Norway as the son of a fisher. When 17 years old, he became a licensed ship captain, only to follow his older brother to Hamburg, where he had a small clothing business. He was willing to take any job, hoping to make money.

---

[94] All the information about Ulrikab and his family stems from Jacobsen, Virchow, or the missionaries. However, his own diary as well as conformity of the accounts provide enough information to follow them; see: Hoffmann, R. (Pub.) (1880): Beiträge über Leben und Treiben der Eskimos in Labrador und Grönland. Aus dem Tagebuche des Herrn Carl Hagenbeck in Hamburg mit dem Schiffe „Eisbär" nach Grönland entsandten Herrn J.A. Jacobsen, Berlin; Lutz 2007; Verhandlungen für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte (1880): Sitzung vom 7. November 1880.

[95] Abraham is the only person with a last name which possibly indicated the name of his wife. His own signature was Abraham, Ulrikes husband. Names have been used to the extent known through sources.

[96] Lutz 2007, p. 25.

[97] Lutz 2007, p. 15.

[98] Hoffmann 1880, p. 16.

Jacobsen would help his brother until 1876, when he sailed to Chile for a year doing various jobs. He came back to Hamburg in 1877 in search of new work.[99] It was the same year Carl Hagenbeck tried to create a new human exhibition with Inuit, who therefore needed to be contracted. When Jacobsen heard of this venture, he went to Hagenbeck and offered to lead this expedition to not only bring back Inuit but also so called ethnographica from Ilulissat (former Jakobshavn) on Danish colonial Greenland. Hagenbeck agreed to this offer and Jacobsen therefore became a contractor for him.[100] But how did this contracting work? What did the "convincing" and "persuading" by Mr. Ford in Nachvak mean and what does it say about the ethics of contracting? In this chapter, I will therefore focus on the ethics by practice of the contractors, producers, and anthropologists on the basis of their direct contact with the exhibited people in order to understand their ethical regime aside from official guidelines.

1. Contracted

When contractors like Jacobsen were sent out to recruit people for exhibitions, it was not their goal to find the ones who would be most willing to come to Germany, but those who would attract the largest audience and biggest profit.[101] Physical features as well as skills Germans would find interesting formed the basic selection criteria, becoming the most important goal everything else was subdued to. In reaching this goal, contractors faced two hurdles. The first one was often overcome before they left for Germany: Most recruited people were living in colonies as subjects to imperial powers. In the case of Jacobsen's journey to Greenland in 1877, where he would enlist Okabak, Maggak, Ane, Katarina, Kokkik and Kojange, he needed the approval of the Danish government, which he got through personal connections.[102] The second hurdle was to convince people to come with him. There are no records in his estate regarding this first contracting, but, according to Jacobsen, when he returned in 1880 to Ilulissat to recruit Inuit for a second exhibition, people were allegedly begging him to be part of the exhibit. Jacobsen claimed that they all knew of Okabak and the other members of the first show and that they had become so wealthy through their stay in Germany that everyone

[99] Thode-Aurora 1989, p. 49.
[100] Dreesbach 2005, p. 60.
[101] Thode-Aurora 1989, p. 59.
[102] Thode-Aurora 1898, p. 69.

in Ilulissat just wanted to follow their footsteps. But it was the Danish authorities on Greenland that did not allow people to be exhibited in Germany again.[103]

It is very difficult to say how much Jacobsen's accounts regarding willingness can be trusted, especially since there are no accounts by Okabak and the other Inuit. However, it becomes apparent that Jacobsen had to accept the refusal of the Danish authorities, he did not try to further "convince" or "persuade" them. The Danish authorities had either protected their subjects, since they knew that people who had been brought to Denmark before had died, or they wanted to keep people inside the colony for easier control and isolation from the European metropoles, a motive that will be discussed below with the Great Industrial Exhibition of 1896. In both cases, the Danish authorities had decided upon the will of the people in Ilulissat, subordinating and keeping them inside their colonial framework. At the same time, Jacobsen would not have accepted a refusal by his potential recruits so easily in comparison to the colonial authorities, because he was subordinating the colonized as much as the Danish authorities himself. It was not so much about their desire to go, but rather about how much convincing it would take. This does not mean that there were no people who wanted to go to Germany and see the world. People like the Somali Hersi Egeh Gorseh even repeatedly went to Germany as part of human exhibitions and tried to use it as an opportunity to earn money and travel the world inside an imperial system that made it difficult for them to do so otherwise.[104] The important point, however, is that the colonial subjects' desires were of no matter to Jacobsen. So, when he left Ilulissat in 1880 and arrived at Hebron, a British colony outside the Danish influence, to finally enlist Inuit on Hagenbeck's orders, no one was willing to leave. He, together with Mr. Ford in Nuchalk, continued to pressure the Inuit, including his translator Abraham Ulrikab, to come with him. To Abraham, he offered food for his mother as well as enough money to pay his debts.[105] "Persuading" or "convincing" therefore does not necessarily mean something drastic. It also did not mean that Jacobsen bribed people with respectable funds, their salary was significantly lower than the revenue of the exhibitions. This gives an idea of the moral understanding by the contractors regarding their perception of the people they wanted to enlist. If an imperial authority said no, they had

[103] Hoffmann 1880, pp. 9-12.
[104] Thode-Aurora 1989, pp. 159-162.
[105] Lutz 2007, p. 15.

to move on. But as a colonized person, saying no did not make the contractor go away. And for the contractors, this imbalance was acceptable.

When Jacobsen was in British Columbia in 1882 to collect objects for Adolph Bastian and the Ethnological Museum in Berlin, he received a letter from Carl Hagenbeck.[106] Hagenbeck ordered Jacobsen "*von den langköpfigen Indianern zu bekommen samt allen [sic] was diese Leute in Gebrauch haben"* and he would be *„mit allen [sic] einverstanden denn Sie wissen ja was nöthig ist; Ich lasse Ihnen auch ganz freien Willen wie sie es mit den [sic] Gehalt dieser Leute einrichten*"[107] Jacobsen therefore was fully in charge of the entire process of finding, negotiating with as well as contracting people. The only condition was that the people would need to be "longheads" and female. When Hagenbeck writes of "getting some of those longheads" it rather appears like the acquisition than the hiring of workers. He was not interested in any transfer of culture or education; he wanted people that looked like an image of "longhead Indians" he had in mind, and it would be entirely up to Jacobsen to bring this image to reality. He went to Fort Rupert, where he attended a Potlatch ceremony of the Kwakiutl in hopes of finding some people whose heads had been pressed through applying pressure with planks. He gifted two cans of ship's biscuits in the hope that the ceremony attendees would come with him – an underwhelming bribery that was declined. But Jacobsen continued to pressure the Kwakiutl community, going to the nearby village of Koskimo where he knew the head of the community named Wachas. Wachas agreed to come with Jacobsen and to bring his wife, too. Jacobsen wrote in his diary that other community members were reluctant to go, but since Wachas agreed, they would potentially follow. It is yet another account where Jacobsen did not accept no for an answer. He wanted the Kwakiutl women, who were particularly reluctant. As a result, Jacobsen tried to pay some Kwakiutl men to marry the women so that they could be forced to join the venture. William Hunt, the head of the Hudson-Bay-Company trading post in Fort Rupert also agreed to wed one of the Kwakiutl so that she needed to come with them. A drastic measure Jacobsen apparently did not have any issue with. It is not clear if the Kwakiutl men eventually agreed to his plan, in his private diary they declined, in the published version they accepted it.

[106] Letter from Carl Hagenbeck 5th January 1882, bequest Jacobsen at the MARKK Hamburg JAC 17.5.

[107] Eng.: to get some of the long-headed Indians including everything those people have in use […] I agree to everything [you decide] since you know what is necessary; I also leave it entirely to your judgment how you handle it regarding the salary of those people; Letter from Carl Hagenbeck 5th January 1882, bequest Jacobsen at the MARKK Hamburg JAC 17.5.

Finally, some would follow him back to Fort Rupert by boat. The hired people urged Jacobsen not to go on the boat because a storm would arrive soon, and they would get sick. But Jacobsen forced them to go anyway. The storm arrived. Everyone, except Jacobsen, got sick. They were very afraid of the journey ahead of them and occasionally other Kwakiutl would reach out to the party, demanding Jacobsen to let the women go. But Jacobsen refused to give in. Once they had reached Fort Rupert, one after another would run away from Jacobsen, even Wachas and his wife. Only one woman remained until the end, when Jacobsen received a letter from Hagenbeck that called off the entire plan.[108]

"Convincing" and "persuading" therefore can be seen as severe pressuring, coming even close to abduction or forced marriage. While Jacobsen acknowledged their fears, he only downplayed them, stating how they hindered his own interests. Finding subjects for Hagenbeck was his outmost goal. These people's discomfort or loss of free will was not of importance to Jacobsen. However, approaching this matter from a different angle, it also becomes apparent that, in Greenland and in Canada, as well as in Labrador, Jacobsen did not openly force people to come with him. Despite the power imbalance, he did not simply commit abduction. In the case of Greenland, it likely was out of fear of the Danish authorities, not because he respected the free will of the Inuit. In British Columbia, on the other hand, while being a European imperialist, he did not hold a monopoly on physical power. While the Kwakiutl would have possibly faced repercussions if they had fought back against Jacobsen, by law it was still illegal to abduct people from the colonies. Jacobsen, often alone or with few companions, was therefore faced with armed communities of First Nations that would have been in the position to fight him if he had given them enough reason. Even though the sources do not disclose any information regarding open abductions, regarding the persuasion it cost, it did come very close to it. So, while the only official guidelines for the contracting were the laws of the colonial authorities, his practises indicate his personal ethical understanding of the contracting, thus indicating his ethics by practise.

These accounts also show that exhibited people had some agency over their fate, even if limited, and not everyone that was attempted to be contracted in the end went to Germany. When German entrepreneurs wanted to create a World Exhibition in Germany in 1896, the state would not support this endeavour. As a result, the exhibition was not named World

[108] See for the entire event Thode-Aurora 1989, pp. 72-76.

Exhibition but Great Industrial Exhibition. One separate part of the display was the German Colonial Exhibition that was supposed to showcase the German colonies. When the first exhibition started in 1896, the German colonial empire was already thirteen years old. Despite that, people from the colonies were rarely shown. As such, contractors tried to enlist people from the German colonies so that they could be shown at this exhibition.[109] The reasoning behind this was that "*tote Sammlungen allein nie im stande [seien], die grosse Masse des Volkes, auf welches schon aus finanziellen Gründen zur Herstellung des Gleichgewichts zwischen Einnahmen und Ausgabe gerechnet werden musste, heranzuziehen*"[110] and therefore people from the colonies should be displayed. This would essentially make it a living exhibition, the exhibited people thus mere living objects in the eyes of the producers. 103 people from the German colonies were enlisted, 22 women, 64 men, and 17 children. Eight of them had been contracted on New Britain (formerly Neu Pommern) in Papua New Guinea, all of them men. Otto Finsch, the same man who had travelled the area with instructions by Rudolf Virchow, wrote in the German Colonial Newspaper in 1896, that he was surprised that the Papuans had followed the contractor named Parkinson "*auf bloßes Zureden*".[111] However, Finsch also explains how the wives of the men had jumped ship in the harbour of Madang right after it had left the quay wall.[112] What had happened? Why did the women jump ship, committing such a drastic action?

There is no source material on the events around their enlistment. However, taking the former cases of Jacobsen as well as Finsch's remarks into account, it is very likely that the people in Madang were very reluctant to go to Germany. With one exception, Papuans had not been to Europe before[113], making the journey to Germany alone unpredictable. But jumping ship also means more than just fear of the journey, it was also dangerous, considering the ship in question was most likely a steamer or a large sailing vessel. They also did it at the very last moment one can escape before reaching the open sea, where they would encounter certain

[109] Richter, Roland (1995): Die erste deutsche Kolonial-Ausstellung 1896. Der „Amtliche Bericht" in historischer Perspektive, in: Debusmann, Robert; Riesz, János (Ed.), Kolonialausstellungen -Begegnungen mit Afrika?, Frankfurt, pp. 25-26.
[110] Eng.: dead collections alone would never be able to interest the great masses of the people, which needs to be addressed already because of the equilibrium between costs and income; cited after Wolter 2004, p. 41.
[111] Eng.: Through pure convincing; Finsch, Otto: Die Deutsche Kolonial-Ausstellung V. Zur Ethnologie unserer Südsee-Besetzungen, in: Meinecke, Gustav (Ed.), Deutsche Kolonialzeitung. Organ der Deutschen Kolonialgesellschaft, 4th July 1896, Nr. 27.
[112] Finsch 1896, Deutsche Kolonialzeitung 4th July 1896, Nr. 27.
[113] Idem.

death. It hints towards Parkinson's convincing having at least entailed a lot of pressure. Otherwise, the women could have simply left the boat when it was still at the quay wall. Of course, there is also the possibility that they simply got scared by the moving vessel. But one small detail makes it more plausible that Parkinson was the reason for their flight, or that they did not freely want to go to Germany: The ship did not turn. It is not known what ship Parkinson used[114], but even if it was a commercial steamship, it is very likely that he would have been able to order the ship to turn around. But it is possible that Parkinson feared that instead of getting the women back on board the eight men would leave too. It is also very doubtful that the Papuan men were glad about undertaking the journey without their wives, but at least from the point of continuing the journey, Parkinson did not care about it. Just from the information given by Finsch it is not possible to conclude that Parkinson pressured the Papuans to come, or even abducted them. But it becomes very likely.

It should be acknowledged that the narrative of voluntary enlistment was very important to the contractors because abducted people would possibly not have been accepted by the public in Germany. For this reason, "pressuring" or "forcing" became "convincing" and "persuading". But a newspaper article from 1882 shows that there was some doubt about these narratives already early on. The *Deutsche Montags-Zeitung* questioned if the Kawesqar in the "Feuerland exhibition" of 1881/1882 really had voluntarily signed their contract after they had gotten on board of a German ship as castaways: "*Man darf in der That wohl fragen, ob es den überhaupt denkbar ist, dass eine so komplicierte Willensäußerung, wie sie hier zu Tage treten müsste, durch Zeichen ausgedrückt werden konnte*."[115] It showcases a contrast to the stories of hunting and capturing animals where brutality, forcefully taking defenceless babies away from their killed mothers was propagated. While the German public had favoured this type of narrative for the animals, the human exhibitions seem to have had different ethical boundaries in the German public discourse. According to the article, German authorities were also obliged to check if the contract had been formed with both parties understanding the full terms of it.[116] In reality, this had little impact on the regulations concerning the contracting of people, as all the different cases have shown. Even if the authorities were obliged to do so, in the early days

[114] Finsch neither gives the name of the ship, nor the date of their departure. He also does not give a reference, probably he only had this information from a personal conversation with Parkinson.
[115] Eng.: Indeed, it has to be questioned if it is even plausible that such a complicated agreement, such as must have occurred here, could have been formulated through hand gestures; cited after Dreesbach 2005, p. 223.
[116] Dreesbach 2005, p. 223.

there were no laws regarding human exhibitions until after 1896. This example also shows that the most important ethical question to the German authorities and the German public had not been if the people had been forced, but rather if they had thoroughly understood the terms of the contract. The contracting of the targeted people therefore had barely any ethical limits, but the public narrative in Germany was very different to that, making "convincing" and "persuading" the key words used by the contractors when coming back to Germany.

2. Exhibited

In the end, it also remains impossible to tell what kind of "convincing" Mr. Ford used when he had spoken with Abraham Ulrikab and the Inuit family from Nachvak consisting of Terrianiak, his wife Paingo and their child Noggasak.[117] Together with Abraham's family and Adrian Jacobsen, they left Labrador and arrived in Hamburg on the 24th of September 1880. Immediately after their arrival, Jacobsen fell ill and had to go to the hospital, a small detail that would prove to be devastating for the Inuit later. In Hamburg, they met Carl Hagenbeck as well as Adolph Schoepf, the son of Albin Schoepf, director of the Dresden Zoo.[118] Schoepf was working for Hagenbeck and accompanied the Inuit and Jacobsen on their tour from Hamburg onwards. The Inuit had to live in *Hagenbecks Thierpark* where they were exhibited and had to perform different shows like throwing harpoons, riding dog sleds, and using a kayak.[119] It is very difficult to report on Abraham's whereabouts and experiences during this time, since he only started his diary when the group were being exhibited in the Berlin Zoo in 1880. It is unknown how and why he did this, but Lutz suggests that Abraham saw Jacobsen writing his diary every day along their journey, which might have inspired Abraham to do the same, thus being on equal terms with Jacobsen.[120] The original diary has been lost and therefore his way of writing possibly been altered by translations and transcriptions. It is unknown what kind of

[117] For Terrianiak's family the names have been taken from Lutz 2007, p. 15. Different variations of their names can be found in the translation of Abraham's diary by Brother Kretschmer (Terrianiak, Panigu, Nochasak) and the presentation by Virchow (Tigganiak, Bairngo, Noggasak).
[118] Thode-Aurora states that Adolph Schoepf was the son of the director of the Dresden Zoo who had the same name. If she refers to the full name, this would imply that there was a third generation in the Schoepf family between Adolph Schoepf, the impresario of 1880, and Albin Schoepf, the zoo director. However, when taking Adolph's and Albin's age into account, it is highly unlikely that Adolph was the grandson of Albin. Adolph Schoepf therefore can be considered the same person who only one year later became the director of the Dresden Zoo after the death of his father; Thode-Aurora 1989, p. 56.
[119] Lutz 2007, p. 17.
[120] Lutz 2007, p. 20.

writing system he used, probably Inuktitut. His journal was sent back to Hebron where Brother Kretschmer, a missionary of the Herrnhut brothers, translated it by hand into German. As a result, it is not possible to tell if Brother Kretschmer left out some unsavoury parts in his translation and if errors are due to Abraham's writing or Kretschmer's translations.[121]

Abraham's diary gives insight into the experience of the eight Inuit during their journey across Europe. It tells how Abraham was a very devout Christian who was mostly interested in going to church and visiting the brothers of Herrnhut. He disliked the other Inuit family traveling with them because they practiced a different religion, which Abraham called "witchcraft".[122] His diary also documents excitement over new impressions he gained during his stay in Europe, for example when taking a train from Hamburg to Berlin, but also of great fear and homesickness. He wrote about missing seal meat and the quietness of their home in Labrador, as well as their friends and their home church. Homesickness in general was a common issue for exhibited people who often had left their homes for the first time, well knowing that the journey alone often was very lengthy and dangerous.

One man from the Patagonian region partaking in a small exhibition in 1879 named Pikjotkje developed a severe form of homesickness after one month in Germany. Jacobsen described his behaviour as "melancholic", and he would eventually sing a song of his own death.[123] He most likely had, in modern terms, developed a severe form of depression. Hagenbeck was aware of this situation and tried to engage with Pikjotkje, letting him stay in a hotel, visiting restaurants, visiting a theatre and museums. But all this did not change the condition of Pikjotkje.[124] It is one of the more severe cases where the mental stress the exhibited people were experiencing became visible or at least acknowledged by the producers. But Hagenbeck's reaction to it shows that he was not so much worried about Pikjotkje's wellbeing but rather his shows. At first glance, Hagenbeck's reactions might seem sympathetic but putting Pikjotkje through and exposing him to exactly what had caused the distress instead of getting him home possibly only made things worse. Pikjotkje's depression must have been bad for Hagenbeck's business, but through these "cheerful" acts, Hagenbeck could continue to present the "Patagonian" to the public. Eventually, he was able to go home. Abraham's experience only a

[121] Idem.
[122] Lutz 2007, p. 26.
[123] Thode-Aurora 1989, p. 101.
[124] Idem, p. 101-102.

year later is an indicator that not much had changed after Pikjotkje's departure. Hagenbeck only decided not to contract any more people from the same region. Thus, for him, the issue was not the contracting system of exposing people to a foreign world without much sympathetic assistance, but that allegedly the people from Patagonia had simply not enough tolerance and were therefore bad for his business. As a result, home sickness or other mental stress stayed a common issue for the exhibited people, which was more likely to remain unaddressed in the sources created by producers, contractors, and anthropologists. The same was true for physical abuse. Abraham wrote on the 7th of November, while still in Berlin, that Jacobsen had beaten Tobias with a whip. It must have been quite severe because, according to Abraham, Tobias fell very ill thereafter.[125] Jacobsen had done so because, in his eyes, Tobias had not always done like he had commanded. This testimony of physical abuse by a contractor or producer has so far rarely been found.

This incidence has significant implications for the ethics by practice of Adrian Jacobsen and therefore possibly for other contractors as well. It is very difficult to make a general assumption from this one incident. But judging from the situation of the exhibited people, it is more likely that other cases of physical abuse remained undocumented. It has been discussed earlier how the abuse of animals, including torture and death, was largely accepted in the German public in the 1870s and 1880s. The readership of German hunting magazines was not spared of reports recounting beatings of the "uncooperative" local population during a hunt. Whipping, a legal offense in the German Empire, falls in line with the behaviour of the animal traders. The major difference in these actions seems not to be the application of violence, but its documentation. Apparently, just as with the case of "convincing" versus "forcing" someone to come to Germany, the German public's ethical boundaries were different to the ones of the contractors. Following the public discourse, beating uncooperative people outside of Germany was acceptable, doing so in Germany was not. As a result, this was most likely not the only time Jacobsen deemed the application of brutal force acceptable. However, Abraham had more options to evade this violence than most other exhibited people. As a literate Christian with strong ties to the Herrnhut Brothers, to whom he wrote at least two letters during his stay, he was able to document the abuse and potentially inform other Germans who would support him. According to his diary, Abraham openly confronted Jacobsen and threatened to

[125] Lutz 2007, p. 33.

send letters to England[126] should he whip someone again.[127] Jacobsen immediately changed his attitude towards the Inuit, becoming friendly and gifting "*unsern beiden Frauen*"[128] silken ribbons. This chain of events indicates that Jacobsen naturally acted the way he did and only afterwards realised that he could not engage with Abraham's family as he usually did with exhibited people. Abraham therefore was in a slightly different, more privileged position, also in comparison to the other Inuit family with them, whom he viewed as backward and ignorant due to their religious differences. It is very likely that he did so because he had been exposed to this very narrative by missionaries for his entire life, which only got intensified when they had arrived in Germany.

3. Examined

When the Berlin Society for Anthropology visited the Inuit in the Berlin Zoo on the 7th of November 1880, Abraham and the other exhibited were again directly informed that there would be severe developmental differences between the Christian Inuit and Terrianiak's family, which supposedly fell back onto the work of the missionaries.[129] This entire narrative, constructed by Rudolf Virchow, also shows how contradictive physical anthropology had become in this period, where physical features were supposed to determine the cognitive capability of a person, but simultaneously concepts of enlightenment, allowing people to develop cognitive abilities regardless of Physical appearance, were still prevalent. Virchow, as a physical anthropologist but also liberal politician, embodied both approaches at the same time. The Inuit had been assessed by Virchow during their stay in Berlin, and Virchow presented the results of this assessment at his presentation in the Berlin Zoo. This assessment shows that either even Abraham's options to fight back abuse were limited or that he simply did not care too much about the other family. Virchow reported how Paingo tried to fight him when he wanted to measure different body parts of hers, indicating that Paingo was very openly against the assessment.[130]

[126] It is not fully clear why he mentions England and not Herrnhut or Labrador. Maybe other brothers he knew were in England and had earlier told him to write them should something occur.
[127] Lutz 2007, p. 33.
[128] Eng.: Our two wives/women; it is unclear if he means Ulrike and Sara or Ulrike and Paingo.
[129] Verhandlungen für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte (1880): Sitzung vom 7. November 1880, p. 253.
[130] See for Virchow's report Verhandlungen für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte (1880): Sitzung vom 7. November 1880, pp. 271-272.

According to Virchow she

> "huschte mir unter dem Arm durch und begann in dem Zimmer umher zu arbeiten […] Sie sprang umher mit einer etwas zusammengebückten Stellung im Zimmer umher, arbeitete auf die Stühle und Tische los, und schmiss sie nach allen Richtungen um; während sie aber im Zimmer umhertollte, machte sie nicht den geringsten Versuch aus der Thür zu entweichen oder auf die Anwesenden loszugehen. Sie sprang von einer Ecke nach der anderen und schrie dabei in heulender Weise; ihr Gesicht sah dunkelroth aus, die Augen leuchteten, es bildete sich etwas Schaum vor dem Munde, genug es war ein höchst widerwärtiger Anblick […] Der Anfall dauerte wohl 8-10 Minuten […] sie sagte in ihrer Sprache: ‚Nun bin ich wieder gut.' Freilich zitterte sie noch und ich hielt es für gerathen, den Versuch der Messung nicht zu erneuern."[131]

Through her open and, if Virchow's account is true, destructive defence, Paingo successfully evaded Virchow's further assessment, distancing herself from him and avoiding further assessments she was not consenting to. Even Virchow himself pointed out that she had been subordinated by force,[132] showing awareness of the power advantage, putting her into a situation that had been dictated by him to be necessary. Virchow did not show concern about creating this situation. As a scientist, he saw his actions justified for the good of scientific progress. He further downplayed Paingo's reasoning and even her humanity, his description shows his disapproval of her reaction. The language Virchow used rather describes an animal than a person. A demonic, animal like creature comes to mind when he talks about glowing eyes, foam spitting, howling, and jumping around in a crouched position. Besides, he also claims to only have seen such behaviour in a psychiatric ward before, indicating that Paingo would not only be less human than animal but also pathologically ill. But why did Virchow use such a denouncing, unhumanising way of describing a situation he had caused by force?

The reason could be seen in the way he handled his own defeat. Virchow was not used to being denied performing his scientific duty. Additionally, these measurements were often public, his description indicates more people being present in the examination room. Making her seem

[131] Eng.: She darted under my arm and began to work around the room [...] She jumped around the room in a somewhat crouched position, worked at the chairs and tables, and knocked them over in all directions; but while she frisked around the room, she made not the slightest attempt to escape from the door or to attack those present. She jumped from one corner to the other and screamed in a howling manner; her face looked dark red, her eyes shone, some foam formed at the mouth, enough it was a most disgusting sight [...] The attack lasted 8-10 minutes [...] she said in her own language: 'Now I am good again'. Admittedly, she was still trembling and I thought it advisable not to renew the attempt at measurement; Verhandlungen für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte (1880): Sitzung vom 7. November 1880, p. 271.

[132] „Zwang, dem sie sich unterworfen sah", Verhandlungen für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte (1880): Sitzung vom 7. November 1880, p. 272.

like a wild animal gone rogue clears him of being perceived as a perpetrator, but rather as an empathic researcher. He needed this story to justify his own behaviour, and the measurements' now evident invasiveness. Paingo never had been Virchow's subject: She had been forced into a situation she could barely escape from in a foreign country, being held by a European man who disrespected her bodily autonomy. Her reaction therefore can be seen as nothing but human. Deeming her animalistic, however, enabled Virchow to apply different ethical boundaries through which he could justify putting other humans into stressful situations of assessment that probably very few, like Paingo, even openly resisted. By stating that Paingo had been put into this situation against her will, Virchow showed that he did not have an issue with that, well knowing that it was his own work that had taken away the freedom of people. Vilifying and portraying their subjects as animalistic, and putting them in zoos, was the anthropologists' justification for applying different ethical boundaries than the ones ordinary physicians would. But there was no pathological illness by default that would make the exhibited patients of Virchow or any other anthropologist. It could therefore be argued that not even standard medical ethics were applied here. These subjects were not even granted the rights of any other German citizen.[133] Instead, the Berlin Society of Anthropology, together with producers of human exhibitions, created an environment where animal ethics would be applied.

However, the Inuit were still not solely treated as animals. The assessments, by 1880s German law, would most likely still have been classified as medical experiments, since the only people conducting them were trained physicians. There are no known incidents where the assessments caused a court case or even a disciplinary hearing. Rarely would newspapers challenge the scientific value and legitimacy of human exhibitions, but the methods of assessment by anthropologists have, at least publicly, not been adressed.[134] Virchow therefore would not have feared legal retaliations if he had continued to force Paingo into the assessment. Looking from a medical ethical point of view, Virchow should have stopped the assessment. From a standpoint of animal ethics, the very one Virchow had created by talking about Paino like an animal, not continuing could have been framed as generosity, the morally righteous thing to do, since it was not customary to grant animals the right of choice.

[133] Also within the German society of the 1880s there were significant differences in how people got treated in accordance with their social class and gender, but their existence as human beings was not being questioned.
[134] Richter 1995, p. 36.

Degrading other human beings to animals made it very easy for anthropologists, producers, and contractors to ethically justify putting people on display, "convincing" them to leave their homes, or forcing themselves upon them.

It also very quickly becomes apparent that Paingo's unpleasant encounter was not a singularity. When the Kawesqar of the "Feuerland Exhibition" had come to Munich in 1882, the anthropologist and physician Theodor von Bischoff was very eager to see the genitalia of the female Kawesqar. But the Kawesqar were not consenting to his assessments. He reported in a presentation that

> "allein ausser der Schwierigkeit sich mit den Feuerländern zu verständigen, da sie nur eine sehr unvollkommene und gänzlich unbekannte Sprache besitzen, tat mir in überraschender Weise die Schamhaftigkeit der Individuen und insbesondere der weiblichen, sehr hinderlich entgegen […] so gelang es mir nur unter Schwierigkeiten, mich zu überzeugen, dass die Weiber auch dieses Völkerstammes sich im Wesentlichen in der Bildung ihrer äusseren Geschlechtsorgane nicht von dem allgemein menschlichen Typus entfernen, und nicht im Mindesten sich den bei den Affen und Anthropoiden vorkommenden Formen anschließen. […] Ich will nur noch hinzufügen, dass es selbst bei den kleinen 4- und 3-jährigen Mädchen der Truppe unmöglich war, sich von dem Verhalten ihrer Geschlechtstheile zu überzeugen, indem ihr eigenes Sträuben auch noch von dem ihrer Mutter unterstützt wurde"[135]

This example of the Kawesqar and Theodor von Bischoff is probably one of the most invasive ones that has been published. For Bischoff, there seem to have been near to no boundaries in the way he approached the women. He first admitted to not being able to properly communicate what he was about to do and ask for consent, but to then trying to investigate the genitalia anyway. He reported being surprised to not have found any similarities with apes, but, in a different section, he continues to call the contractor of the group their "*Wärter*", a word either used for an animal keeper or a prison guard. He was outmost annoyed by the fact that mothers did not like a stranger man to closely and in length examine their daughters' genitalia. Bischoff used the same ethics by practise, since there were no official guidelines, as

[135] Eng.: Only apart from the difficulty of communicating with the Firelanders, since they possess only a very imperfect and entirely unknown language, the modesty of the individuals, and especially of the females, was a surprising hindrance to me [...]. Thus it was only with difficulty that I succeeded in assuring myself that also the females of this tribe do not essentially differ from the general human type in the formation of their external sexual organs, and do not in the least follow the forms found among the apes and anthropoids. [...] I will only add that even with the little 4 and 3 year old girls of the troupe it was impossible to be assured of the constitution of their sexual parts, their own balking being also supported by that of their mother; Bischoff, Theodor (1882): Bemerkungen über die Geschlechtsverhältnisse der Feuerländer, in: Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-physikalischen Classe der königlich bayrischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München (1882, Heft II.), pp. 243-244.

Virchow earlier in the case of Paingo. When he states that he was only able to obtain his results "*unter Schwierigkeiten*", it indicates that he did not simply stop when he encountered resistance, he even went a step further than Virchow. Besides this detail, the similarity of both instances is striking. He did not fully use force, even though he probably would have been able to, and he eventually did not finish all his measurements. But again, he started to revile the women afterwards, stating how they would belong to "*der niedrigsten Stufe der Civilisation*" and talking about a "*Wärter*" of theirs indicating an animal like behaviour, even though his very own conclusion had been that they were human, just as he was.[136] Just as Virchow, he was not used to getting denied: when some of the women had died in Zurich, Bischoff immediately ordered the corpses to be brought to him so he could finally finish what he could not when the women were still alive to fight him.[137] Using the bodies of people who had denied him makes clear that consent was not important to Bischoff, but what mattered was, as in the case of Virchow, that forceful behaviour did not become public.

This denunciation did not always mean that the people were likened to animalistic traits. During the colonial exposition of 1896, Felix von Luschan tried to assess all the exhibited people. He later wrote a lengthy report with all the results and his personal thoughts. When he writes how "*ein Material von über hundert Schwarzen*"[138] would provide a great opportunity for research, their objectification becomes apparent. Although he used their names in the report for indication,[139] he only refers to them as numbers talking about them, completely stripping them of their humanity. Of the 103 people at the exhibition, only 82 allowed their measurements to be taken, and only 51 consented to being photographed.[140] In contrast to the other cases, Luschan does not indicate if, and to what extent, he tried to "convince" people to be assessed. He only reported the assessments taking place in the mornings when it had been unusually cold. As a physician, he was aware of the health concerns of stripping people naked in these temperatures but still persisted.[141] He lamented how the

[136] Idem.
[137] Bischoff, Theodor (1882): Weitere Bemerkungen über die Feuerländer, in: Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-physikalischen Classe der königlich bayrischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München (1882, Heft III.), pp. 356-358.
[138] Eng.: Material of over hundred Blacks, von Luschan, Felix (1896): Physische Anthropologie, in: Meinecke, Gustav (Ed.), Deutschland und seine Kolonien im Jahre 1896, Berlin, p. 205.
[139] He himself states that he only wrote down the names the way he heard them, indicating that they could be completely wrong or just fabricated.
[140] Richter 1995, p. 36.
[141] Von Luschan 1896, pp. 205-206.

"*Unlust der meisten Leute, sich messen zu lassen, und in der vollständingen Unmöglichkeit, irgend einen [sic] Zwang auf sie auszuüben*"[142] which caused him trouble. While the entire procedure was probably more troubling for the exhibited people, his remarks also indicate that he was able to exert force upon earlier subjects, or that he wished to be capable of doing so. In either case, exerting force does not seem to have arisen any ethical issues for him. One reason for their different treatment could come down to them being German subjects and the exhibition in general being an attempt to portray the German colonies. Force and abuse were therefore less acceptable. This would imply that there was a perceived difference between people from German colonies and other parts of the world in the eyes of the German public, and, as a result, different ethical guidelines were applied. Until the *Schutzgebietsgesetz* of 1900, there was no clear definition for the legal status of colonized people in German colonies, who were mostly considered as subjects, but not citizens, which granted them no legal rights in Germany.[143]

While Luschan did not use animalistic vocabulary like Virchow, he still tried to denounce non-compliance. In his report, he heavily linked behaviour with physical appearance, even questioning the people's heritage if their behaviour did not match his constructed vision of their ethnicity. This change in narrative compared to von Bischoff or Virchow can be explained through the development of physical anthropology from the 1880s to the late 1890s. When a man called August or Ewane from Cameroon[144] did not comply with the measurements, Luschan noted "*Verweigert die Messung; dummdreister Bursche, der richtige Hosen-Nigger*".[145] There was also a photo of him in the report wearing a dark suit and a white shirt with a bowtie. The fact that Luschan was able to take a photo while August/Ewane was wearing a suit but did not manage to do the measurements indicates that August/Ewane was very well aware of the work Luschan did. But he tried to evade Luschan's degradation through measuring by letting himself be photographed just like any other "civilized" person, but not stripping naked or getting measured. By using a racial slur and insults, Luschan attempted to

[142] Eng.: The unwillingness of most people to be measured and the complete impossibility of exerting any force on them; von Luschan 1896, p. 209.
[143] See Trevisiol, Oliver (Diss.) (2004): Die Einbürgerungspraxis im Deutschen Reich 1871-1945, Konstanz.
[144] There is no further information about his background which makes it difficult to know for certain from where he came. This is true for most of the people mentioned in the report. At the same time, the report offers a great opportunity for future research to further investigate the lives of exhibited people and attempt to reconstruct some of their journeys to understand their emotions, beliefs, and motivations.
[145] Eng.: He refuses the measurement; insolent fellow, the typical trouser negro; von Luschan 1896, p. 220.

degrade him again, also implying August/Ewane's social immobility. All that only because he had successfully escaped Luschan's grasp, because Luschan, just like Virchow and von Bischoff, could not stand resistance. The will and well-being of their research subjects was not their concern, results were. In these cases, their ethics by practice can be defined as unhuman, giving in to the demands of the exhibited people not because of their own moral compass, but because the anthropologists feared public outcry. People like Paingo, the Kwakiutl women, or August/Ewane, on the other hand, were therefore successful in fighting for a small piece of agency, a small piece of self-determination within measuring, assessing, and foremost systematic othering.

Anthropologists were not the only physicians who examined exhibited people during their time in Germany. At the colonial exhibition of 1896, three different medical doctors of three different institutions regularly wanted to examine the exhibited people. One of them, who had been hired by the producers of the Great Industrial Exhibition, was supposed to examine the people as well as their accommodations daily. He had an assistant who had worked at a military field hospital before. The assistant was at the exhibition all the time and was supposed to "watch and nurse" any patient. Furthermore, the foreign ministry had ordered the medical officer Kohlstock to control if the accommodation was adequate and the treatment of the people was "good". Finally, the district medical officer of Teltow, Mr. Elten, was supposed to assess the people once every week to detect any infectious diseases.[146] It needs to be highlighted that all these different measures were not requested by the exhibited people and were brought upon them. Their contracts stated that they would have access to medical care, but not that medical examinations would take place daily. The physicians and the assistant were trained by the military and the weekly assessment for infectious diseases was done "*nach Art, wie es beim Militär Sitte ist*".[147] This meant that the people had to go into a room in groups according to their perceived ethnicity attributed by the physicians, where they were assessed by Mr. Elten and Mr. Kohlstock. The report does not state how this assessment was done. Gronauer only wrote that the assessment "*uns durchaus nicht anstößig erscheint*".[148] But exhibited people were no soldiers. The approach of the medical doctors was not asking the people what procedure would not be invasive but thinking that they would know better what

[146] Gronauer, Wilhelm (1896): Amtlicher Bericht, in: Meinecke, Gustav (Ed.), Deutschland und seine Kolonien im Jahre 1896, Berlin, pp. 45-46.
[147] Eng.: in a manner, that is custom at the military; Gronauer 1896, p. 46.
[148] Eng.: it does not appear offensive to us; Gronauer 1896, p. 46.

procedure would be acceptable. After a few weeks, there were protests against the weekly assessments, demanding that they should be stopped. It is not possible to tell what the specific issues were, but the protest was successful. They argued that this procedure had not been part of their contract, and despite the district medical officer and administrator objecting to their refusal, the supreme president ordered that the assessments should be stopped and the medical advice by the general physician would be sufficient. It is therefore a similar case to the assessments by the anthropologists where the exhibited people successfully fought treatments they did not agree with. But just as with the anthropologists, the subsequent report tried to denounce the behaviour of the exhibited. The scientists' regime was to decide for the exhibited people because they were deemed not civilised enough to understand the necessity of said procedures. In contrast, genuine concern and distress expressed by the people was simply downplayed.

Nevertheless, physicians where important for the people coming to Germany, for many became sick during their stay. The medical report of the colonial exhibition 1896 gives a long list of sicknesses, with the eight Papuans alone suffering from several diseases: Taolutte[149] developed severe pneumonia which had to be treated in the Charité, the central Hospital of Berlin where Virchow worked as well, for four weeks. Tokulap[150] got a significantly swollen lymph node in his groin which also needed to be treated at the Charité. Taoluna[151] also suffered from a severely swollen lymph node which was surrounded by pus in his neck. According to Luschan, he also had a swollen testicle which was not listed in the medical report, showing how Luschan's assessments were possibly more invasive than the ones of the general physician at the exhibition.[152] The lymph node was cut open at the Charité. Tolanglagur[153] developed a high fever and a gastrointestinal infection, which also needed to be treated at the Charité, where he subsequently got pneumonia.[154] All of them, according to Gronauer, were able to leave Germany fully recovered after the exhibition. In the end, out of eight men, five got so sick that they had to go to the hospital and stay there for treatment. In general, especially pneumonia and other infectious diseases were very common among exhibited people,

[149] The name is according to Gronauer, there is no Taolutte in Luschan's list, he probably called him Towalut/Taualup.
[150] Luschan probably called him Topalangat.
[151] Luschan probably called him Tau-luna.
[152] Von Luschan (1896), p. 241.
[153] Luschan probably called him Dalang-lagur.
[154] Gronauer 1896, pp. 48-49.

something that was also noted in the medical report. Several reasons for this can be found: first and foremost, most of them had not been outside of their home before and therefore had not been in contact with, i.e. immune to, infectious diseases common in Europe. They thus did not have any antibodies to protect themselves, something only a vaccine could solve for certain viruses. A second reason could be found in the accommodation. Except for very rare cases, like the homesick Pikjotkje, people were not accommodated in hotels and would only perform at the exhibition during the day. Instead, they were forced to live in poorly fabricated housing that was constructed like their "natural habitats", imitating a European picture of their home. There was a reconstruction of an East-African clay castle, a small village resembling New-Guinean houses, and several huts that supposedly were imitating the Togo, Cameroon, and West-African regions. As such, the people of the colonial exhibition of 1896 had to live in a clay castle, huts with roofs out of loose hay, or tents made of palm leaves.[155] All this in the middle of Berlin during a cold summer.

Abraham Ulrikab reported that their situation sixteen years earlier had not been much different. When Carl Hagenbeck proudly wrote that "*nach Eskimoart wurde den Leuten eine Wohnung hergerichtet, nämlich halb unter der Erde*",[156] it shows the ethical understanding of putting people, who had lived in a wooden house completely above the ground constructed by German missionaries, in such a dwelling. It also was very cold during that time, and in contrast to the colonial exhibition of 1896, Abraham and his family were touring Germany during the winter. As such, Abraham stated them being extremely cold.[157] Their housing also had very little resistance to visitors pouring into their home, leaving them without any private space, something Abraham and his family were very unhappy about. He wrote on the 10th of November 1880 how the barrier around their house had been broken several times by then and masses of people would push themselves into their home.[158] This barrier at the zoo had probably been erected to separate animals from humans, however, in 1880, the Inuit families had become the perceivable "animal" the barriers should hold back from the "civilized". But in the end the barriers were not able to protect humans from humans. Abraham, who was asked

[155] Meinke, Gustav (Ed.) (1896): Deutschland und seine Kolonien im Jahre 1896, Berlin, pp. 34-44.
[156] Eng.: In Eskimo style, a dwelling was prepared for the people, namely half under the ground; Hagenbeck 1909, p. 89.
[157] Lutz 2007, p. 29.
[158] Lutz 2007, p. 38.

to do so by Jacobsen and Schoepf, had to defend the hut against masses[159] of visitors by swinging a whip and yelling.[160]

4. Infected

Due to the poor housing, the harsh winter, as well as their non-existing immunity to infectious diseases prevalent in Europe, Abraham and his family got sick regularly. But despite Abraham developing a severe flu in November 1880 and his daughter Sara being bedridden from the same disease, Abraham had to continue working. He wrote that it was not only his own sickness that made work difficult to him, but also leaving his daughter all alone during the day made him sad.[161] All of this, apparently, was not an issue to Jacobsen and Schoepf, who were in charge of the work schedule during their time in Berlin. And while Abraham had been one of the first people exhibited within the so called "Völkerschauen", the colonial exhibition of 1896 was executed when it was well known among producers that people would face infectious diseases or other illnesses if they were to come to Europe. But even though the producers knew this, they did not start questioning the rightfulness and necessity of the human exhibitions. Instead, the sick were denounced just like the exhibited who had refused the examination by anthropologists. Gronauer wrote in his medical report of the colonial exhibition that bringing the people to Germany was not the issue to their health, but them not following their orders, like not sitting on the naked, moist floor.[162] The very same floor of the very same buildings that they had been forced to live in by the very same doctors who lamented their behaviour and blamed them for getting sick. None of the contracts had warned them of the physical dangers of their journey to Europe, they had only promised the best medical care, after they had been made sick. Providing health care was the ethics by practise deeming the human exhibitions morally rightful, when not bringing the people to Europe in the first place would have avoided them getting sick. And eventually, getting sick led to death.

Abraham had written about how the entire family persistently had a cold. But they continued to tour different zoos in Prague and Frankfurt until they reached Darmstadt, where Noggasak

[159] Abraham is not giving an exact number, only that their house was completely filled with people so that even moving became impossible; idem.
[160] Idem.
[161] Lutz 2007, p. 35.
[162] Gronauer 1896, p. 49.

died within two days after she fell ill. According to Abraham, she was in great pain and suffered severely during the two days.[163] To this point, medical doctors and Jacobsen had only suspected a stomach ulcer. Her family quickly had to bury her in Darmstadt because Jacobsen and Schoepf brought them to Krefeld only one day later, where they arrived on the 16th of December 1880.[164] According to Jacobsen's diary, Hagenbeck, as a reaction to Noggasak's death, gifted Christmas presents to the Inuit to lift their spirits. They received clothing, Abraham received a violin, and Tobias a guitar.[165] All these gifts do not appear to be a pure act of condolence towards the Inuit, but a motivator to keep them performing, as playing instruments for show would increase their popularity. At the same time, these gifts compare not in the slightest to the loss of human life. There was no proper compensation to the family, also not in the case of other exhibitions by Carl Hagenbeck.

Only two days after Christmas, Paingo fell sick as well. Jacobsen called a medical doctor who diagnosed her with rheumatism, claiming it to be nothing they needed to worry about. On the next day, Sara, the older daughter of Abraham, also became sick. Hagenbeck, who was in Hamburg during this time, immediately sent a letter to Jacobsen asking him about Piango's condition after receiving a telegram from Schoepf. In his letter, he was most worried about Paingo not being able to travel and consequently the whole group having to stay in Krefeld longer than planned. He therefore especially asked for how long they would need to stay there.[166] But Paingo died on the following day as well. Abraham noted in his diary how his daughter Sara was still brought to a hospital in Krefeld where he was able to visit her. He was very afraid for the life of his child. They sang and prayed together in the hospital and when he had to leave, she asked him to greet her mother and younger sister. She fell asleep before his departure. While she was still alive at the hospital, the rest of the group boarded a train to Paris. There, on New Years' Eve, they received the message that Sara had died as well.[167] This is the last entry in Abraham Ulrikab's diary.

He only wrote one last letter to Brother Elsner, reporting how Noggasak, Paingo, and Sara had died, and that by the time of writing they knew that they had died of smallpox.[168] Tobias and

[163] Lutz 2007, p. 41.
[164] Lutz 2007, p. 18.
[165] Idem.
[166] Letter from Carl Hagenbeck 26th December 1880, bequest Jacobsen at the MARKK Hamburg JAC 17.3.
[167] Lutz 2007, p. 42.
[168] Lutz 2007, pp. 44-45.

Maria, the baby daughter of Abraham, had become sick as well. Terrianiak, whose entire family had died by now, had become a broken man. He had asked Abraham to convert him to Christianism and started participating in their prayers. Abraham's accounts sound fearful and desperate. He wrote how his only wish was to see his relatives and friends in Hebron again, and how they all regretted leaving their home. He ended his letter by saying that "*in Paris ist es kalt, sogar sehr kalt; aber unser Vorgesetzter ist jetzt sehr gütig gegen uns alle*".[169] This indicates that Jacobsen, who can be seen as their main supervisor, had not been as friendly to them before. Leaving his dying daughter in Krefeld was very likely against the will of Abraham and his family and must have been heart-breaking to him. Jacobsen, who possibly had understood the pressure by Hagenbeck, was responsible for dragging the group along to Paris, despite the death and sickness surrounding the group. By that time, Jacobsen also felt responsible when he wrote in his diary "*soll ich indireckt schuld am [sic] Ihren tod [sic] sein?*".[170] He grasped his part of the blame about the Inuit not having been vaccinated against smallpox upon their arrival, because he had been sick when they arrived and had forgotten about it afterwards. However, Hagenbeck, whom they also had met right after their arrival, was just as responsible. Jacobsen becoming aware of his blame, though, did not prevent the death of Maria on the 7th, Tobias and Terianiak on the 9th, Abraham on the 13th, and Ulrike on the 16th of January.[171] Their burial sites are unknown, but they likely got buried in Paris. Because the medical doctors at the hospital in Krefeld were unsure why Paingo had died, they ordered an autopsy to find out the cause of death. It is unknown if Terianiak gave his consent to this, but it appears unlikely. However, this must have happened while the group was still in Krefeld since Jacobsen, in search of profit in any situation, as will be discussed in chapter three, received her skullcap from the hospital. As such, Terianiak had to leave his family behind in Germany, not being able to take home their remains. Jacobsen, however, was able to take Paingo's skull with him, which sounds unbelievably grotesque, but it also remarkably demonstrates the ethics by practice of the human exhibitions. The skullcap was later given to the Paris Museum of Ethnology.[172]

[169] Eng.: It is cold in Paris, even very cold; but our supervisor is now very friendly to us all; Idem.
[170] Lutz 2007, p. 19.
[171] Idem.
[172] Lutz 2007, p. 19.

5. Aftermath

After the death of the Inuit, Jacobsen left Paris immediately. According to the letters he received,[173] in much distress. He travelled to Aachen and stayed there for some weeks. However, he was not distressed because of the human tragedy of the dead Inuit, but because he feared for his financial situation. He had also fallen sick, possibly smallpox as well, but in contrast to the Inuit he was properly vaccinated. He must have written to everyone he knew about the situation and his financial worries, as in the following days he received letters from Schoepf, Hagenbeck, and Henny[174] who all told him not to worry about the money, which he should receive soon.[175] All of the letters were written on the same day and Henny even underlined the word "*unbesorgt*"[176] when writing about the money. Besides financial troubles, Jacobsen as well as Henny, Hagenbeck, and Schoepf, were not too concerned about the death of the Inuit and did not question their business of human exhibitions. Hagenbeck was still planning the next exhibition with the Kawesqar and thinking about future income, Henny hoped that Jacobsen would become the leader of that exhibition again, just eleven days after Abraham had died.[177] But Jacobsen remained worried about his financial situation, the death of the Inuit seemed like a financial tragedy to him, not a real tragedy to the Inuit. One month later, Schoepf had to reassure him that everything would be alright and that it would not be "*so schlecht als wie Sie glauben*".[178] Hagenbeck himself wrote Jacobsen that he would not want to see any of their belongings and that he should simply get them sold, the price would not matter to him.[179] This tragedy did not stop him from producing human exhibitions or change

[173] His bequest only includes the letters he received, but they also indicate the kind of letters he wrote to others according to their responses.
[174] It is not possible to find out who Henny was. She could be his wife Hedwig, but the handwriting does not align with Hedwig's earlier letters. On the other hand, she writes as if she was very close to Jacobsen. An unknown sister also does not fit the situation because she wrote in German, whereas Jacobsen's brother always wrote in Norwegian. Henny was in Hamburg and must have known Hagenbeck, whom she also talked to. Hedwig, on the other hand, had been in Dresden, at least until late 1879. Henny therefore could still be Hedwig, but it seems unlikely. For this analysis, however, it is not too important to understand who Henny was aside from her being very close to Jacobsen and having contact to Hagenbeck and the business of human exhibitions.
[175] Letter from Hagenbeck 27th January 1881, bequest Jacobsen at the MARKK Hamburg JAC 17.4; Letter from Schoepf 27th January 1881, bequest Jacobsen at the MARKK Hamburg JAC 17.4; Letter from Henny 27th January 1881, bequest Jacobsen at the MARKK Hamburg JAC 17.4.
[176] Eng.: Do not worry.
[177] Letter from Henny 27th January 1881, bequest Jacobsen at the MARKK Hamburg JAC 17.4.
[178] Eng.: As bad as you believe it to be; Letter from Schoepf 17th February 1881, bequest Jacobsen at the MARKK Hamburg JAC 17.4.
[179] Thode-Aurora 1989, pp. 34-35.

anything about them, he only made sure that the people were vaccinated against smallpox once they reached Germany.

This changed when the Kawesqar of the "Feuerland Exhibition" 1881/82 died as well, again of respiratory diseases despite them being vaccinated against smallpox.[180] It was not Jacobsen who had led that exhibition, who was in British Columbia at that time on Hagenbeck's orders to contract Kwakiutl women for a new exhibition. While instructing Jacobsen on the people he should recruit, Hagenbeck also informed him about the "Feuerland Exhibition's" progress. On the 4th of February 1882, he wrote Jacobsen "*die Feuerländer sind Gott sei Dank alle wohlauf [sic] und gesundt und das Geschäft geht gut*".[181] The relief in Hagenbeck's tone was not only caused by the success of the exhibitions. It shows that he, at least by now, was well aware of the risks his exhibitions posed. Instead of adjusting his business to avoid endangering lives, he simply prayed for a better outcome. Too tempting was the prospect of profit. Only two weeks later, on 20th of February 1882, Hagenbeck wrote how one of the Kawesqar women had died and one man got sick. Hagenbeck called this development an accident. But he hoped that "*dieser [junge Mann] am Leben bleibt und ich weiter werde keinen Unfall zu beklagen haben*".[182] To Hagenbeck, he himself was the only harmed one. For him, his potential financial loss outweighed any personal tragedy. Two weeks later the man and another woman died. The medical doctors suspected tuberculosis and measles in all remaining people of the group. The turn of events made Hagenbeck highlight again that Jacobsen should not forget to vaccinate the Kwakiutl should they come to Germany. He underlined the word "vaccinate" twice.[183] But no vaccination would have saved them from tuberculosis or the measles, two very common diseases at the time. On the 17th of March, Hagenbeck reported the death of five people. It was at this moment that Hagenbeck had possibly realized that his shows were responsible for the deaths. He told Jacobsen to stop the search for the Kwakiutl: "*so dass ich es mir fest vorgenommen habe nie mehr Menschen Ausstellungen zu arrangieren und möchte bitte dass Sie sich ganz hiernach richten*."[184]. *"Nie mehr"* very quickly turned into only a few months. In

[180] Bischoff 1882 Weitere Bemerkungen über die Feuerländer, p. 356.
[181] Eng.: The people from Fireland, thank God, are all well and healthy and the business is running great; Letter from Hagenbeck 4th February 1882, bequest Jacobsen at the MARKK Hamburg JAC 17.5.
[182] Eng.: this [young man] will stay alive and that I will not have to mourn another accident; Letter from Hagenbeck 20th February 1882, bequest Jacobsen at the MARKK Hamburg JAC 17.5.
[183] Letter from Hagenbeck 2nd March 1882, bequest Jacobsen at the MARKK Hamburg JAC 17.5.
[184] Eng.: So that I have firmly resolved never to arrange human exhibitions again and would like to ask you to comply with this completely; Letter from Hagenbeck 17th March 1882, bequest Jacobsen at the MARKK Hamburg JAC 17.5.

1883 alone, Hagenbeck produced at least three human exhibitions.[185] His conviction to never host them again disappeared in the light of new profits. In his book, Hagenbeck simply lied about this. While he mentioned all the other exhibitions of that time, the Inuit exhibition of 1880/81 as well as the "Feuerland exhibition" of 1881/82 are not referred to at all. His actions had not only led to their deaths but he also deafened their legacy. His doubts about the rightfulness of the exhibitions after the death of the Kawesqar also gave way to the simple "*die Völkerausstellungen […] die ununterbrochen ihren Fortgang nahmen*" for the chain of events between 1880 and 1883.[186]

Also, after these events, death stayed imminent in human exhibitions. During the Colonial Exhibition of 1896, at least three people died of infectious diseases.[187] The consequence was that exhibitions with people from German colonies became forbidden by law. But the purpose of this law was only the protection of exhibited people, not the banning of such events. On the surface it was introduced to protect people from getting killed through an exhibition, otherwise human exhibitions in general would have been banned. Quite the opposite, the law was not introduced to protect people from getting exhibited. Instead, as Sippel argues, it should keep the perceivedly underdeveloped in the colonies so that they would not see the dire reality of German metropoles, which would have brought German Colonial Regime and its justification based on developmental superiority to crumble. The encounters exhibited people would have did not resemble the dream of civilization, the dream German authorities wanted to tell colonized people to justify their rule over the perceivedly undeveloped. Furthermore, German companies feared that more and more exhibitions with people from the colonies would leave them without enough people to exploit in the colonies for labour.[188] This act technically ended the exhibition of people from German colonies, but they would continue nonetheless, for example, with the Samoa exhibitions touring Germany well into the 20th century.[189] With the opening of Hagenbeck's own zoo in Stellingen near Hamburg in 1907, he had even designed a part of the zoo exclusively for human exhibitions. The way of the

[185] Thode-Aurora 1989, p. 169.
[186] Eng.: the human exhibitions which continued uninterruptedly; Hagenbeck 1909, pp. 95-96.
[187] Gronauer 1896, p. 48.
[188] See Sippel, Harald (1995): Rassismus, Protektionismus oder Humanität? Die gesetzlichen Verbote der Anwerbung von „Eingeborenen" zu Schaustellungszwecken in den deutschen Kolonien, in: Debusmann, Robert; Riesz, János (Ed.), Kolonialausstellungen – Begegnungen mit Afrika?, pp. 43-64.
[189] See Steffen-Schrade, Jutta (1998): Exkurs: Samoaner im Frankfurter Zoo, in: Kroeber-Wolf, Gerda; Mesenhöller, Peter (Ed.), Talofa! Sammoa, Südsee. Ansichten und Einsichten, pp. 367-391.

exhibitions slightly changed with this, since they stopped traveling around the country but would become a fixed instalment in Hagenbeck's zoo, but the exploitative conditions remained unchanged.

***

The death of exhibited people during the early exhibitions was not praised as in the case of the dead monkeys in the London Zoo, but their death was accepted by producers, contractors, and anthropologists, without any consequences for future exhibitions. If there had been ethical concerns about their deaths, people like Hagenbeck or Jacobsen would have either pushed for real changes or for the end of human exhibitions, but as profit-hungry businessmen, they would not allow this. Instead, they sought excuses, clung to the idea that the only reason for the death of the people had been a simple mistake, forgetting the vaccine, and not the overall endeavour of human exhibitions. They only for a very small moment realized their responsibility for the death of the Kawesqar. All of them, including Carl Hagenbeck and his very first exhibitions as well as the producers of the colonial exhibition over 19 years later, were very well aware of the risk of death of exhibited people. But in their understanding, profit through entertainment was more important than the lives of people they had "convinced" to come to Germany, whom they had forced to undress and get assessed, whom they had pressured into a life exposed to the elements in zoos, whom they had infected with diseases, whom they had killed.

Chapter 3: Boundaries of Collecting

Only four days after Ulrike, the last living Inuit of the group, had died, Adolf Bastian wrote a letter to Jacobsen asking him if the Inuit's objects were available to be placed in the collection of the Ethnological Museum in Berlin.[190] Vulture-like, Bastian wanted to secure these objects for himself, using the tragedy of others for his benefit. Schoepf, still in Paris, instead attempted to sell the items to other people until he had to leave on Hagenbeck's orders. Only then Jacobsen agreed to sell the objects to Bastian. [191] But Bastian had other plans with the now unemployed Jacobsen, and wanting him to travel the world, "buying" and "trading" objects for his collection. It is not fully possible to reconstruct the events of the first months of 1881 after the death of the Inuit Ulrike just from the letters Jacobsen received. But by July 1881, he was already in New York on his way to Canada in search of objects for Bastian and by the end of August had reached Victoria in British Columbia. Bastian had within a few months established a large fund that financed all of Jacobsen's expenses.[192] The fund's sole purpose was to finance the increase on the number of objects in the Berlin museums, indicating that it was mainly the quantity of objects that was important to the ethnological collection during the late 19th century, not necessarily the quality. As a result, Adrian Jacobsen, originally a contractor for human exhibitions, became a collector for so-called ethnographica.

This chapter will therefore focus on the more implicit consequences of the human exhibitions, namely the collecting of objects and human remains. The central question to this can be seen in how and why human exhibitions became not only responsible for exhibiting people in zoological gardens, but also further enabled the looting of objects and objectification of humans. What does this imply to the ethical regime of the contractors and producers, who, with this, went beyond simply contracting and exhibiting people, but constructed an even larger industry of exploitation and othering?

Human exhibitions were closely linked to this collecting. While many object collectors only pursued this career, the human exhibitions were also a place of exhibiting objects, and the

[190] Letter from Bastian 20th January 1882, bequest Jacobsen at the MARKK Hamburg JAC 17.5.
[191] Letter from Bastian 4th April 1882, bequest Jacobsen at the MARKK Hamburg JAC 17.5.
[192] Vertrag zwischen dem Hilfskomitee für Vermehrung der anthropolgischen Sammlungen der königlichen Museen in Berlin in Kapitän J. Adrian Jacobsen, 27th July 1881, bequest Jacobsen at the MARKK Hamburg JAC 17.5.

contractors themselves were the ones who collected them. It was yet another way of constructing a picture of a culture, rendering the narrative that the producers wanted to tell through their human exhibitions. As such, Hagenbeck did not only directly order specific people to be contracted but also wanted a large number of "their" objects to be exhibited alongside them and eventually be sold.[193] Hagenbeck had no interest in having an exhibition akin to an ethnographic museum, he only saw another opportunity to make money. When Hagenbeck participated in the World Exhibition of 1893 in Chicago, Jacobsen came with him, selling objects that had largely been acquired during the contracting of the exhibited people of Hagenbeck's shows. They made a list of all the price-tagged objects so that visitors could simply pick something they liked from the catalogue.[194] This step alone was yet another way Hagenbeck and Jacobsen constructed a value of certain cultures, of certain objects, not through their functionality but through their otherness. The entire collection of objects from British Columbia in the catalogue could have been bought for 4 500 US Dollars, a collection that had solely been put together during the contracting of people for the Bella Coola Exhibition in 1885. Although Chicago was still far away from British Columbia, it seems ironic that all these objects had been taken away from North America to Europe only to be sold in North America again, which indicates just how lucrative this trade must have been for Hagenbeck. But while retailers made so much profit, the colonized that had produced and owned the objects did not earn their fair share of the price.

Many times, Jacobsen did not even pay a price. In a speech he must have held at different events in the years 1911 and 1914, he looked back on the way he dealt with the people and their belongings.[195] He began his story telling by saying that

> "man […] keinesfalls glauben [darf], dass die Eingeborenen der verschiedenen Erdteile nur darauf warten, bis irgend ein Sammler kommt, um ihnen ihre Heiligtümer abzukaufen oder einzutauschen! Es ist im Gegenteil eine gewisse Kunst, den Eingeborenen glaubhaft zu machen, dass sie den vorteilhaftesten Tausch machen, gleichviel, was sie dafür erhalten".[196]

[193] Letter from Hagenbeck 4th February 1882, bequest Jacobsen at the MARKK Hamburg JAC 17.5.
[194] Jacobsen Ethnographische Sammlungen für Chicago 1893 including Price List of Ethnographical Collections, bequest Jacobsen at the MARKK Hamburg JAC 22.5.
[195] Erlebnisse beim Sammeln in den 3 Welttheilen, bequest Jacobsen at the MARKK Hamburg JAC 20.3.
[196] Eng.: One must by no means believe that the natives of the various parts of the world are only waiting for some collector to come and buy or exchange their sacred objects! On the contrary, it is a certain art to make the natives believe that they are making the most advantageous exchange, no matter what they receive in return; Idem.

While this account has been written retrospectively, it still highlights his boasting attitude about getting objects from people without paying them a reasonable price, instead manipulating them. At the same time, by stating how the objects were supposedly sacred to the people, Jacobsen showed that he was very well aware of the objects' importance to their owners. But this did not cause him any remorse, nor question of moral wrongdoing. Instead, he tried to acquire as many items for the least amount of money possible. He also did not shy away from plain looting and stealing. When Jacobsen travelled to Nanaimo on Vancouver Island to contract the Kwakiutl, he encountered a burial site near a village where he found various totem poles and burial masks. The people living in the village made very clear that they did not want Jacobsen touching the objects, let alone agreed to selling them to him. However, just as with the contracting, declining a request did not help them evade the situation. Jacobsen did not give up, but went back at night, together with a French man he paid to help him, and looted the entire burial side. They hid the objects on a cart and lied on their way back about their load.[197] His description of secretly stealing the objects as well as the knowledge about the owners' disapproval shows how he was aware he was of committing theft. But instead of being morally conflicted, Jacobsen appeared proud of his actions. His ethics by practice therefore had no boundaries, no line of conflict, when it came to stealing or looting objects as well as when using his position to gain advantage negotiating an object's price. And all this only happened with the sole motivation of his profit, not because he himself was interested in the objects.

This looting and stealing was not different from the regular looting and stealing by collectors who were not involved with human exhibitions. Jacobsen only did so while he was looking for people to contract. Without the human exhibitions, without Carl Hagenbeck's "business", Jacobsen would not have been in the position to collect objects for Adolf Bastian and the Berlin Museum for Ethnology. Especially the number of objects he collected for Bastian in British Columbia indicates how ruthlessly Jacobsen acted, ranging all the way from wooden spoons to dancing masks and the mentioned totem poles. In a letter to Hagenbeck, he claimed to have "collected" the most objects anyone ever had in British Columbia.[198] And this claim was made only halfway through his time there. It is not relevant here if his remarks hold any truth, it in either case shows that he himself was aware of the impact he had on the people, and that he

[197] Erlebnisse beim Sammeln in den 3 Welttheilen, pp. 5-7, bequest Jacobsen at the MARKK Hamburg JAC 20.3.
[198] Letter from Jacobsen to Hagenbeck 3rd November 1881, bequest Jacobsen at the MARKK Hamburg JAC 17.4.

apparently did not see any issues in it and neither expected Hagenbeck to have a differing opinion.

When Jacobsen returned to British Columbia in 1885 to try once again to contract Kwakiutl women, he failed. But in Victoria he was able to "persuade" nine Nuxalk men to come to Europe. They would form the Bella Coola Exhibition of 1885/86. In Germany, they had to perform dance routines that should resemble their cultural festivities such as a potlatch.[199] They used multiple masks in the shows that would later partly be taken to the Ethnological Museum in Berlin. Franz Boas wrote for the *Berliner Tageblatt* how there was a large collection of other objects accompanying the exhibition: "*Wonderously [sic] beautiful are some of the carved house posts which are erected by this tribe and which represent the family tree; no less notable are the beautifully carved stone implements, axes, hammers, bowls, and the like*."[200] It was the first time Boas was in contact with the Nuxalk, which motivated him to further research the First Nations of the American Continent, but also to conduct field work instead of analysing cultures through constructed shows on European soil. Franz Boas is an example for questioning the habit of collecting and exhibiting as scientific research, but this awareness would also take until the turn of the century to develop. For the early human exhibitions, however, this form of collecting and exhibiting was barely problematised. As such, people like Jacobsen or Hagenbeck would perform these practices as part of the human exhibitions without any moral limitations as long as they could sell a supposedly authentic story to a German audience.

However, not everything collected by Jacobsen and other contractors can be considered an object. Before Abraham and his family got recruited in Labrador, Jacobsen had been in Ilulissat on Greenland. There, the Danish authorities had not allowed him to contract any people. But while he had not been able to contract anyone, he still collected objects for the exhibition. All this happened without the request by Adolf Bastian, in contrast to his collecting in British Columbia. Jacobsen went outside the settlements in order to open graves and plunder them for objects. According to his diary, he did so in secret because he thought the Inuit would not allow him to dig up the graves.[201] It is important to note that yet again he expected his own

[199] See Cole, Douglas (1982): Franz Boas and the Bella Coola in Berlin, in: Northwest Anthropological Research Notes (Vol. 16,2), pp. 115-124.
[200] Boas, Franz (1886), Captain Jacobsen's Bella Colla Indians, Berliner Tageblatt 25th January 1886; cited after Cole 1982, p. 122.
[201] Hoffmann 1880, p. 13.

behaviour to fundamentally oppose the needs and culture of the people he was dealing with. And yet he did not stop his actions but thought it to be a great story to tell the German audience. Putting it in reverse perspective, it can be doubted that the same audience would have enjoyed a story about grave looting if it had concerned their local cemetery.

While he was in British Columbia leading the Kwakiutl to Fort Rupert where they would eventually escape him, Jacobsen left the trail without them for a short moment because he knew of a burial site nearby. In his diary he wrote: "*dort angelangt – fan ich 2 Waibliche 1 Manlicher Kopf wilche ich mitnahm – in der Eile, denn wir waren ängstlich entdeckt zu werden – zerreiste ich meine Hanf um eine Halswirbel einer Mumie – bei abdrehen der Kopf*"[202] Jacobsen therefore looted graves not only for objects, but also for human remains which he took apart and destroyed. He was yet again anxious to be discovered by other people, thus directly showing that he was aware of the wrongfulness of his acts. It could be asked if Jacobsen would have done the very same with a grave in Norway, maybe even of his own family. Whereas it might still be that he would have dug up such a grave and misplaced the bones, it appears to be unlikely that he would have ruthlessly twisted skulls off spines and written about it like a cook preparing prawns. As a result, his actions do not differ substantially from the looting of objects, especially regarding the looting of the graves in Greenland. But the difference can be seen in the type of the sources.

Both accounts by Jacobsen had been part of his diary. But his story about looting objects from the graves near Ilulissat was edited and published for the public, while the report on twisting skulls off spines was left out. This seems to indicate a different public perception of collecting objects and human remains. Looting graves and taking human remains was largely practiced by German collectors, not only Jacobsen, and these remains ended up in German ethnological museums.[203] But within the collectors' ethics by practise, looting itself appears acceptable, including for show producers and anthropologists, but not towards the German public who would not approve it. Also, years later, during his speech on his travels in British Columbia, Jacobsen did spare the part of looting the corpses while clearly stating that he took graves apart. Another indicator can be seen in the criminal law of imperial Germany, which regarded

[202] Eng.: Once there - I found 2 female 1 male heads which I took with me - in a hurry, because we were afraid of being discovered - I tore my hand on a cervical vertebra of a mummy - while twisting the head off; Jacobsen's German had many grammar and spelling mistakes which have not been translated; cited after Thode-Aurora 1989, pp. 74-75.

[203] See Aly, Götz (2021): Das Prachtboot. Wie Deutsche die Kunstschätze der Südsee raubten, Frankfurt.

misplacement of a corpse without the eligibility to do so as a criminal offense that could be punished with up to two years of prison. Destroying a grave was technically a legal offense as well, but the law did not say anything about taking objects out of the grave.[204]

Taking this into account, it becomes very likely that Jacobsen's work was even more invasive than he himself had openly admitted. When he looted the graves in Ilulissat and near Nanaimo he could as well also have taken human remains, most likely skulls, without mentioning it in his public reports. That Jacobsen personally had no issues with taking these remains with him is clearly noted when taking the case of Paingo into consideration, where Jacobsen took her head plate with him to Paris from Krefeld. Right after her death, she had been taken apart only for a piece of her head to be put into Jacobsen's pocket. But in this case, there had been an instance that had given her remains to Jacobsen: the medical doctors who had performed that autopsy. It is not possible to reconstruct how this came to be, but it also needs to be highlighted that Jacobsen only took parts of the skull, just like in British Columbia. He possibly could have taken any part of the body or every bone there was. The skull would have been the easiest part to sell to anthropologists like Rudolf Virchow, since craniology was such a popular discipline. But Jacobsen himself was not a craniologist, nor was he contracted by one at the point of Paingo's death, in contrast to his time in British Columbia. Jacobsen therefore took the skull solely for profit, hoping to sell it as quickly as possible. The fact that Paingo's head ended up in some Parisian collection manifests this objectification of human remains for quick profit and a nearly limitless ethical understanding of "convincing", looting, and desecration of corpses.

After all, Paingo had not given consent that Jacobsen could take her head, just as much as the Kawesqar women had not given consent to Theodor von Bischoff when he had taken their bodies to his theatre and had performed autopsies of their genitalia. Terianiak, Paingo's husband, most likely did not know about this when they buried her body in Krefeld. Jacobsen therefore technically had committed something that, in contrast to all the forceful assessments of the anthropologists, was a criminal offense by German law. And it was not only Jacobsen who was a part of this but also the medical doctors that had handed the head plate to him. But there was no investigation, let alone punishment. If Paingo had any protection through German law while she was still alive, she had lost it when she died. Officially, the medical

[204] Das Strafgesetzbuch für das Deutsche Reich vom 15. Mai 1871 nach der Novelle vom 26. Februar 1876, p. 49.

doctors had performed the autopsy to detect the cause of death. But this should not have allowed Jacobsen to take her skullcap with him. The only reason had been because Paingo was not German, or at least European, by definition of the German societal order. She had been fetishized as a human being for her constructed otherness within the human exhibitions, and after her death she was fetishized again as an object within museal exhibitions and scientific collections.[205] The very same thing had happened to the people whose skulls or any other remains had been taken out of their graves to be brought to Europe as objects, not human remains. This was the reason why the law, which was in place to prevent this act of desecration, did not protect them, as law enforcers saw an object and not a human being or a corpse. Only things happening to Germans, either dead or alive, were deemed problematic, because they were perceived as human beings, also after their death.

Contractors like Jacobsen were solely driven by personal gain and profit, disregarding the rights, cultural significance, and well-being of the communities they acquired objects from. Jacobsen used manipulative and forceful tactics to convince people to part with their sacred objects for meagre compensation, if any. He took advantage of power imbalances where people could not simply decline his demands, treating their cultural heritage as commodities to be exploited. Furthermore, the looting and stealing of objects, including from burial sites, demonstrate a complete disregard for the sacredness and cultural sensitivities surrounding human remains. The collectors' focus on profit overshadowed any consideration for the ethical implications of desecrating graves and taking objects without proper authorization, something that was not part of Jacobsen's ethics by practice. As such, human remains were objectified as commodities for sale or exhibition not only by anthropologists or specialized collectors but within the human exhibitions that had made this practice possible and monetized it. Human remains were treated as objects divorced from their cultural, historical, and spiritual contexts and this practice was neither publicly nor internally questioned by the actors. By reducing individuals to mere artifacts, they perpetuated a dehumanizing practice that disregarded the dignity and respect owed to the deceased. The case of Paingo's head most likely was not a singularity, contractors like Jacobsen possibly took more human remains with them than they

[205] Tinne Claes and Pieter Huistra have shown how this not only happened to exhibited people but also European citizens in the late 19th century through their case study on the shortages of corpses for the medical faculties in Belgium; Claes, Tinne; Huistra, Pieter, Huistra (2016): 'Il importe d'établir une distinction entre la dissection et l'autopsie'. Lijken en medische disciplinevorming in laatnegentiende-eeuws België, in: BMGN - Low Countries Historical Review, Vol. 131(3), pp. 26–53.

officially acknowledged. All this was facilitated through human exhibitions, not only financially, but also by the creation of an ethical understanding of legitimacy of these actions through systematic othering and dehumanizing. Human exhibitions therefore also played an important part in the collection of objects and objectification of human beings.

Conclusion

When Rudolph Virchow held his speech at the zoological garden of Berlin in 1880, he not only defended the practise of "*Völkerschauen*" in zoos but the rightfulness of his research methods as an anthropologist in general. His accounts of the examination of Paingo, in which he described her defensive behaviour and angry rage like the outburst of a demonic, animalistic creature, were presented in the very same speech. There were no official guidelines on the ethics of human exhibitions or medical assessments. But Virchow's speech revealed the ethics by practice of the contractors, producers, and anthropologists, the people who kept the exhibitions running.

Throughout this paper, it has been argued how the exhibited people were not regarded as equal by the responsible actors. Especially anthropologists tried to categorise them not as human, but rather as something in between the human and animal realm. The anthropologists often highlighted how the exhibited's societies would be closer to wild, animal like creatures than civilized mankind. Accordingly, producers and officials tried to accommodate the exhibited the way they were portrayed as by the anthropologists, arguing that wooden huts, clay castles, and unfit clothing would actually be better for the exhibited. This was shown in the case of the Colonial Exhibition of 1896, where the officials made certain guidelines about the housing of the exhibited, as well as the housing Hagenbeck saw as appropriate for his shows. It implies that the people responsible for the exhibited people did not see their treatment as unethical but justified because they thought they were treating the people in the zoo better than animals, not worse than humans. They had constructed a system of othering and subordinating that made it possible for them to believe that their actions towards the exhibited people were legitimate and righteous. However, the ethics of the officials need to be separated from the ethics of the producers and anthropologists. While the officials, for one of the first times, made guidelines for the exhibitions from the outside of the organisational structure of the exhibitions, the ethics by practice of the producers, contractors, and anthropologists followed different motives. The outside guidelines were aiming at the wellbeing of the exhibited, the inside motives were rather aimed at either selling an overall performance to the German audience or becoming the scientific authority in classifying different cultures.

It could therefore be argued that also the ethics by practice of the producers and the anthropologists differed from each other, but this is only true for their implicit motives, not for their ethical understanding of their own actions. When Jacobsen had used his whip against Tobias, his reaction had shown how this behaviour was normal, not an exception. When Virchow, Bischoff, and Luschan tried to examine the Inuit, the Kawesqar, or the people in the German colonial exhibition of 1896, they showed their contempt for being rejected. All the guidelines and handbooks for measuring people without any discussions about the customs of convincing people to be assessed indicate how little thought was paid to other peoples' wellbeing. As a result, the ethics by practice, the ethics they deployed without any external guidance and collective agreement, among the anthropologists were still homogenous. Following this argument, a general ethical regime of the producers and anthropologists was in place, seen through their practices, not written down rules or general acknowledgments.

It was the same for the contractors who were able to pressure other people beyond their own control. Just as much as the anthropologists, contractors like Jacobsen or Parkinson did not accept that men and women refused to come to Germany. They obeyed imperial authorities where they had to, but when Abraham said no to Jacobsen, or the Papuans were reluctant to board a ship, the contractors "convinced" them to come, nonetheless. I have discussed how "convincing" or "persuading" did not automatically mean forceful pressuring or abduction. But simply declining the offer to come to Europe would not make the contractors desist. The contractors abused their power to the extent where people were not held hostage but still had to jump ship or escape camp at night. In the end, the collectors and contractors could hold the Papuan men and women or the Kwakiutl men and women at gunpoint, and they would still describe it as "convincing" in the contractor's report.

Indeed, there could be more similarity between the way these entrepreneurs caught and treated animals and the way they contracted and treated human beings for Carl Hagenbeck than scholars have acknowledged so far. When captain Schweers had brought to Germany the homesick Patagonian Pikjotkje and two Patagonian women, newspapers had questioned if Schweers had actually helped the shipwrecked or might have caused their hardship in the first place. It appears unlikely that contractors went through villages, killing people just to abduct the few survivors to Europe, in the way that the animals were caught. Activities like this would have been recorded and caught the colonial authorities' attention, in contrast to the death of

animals. Colonial authorities or the physical superiority of their potential victims limited the ruthlessness of the contractors. Internal doubts or thoughts, on the other hand, rarely occurred. In the case of Jacobsen looting graves in British Columbia and Greenland, the practices of the contractors show how their ethics even allowed them to acknowledge disapproval of the humans they were dealing with, without questioning the ethical rightfulness of their actions.

The producers, like Carl Hagenbeck, had been the ones who had made this possible in the first place. They had been the ones who set up the business of human exhibitions, in the case of Hagenbeck just on top of the business of animal trading. It was him who made sure Jacobsen would follow the instructions of the Danish authorities on contracting people, but nothing more. Hagenbeck tended to act selfishly and mostly profit-oriented: Wenn Pikjotkje developed a severe depression caused by homesickness, Hagenbeck only preoccupied himself with the problems that would arise for him due to Pikjotkje's illness. Hagenbeck's reaction would still show him in public in different locations, covering it as a gesture of genuine concern, but really doing advertisement with him. When the members of the Inuit families fell victim to Jacobsen's errors resulting in sickness and death of their relatives, Hagenbeck's reaction was gifting them musical instruments for show that would mostly benefit his business. At the very latest, after the reports of Virchow and von Bischoff, Hagenbeck must have understood how invasive the examinations by anthropologists were, yet he continued providing them with opportunities to deploy their instruments on the people he was partially responsible for. Too lucrative was the cooperation between him and the anthropologists from the Berlin Society.

Hagenbeck framed the death of the Inuit and the first Kawesqar, just like the death of his animals, as his personal tragedy. In his letters, as well as in his book, he asks himself multiple times in self-pity why this would happen to him, causing him financial trouble, while for the human beings he had ordered for his exhibitions and their relatives it meant the loss of a loved one, something he did not acknowledge at all. The small moment of realisation that the loss of human life was more than just a financial loss and that the production of the exhibitions might be responsible for this only came after more and more death. But this brief realisation had no lasting impact. If Hagenbeck would have changed his regime on the exhibitions, he would have adjusted the practices of the exhibitions or stopped them entirely. But only a few months later it was back to business as usual. For him, just as for Jacobsen, profit was the first

premise, the wellbeing of the exhibited people and the rightfulness of the exhibitions came only second. This ethical regime was all-encompassing to the exhibitions, not only including the contracting, exhibiting, and repatriating of the people, but also looting, distorting, and exhibiting their objects. The systematic othering that was deployed by the human exhibitions also made it possible for contractors and anthropologists to objectify human remains of either the exhibited people themselves or remains they had acquired during the contracting. As such, the exhibitions also played their part in legitimizing this collecting apart from them by people who were not affiliated with them.

Despite the ruthless behaviour of contractors, publishers, and anthropologists, I have highlighted throughout this paper how the exhibited people enacted various forms of protest, revealing their agency. Whereas Abraham's case, as a literate Christian with a good connection to German missionaries, should rather be seen as an exemption of evading direct abuse, the Kawesqar women or the participants of the Colonial Exhibition of 1896 have demonstrated that they could hold Bischoff or Luschan off. But this was most likely not due to the internal moral boundaries of the anthropologists, who immediately after the death of the exhibited did not care about their will, but to the external pressure of the German public. While the ethics by practice seem to be quite homogenous for the contractors, publishers, and anthropologists, the external view on the exhibitions by the German public appears to be different. Visitors of the exhibitions wanted to experience a scenery of happy people that had come to Europe on their own terms. This can be seen in what was communicated to the German public, through speeches, reports, and books, and what stayed only privately through letters or diaries. As a result, the terms "convincing" and "persuading" were used to hold up the image of freedom of choice.

Furthermore, bragging about stealing and looting of objects was acceptable, but looting human remains or openly forcing people to get examined was not. Once these moments of misconduct became visible, newspapers also reacted to them, questioning how the exhibited from the Patagonian region could have understood the contract they signed when they were barely able to communicate through hand gestures due to language barriers, or the death of the Inuit in 1880/81 which was also commented upon in the newspapers. Finally, roughly 16 years after the Colonial Exhibition of 1896, the first law regulating the contracting and exhibiting of people within human exhibitions was introduced. It technically banned the

exhibiting of people from German colonies, pointing out the death of the three participants of the exhibition. Whilst the motivations behind this law had been political and economic instead of humanistic, the discussions around it still incorporated issues that were known already from the start of the human exhibitions onward. That, for example, exhibited people faced a high risk of contracting infectious diseases and potentially dying was pointed out as criticism towards the producers of the exhibition. The producers, on the other hand, blamed the exhibited people themselves for not following orders to not sit on humid ground and take a cold bath. But neither a dry ground nor a warm bath could have prevented most of the dangers the exhibited people had to face. The law regulating the exhibiting of German colonial subjects would not have a large impact on the exhibitions in general, but it still meant a slow development towards a different public understanding of the human exhibitions from the turn of the century onwards, for the better and for the worse.

Despite this difference in ethics by practice internally and externally, in most of the human exhibitions there was homogenous approval by both the creators and the German public. The general concept of exhibiting humans next to animals in zoos, heavily stylising and partly dehumanising them was largely supported or tolerated. Newspaper articles that would criticise this general concept, like the one Virchow commented in 1880, were an absolute rarity. But most importantly, the large number of people going to the zoo and supporting Hagenbeck's, Jacobsen's, and Virchow's ventures were the mute approval that made the exhibitions viable. Without this, the exhibitions would have never been able to create such a cruel, long-lasting impact and stay relevant for more than 40 years. Traces of the concept of the human zoo are still prevalent today and are often tolerated by people who on the outside still do not admit to any looting, abuse, or killing. The Hagenbeck Foundation shies away from allowing new research on their responsibility in the human exhibitions, denying any wrongdoing. Through this, they continue the same belief also Carl Hagenbeck tried to convince himself of up until the death of the Kawesqar.[206] The Hagenbeck Zoo still presents the human exhibitions produced by Carl Hagenbeck, also before the opening of the zoo in 1907, as an important part of their history, simply stating how Hagenbeck had made it possible for many people to get in contact with foreign cultures and how the interest in these shows was very

[206] Documentary by Seekamp, Mirco; Ruprecht, Anne (03.11.2022): Menschen ausgestellt im Zoo – Das dunkle Kapitel Völkerschauen, Panorama 3 (https://daserste.ndr.de/panorama/archiv/2022/Panorama-vom-24-November-2022,panoramaarchiv1782.html as of 14th June 2023).

high.[207] By overlooking the price the exhibited people and their families and loved ones had to pay in the end and not laying open the forceful circumstances of the exhibitions, the zoo perpetuates the same narratives and thus follows similar ethics by practise as Hagenbeck did 150 years ago.

The artefacts Jacobsen had brought to Germany for Adolf Bastian are still in the current ethnological collection at the Humboldt Forum, many of them being on display in the permanent exhibition. The narrative of the Forum's officials, just as for most of the objects within their collections with a dubious past, continues to be that the objects should remain within the thick walls of the newly reconstructed Berlin Palace.[208] They do acknowledge the same issue that has been addressed throughout this paper, of Jacobsen often "convincing" people to sell their objects to him while it remains unknown what "convincing" really meant from case to case.[209] There is a substantial informational discourse about Jacobsen's travels in British Columbia, his role within the human exhibitions however is only touched upon. At the same time, the same officials had the audacity to publish a computer game that was supposed to accompany the exhibition. In this computer game, which is still being promoted on the website of the Humboldt Forum[210] and can still be downloaded,[211] the player controls Adrian Jacobsen walking through British Columbia. According to the promotion the player can:

> "Enjoy a day of Johan's journey, featuring great outdoor activities such as canoe races, collecting clams, not getting eaten by a giant grizzley [sic] and of course fish oil binge drinking. Get in contact with the local tribes, that are struggling to preserve their ways of life and their cultures in a rapidly changing world".

Beating the people that would not do as Jacobsen ordered them to is also part of the game. Maybe, just by that, the Humboldt Forum has delivered the simplest answer to what "convincing" meant. But at the same time, the Forum continues to show a romanticised view on Jacobsen's journey that completely ignores the beating, looting, and abducting of people.

[207] History of the zoo according to the official website (https://hagenbeck.de/de/tierpark/tierpark/historie.php as of the 16th of July 2023).
[208] See Aly 2021.
[209] Provenienzspuren 1, Powers of Persuasion, Mask of a Bird Monster; visit of the author of this MA-thesis to the collection on the 26th of April 2023.
[210] http://www.humboldt-lab.de/projektarchiv/probebuehne-4/reisebericht/projektbeschreibung/index.html as of the 16th of July 2023.
[211] https://www.totems-sound.com/ as of the 16th of July 2023.

Thus, the Humboldt Forum continues [or reifies] the beliefs of Jacobsen that would legitimize his actions, no matter if it was collecting or contracting.

In conclusion, I have shown how the ethics by practice of producers, contractors, and anthropologists of the early human exhibitions had severe, life altering consequences for the exhibited people which they could rarely evade. They did have some minor points of leverage but, in general, the scholarly and commercial entrepreneurs responsible for the exhibitions enacted pressure upon them for their own benefit, also accepting that exhibited human beings would get severely sick or eventually die. The concept of the human exhibitions at zoological gardens was only very rarely questioned and did survive partially until today, with many narratives created by people like Carl Hagenbeck, Adrian Jacobsen, or the Berlin Society of Anthropology still being upheld by current German institutions. Carl Hagenbeck and Adrian Jacobsen massively benefited from the systems they had set up. Abraham, Ulrike, Sara, Maria, Tobias, Terianiak, Paingo, Noggasak, and many others never saw their home again because of it.

The contractors, producers, and anthropologists, as the actors responsible for the exhibitions, followed a homogenous ethical regime which they enacted upon the exhibited. Their motives have been different: Whereas the anthropologists like Virchow or Bischoff were looking for prestige and scientific authority, producers and contractors like Hagenbeck and Jacobsen were mostly looking for profit. But their ethics by practice, how they interacted with the exhibited and their belongings, were not different to each other. One important aspect of this regime was the underlying understanding of the rightfulness of their actions. Virchow did not think of his methods to be too invasive, he thought of the exhibited to be too animalistic to understand the necessity of his methods. The same was true for von Bischoff or von Luschan. Hagenbeck wrote in his book about how Pikjotkje allegedly had an encounter with a German naval officer years after the exhibition. Hagenbeck wrote on Pikjotkje:

> „Du [Pikjotkje] hast die kurze Zeit die du unter meiner Obhut zubrachtest, nicht vergessen und in deinem Herzen wohnt Dankbarkeit. Zwar bist du nur ein brauner, in rohe Felle gekleideter Indianer, und doch erhebt es mich, daß du mir drüben, aus deiner wilden Pampa, als ein Freund lebst.“[212]

[212] Eng.: You [Pikjotkje] have not forgotten the short time you spent under my care, and gratitude resides in your heart. You are only a brown Indian dressed in crude furs, but it uplifts me that you live over there, out of your wild pampas, as a friend to me; Hagenbeck 1909, p. 104.

Hagenbeck thus demonstrated his own vision of the human exhibitions. Pikjotkje would be nothing more than a “savage” Hagenbeck had taken care of. His treatment of Pikjotkje, according to Hagenbeck, had been nothing but the best, calling himself a friend of Pikjotje. He leaves out the part where Hagenbeck had used Pikjotkje for his own benefits, even when Pikjotkje had developed severe homesickness and depression. The exhibited were mere savages that should live in simple huts as opposed to a proper bed. This was the ethical regime of the producer Carl Hagenbeck that made him believe he was doing the right thing. It is not important if Hagenbeck really believed in the friendship between himself and Pikjotkje.

This story was also important because of the ethics of the general German public. The story Hagenbeck had told in his book should yet again display the human exhibitions as a place where the exhibited people had come to freely and willingly. The ethical regime of the German public was different to the one of the producers, contractors, and anthropologists. This not only meant that the producers and contractors displayed a different reality to the outside compared to their actual practices, because the general German audience did value the practices differently, also compared to animals where cruelty was accepted, if not even cherished. It also meant that the producers were aware of this disparity, that the public’s ethical regime was different to their own. Just like the contractors, who acknowledged that looting was not accepted by their victims, the producers still did not change their practices according to the public opinion. Instead, they altered the public narrative of the exhibitions accordingly. Only because of this development, the exhibition would be so successful within the German public, causing more and more distress for the exhibited. This difference in the ethical regime of certain actors, the general public, and official authorities, was and is not exclusive to the human exhibitions. Understanding this ethical regime, detecting it through the analysis of ethics by practice, will hopefully enable future research on other topics to further understand this problem and solve issues that are applicable until today.

Bibliography

1. Sources

Bequest Jacobsen at the MARKK Hamburg:

- JAC 17.3
- JAC 17.4
- JAC 17.5
- JAC 20.3
- JAC 22.5

Bischoff, Theodor (1882): Bemerkungen über die Geschlechtsverhältnisse der Feuerländer, in: Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-physikalischen Classe der königlich bayrischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München (1882, Heft II.), pp. 243-246.

Bischoff, Theodor (1882): Weitere Bemerkungen über die Feuerländer, in: Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-physikalischen Classe der königlich bayrischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München (1882, Heft III.), pp. 356-368.

Documentary by Seekamp, Mirco; Ruprecht, Anne (06.12.2022): Rassistische Völkerschauen: unsere verdrängte Geschichte, STRG_F (https://www.funk.net/channel/strgf-11384/rassistische-voelkerschauen-unsere-verdraengtegeschichte-strgf-1857853 as of 14th June 2023).

Documentary by Seekamp, Mirco; Ruprecht, Anne (03.11.2022): Menschen ausgestellt im Zoo – Das dunkle Kapitel Völkerschauen, Panorama 3 (https://daserste.ndr.de/panorama/archiv/2022/Panorama-vom-24-November-2022,panoramaarchiv1782.html as of 14th June 2023).

Finsch, Otto: Die Deutsche Kolonial-Ausstellung V. Zur Ethnologie unserer Südsee-Besetzungen, in: Meinecke, Gustav (Ed.), Deutsche Kolonialzeitung. Organ der Deutschen Kolonialgesellschaft, 4th July 1896, Nr. 27.

Gronauer, Wilhelm (1896): Amtlicher Bericht, in: Meinecke, Gustav (Ed.), Deutschland und seine Kolonien im Jahre 1896, Berlin, pp. 43-50.

Hagenbeck, Carl (1909): Von Tieren und Menschen. Erlebnisse und Erfahrungen von Carl Hagenbeck, Berlin.

Hoffmann, R. (Pub.) (1880): Beiträge über Leben und Treiben der Eskimos in Labrador und Grönland. Aus dem Tagebuche des Herrn Carl Hagenbeck in Hamburg mit dem Schiffe „Eisbär“ nach Grönland entsandten Herrn J.A. Jacobsen, Berlin.

von Luschan, Felix (1896): Physische Anthropologie, in: Meinecke, Gustav (Ed.), Deutschland und seine Kolonien im Jahre 1896, Berlin, pp. 205-243.

Lutz, Hartmut (Ed.) (2007): Abraham Ulrikab im Zoo. Tagebuch eines Inuk 1880/81, Greifswald.

Magdeburger Zeitung 21st of October 1880, Nr. 493.

Meinecke, Gustav (1897): Deutschland und seine Kolonien im Jahre 1896, Berlin.

Ranke, Johannes (Ed.) (1896): Correspondenz-Blatt der deutschen Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Frühgeschichte (XXVII. Jahrgang), Munich.

Strafgesetzbuch für das Deutsche Reich vom 15. Mai 1871 nach der Novelle vom 26. Februar 1876.

Totem's Sound (https://www.totems-sound.com/ as of the 16th of July 2023).

Verhandlungen für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte (1880): Sitzung vom 7. November 1880, pp. 253-274.

2. Literature

Ackerknecht, Erwin (1953): Rudolph Virchow. Doctor, Statesman, Anthropologist, New York.

Aly, Götz (2021): Das Prachtboot. Wie Deutsche die Kunstschätze der Südsee raubten, Frankfurt.

Bruce, Gary (2017): Through the Lion Gate: A History of the Berlin Zoo, Oxford.

Ciarlo, David (2011): Advertising empire: race and visual culture in imperial Germany, Cambridge.

Claes, Tinne; Huistra, Pieter, Huistra (2016): 'Il importe d'établir une distinction entre la dissection et l'autopsie'. Lijken en medische disciplinevorming in laatnegentiende-eeuws België, in: BMGN - Low Countries Historical Review, Vol. 131(3), pp. 26–53.

Cole, Douglas (1982): Franz Boas and the Bella Coola in Berlin, in: Northwest Anthropological Research Notes (Vol. 16,2), pp. 115-124.

Dittrich, Lothar; Rieke-Müller, Annelore (1999): Carl Hagenbeck (1844-1913): Tierhandel und Schaustellung im Deutschen Kaiserreich, Berlin.

Dreesback, Anna (2005): Gezähmte Wilde: Die Zuschaustellung „exotischer" Menschen in Deutschland 1870-1940, Frankfurt.

Gingrich, Andre (2005): From the National Birth of Volkskunde to the establishment of Academic Diffusionism: Branching Off from the International Mainstream, in: Barth, Frederik; Gingrich, Andre; Parkin, Robert; Silverman, Sydel (Ed.), One Discipline, Four Ways. British, German, French, and American Anthropology, London, New York, pp. 61-156.

Goschler, Constantin (2002): Rudolf Virchow. Mediziner, Anthropologe, Politiker, Cologne.

Grewe, Cordula (2006): Between Art, Artifact, and Attraction: The Ethnographic Object and its Appropriation in Western Culture, in: Grewe, Cordula (Ed.), Die Schau des Fremden. Ausstellungskonzeote zwischen Kunst, Kommerz und Wissenschaft, Stuttgart, pp. 9-44.

Haraway, D. (1984). Teddy Bear Patriarchy: Taxidermy in the Garden of Eden, New York City, 1908-1936, in: Social Text (11), pp. 20-64.

Hogarth, Rana (2017): Medicalizing Blackness: Making Racial Difference in the Atlantic World, 1780-1840, Chapel Hill.

Howes, Hilary S. (2013): The Race Question in Oceania. A.B. Meyer and Otto Finsch between metropolitan theory and field experience, 1865-1914, Frankfurt.

Ito, Takashi (2021): History of the Zoo, in: Roscher, Mieke; Krebber, André; Mizelle, Brett (Ed.), Handbook of Historical Animal Studies, Berlin, Boston, pp. 439-456.

Kramer, Jennifer (Diss.) (2003): Switchbacks: Art, Ownership, and Nuxalk National Identity, Vancouver.

Labisch, Alfons (2013): From Traditional Individualism to Collective Professionalism: State, Patient, Compulsory Health Insurance, and the Panel Doctor Question in Germany, 1883-1931, in: Berg, Manfred; Cocks, Geoffrey (Ed.), Medicine and Modernity. Public Health and Medical Care in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Germany, Cambridge, pp. 17-34.

Maehle, Andreas-Holger; Tröhler, Ulrich (2012): The discourses of Practitioners in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Germany, in: The Cambridge World History of Medical Ethics, pp. 432-438.

Masterman, Sylvia (1934): The Origins of International Rivalry in Samoa: 1845-1884, London.

Mitchinson, Wendy (1991): The Nature of their Bodies. Women and their Doctors in Victorian Canada, Toronto.

Penny, H. Glenn (2002): Objects of Culture: Ethnology and Ethnographic Museums in Imperial Germany, Chapel Hill.

Pouillard, Violette (2020): Structures of Captivity and Animal Agency. The London Zoo, ca. 1865 to the Present Times, in: Mengozzi, Chiara (Ed.), Outside the Anthropological Machine. Crossing the Human-Animal Divide and Other Exit Strategies, London, pp. 40-57.

Richter, Roland (1995): Die erste deutsche Kolonial-Ausstellung 1896. Der „Amtliche Bericht“ in historischer Perspektive, in: Debusmann, Robert; Riesz, János (Ed.), Kolonialausstellungen - Begegnungen mit Afrika?, Frankfurt, pp. 25-42.

Rollin, Bernard (2019): Progress and Absurdity in Animal Ethics, in: Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics (32), pp. 391-400.

Rothefels, Nigel (2002): Savages and Beasts: The Birth of the Modern Zoo, Baltimore.

Rothfels, Nigel (2021): Elephant Trails: A History of Animals and Cultures, Baltimore.

Rydell, Robert (2005): Buffalo Bill in Bologna. The Americanization of the World, 1896-1922, Chicago.

Sippel, Harald (1995): Rassismus, Protektionismus oder Humanität? Die gesetzlichen Verbote der Anwerbung von „Eingeborenen“ zu Schaustellungszwecken in den deutschen Kolonien, in: Debusmann, Robert; Riesz, János (Ed.), Kolonialausstellungen – Begegnungen mit Afrika?, Frankfurt, pp. 43-64.

Steffen-Schrade, Jutta (1998): Exkurs: Samoaner im Frankfurter Zoo, in: Kroeber-Wolf, Gerda; Mesenhöller, Peter (Ed.), Talofa! Sammoa, Südsee. Ansichten und Einsichten, Frankfurt, pp. 367-390.

Sysling, Fenneke (2022): Human Subject Research and Medical Ethics in Colonial Southeast Asia, Leiden.

Sysling, Fenneke (2015): Faces from the Netherlands Indies: Plaster casts and the making of race in the early twentieth century, in: Revue d'histoire des sciences humaines (Vol. 27), pp. 89-107.

Thode-Arora, Hilke (1989): Für fünfzig Pfennig um die Welt: die Hagenbeckschen Völkerschauen, Frankfurt.

Trevisiol, Oliver (Diss.) (2004): Die Einbürgerungspraxis im Deutschen Reich 1871-1945, Konstanz.

Wolter, Stefanie (Diss.) (2005): Die Vermarktung des Fremden. Exotismus und die Anfänge des Massenkonsums, Frankfurt.

Zimmerman, Andrew (2001): Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany, Chicago.