



Conclusion

It was 15 September 1914 when the British ship *Armada Castle* bombarded the radio station of Swakopmund. Decorations for the celebration of Germany's victory in the Battle of Tannenberg were still up.¹ Fearful of additional attacks German officials decided to destroy the apparatus themselves.² After inhabitants wrecked water pumps and other supply structures an evacuation followed.³ Germany's entry point, the key to the colony, it seemed, turned into a "ghost town."⁴ In the early hours of 18 September, British and South African forces then slipped into Lüderitzbucht. They came with two cruisers, four torpedo boats, more than ten transport ships, and 8,000 soldiers; yet they also brought instruments meant to deal with logistical issues: 750,000 gallons of bottled water, an extra locomotive, railway tracks, thousands of pack animals.⁵ Once the remaining Germans on sight saw them, they hastily raised the white flag.⁶ What else was there to do other than maybe poison the water supply and surrender? Once on site, the occupation troops erected an evaporator and storage spaces to supply troops with drinking water.⁷ They knew water was hard to come by. Meanwhile, German forces under major Victor Franke had withdrawn inland. Maybe ironically, they now tried to turn the Namib Desert into a shield against outsiders.⁸ After dealing with delays tied to a rebellion at home, South African troops led by Boer War hero Louis Botha moved toward Windhoek. That Franke and Governor Seitz eventually surrendered at the water hole, in Khorab, near Grootfontein, 9 July 1915 seemed only fitting.⁹ On 21 October 1915, German Southwest Africa officially became the British Protectorate of South-West Africa; four years later, in June 1919 representatives of the German government—ironically none other than colonial critic Matthias Erzberger—signed the Treaty of Versailles.¹⁰ According to Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations there were three types of mandates, theoretically supervised by the League's Permanent Mandates Commission.¹¹ German Southwest Africa became a class C mandate assigned to neighboring South Africa, the actual overseer of the area. Officially, at least, German colonialism had come to an end.

The war disrupted investments and turned Southwest Africa into a backwater. For one, those German settlers returning to the colony after this global conflict now had to disembark in Walvis Bay. Occupying forces had taken apart the wooden pier in Swakopmund; the metal jetty had only reached about 262 meters when the war broke out.¹² Overall, one might say, Swakopmund was left to its own devices.¹³ Soon the appearance of the coastal town began to change. As outlined by one contemporary in the 1920s, “The massive work of German engineering was now little more than Swakopmund’s landmark and promenade [meant] for those suffering of too much leisure on their hands. If someone would be enterprising enough to build a casino at its bridgehead then a completed jetty like in Nice [in France] would have emerged. But no one had the courage and so the big tower cranes whose rattles and turning gave testimony to German diligence and German hard work, rose lonely and sad into the air, unsavable [and] shortly giving in to rust, no good for anything anymore, except as resting places for seabirds.” “Today,” he added, “the jetty is gone from the townscape. With melancholy in our hearts, we had to watch how the British removed it, how it got shorter and shorter, how it was hauled away by [train] wagon-load.”¹⁴ The same applied to railways and other infrastructure projects, as well as measures around afforestation.¹⁵ The dam and irrigation system of Farmer Brand, for instance, did not deliver as anticipated. He had been unable to fully complete it.¹⁶ The same applied to the construction of dams along the Fish River as virtually everything came to a grinding halt, a storyline that of course conveniently fitted into a development-narrative long pushed by German settlers.

Environmental infrastructure had reshaped much of the region. After natural forces virtually rerouted travel away from the shoreline it became the commodification of nature that drew human agents into this borderland. Dingy structures appeared near Cape Cross, Walvis Bay, and Lüderitzbucht. These constructions were meant to help outsiders plunder. Eventually the British snatched up Walvis Bay, the key to colonizing the region. The birth of German colonialism came with the annexation of Angra Pequena in 1884, the only other entry point into the colony. Local resistance led by Hendrik Witbooi, combined with dependence on the British in Walvis Bay, encouraged Germans to create their own harbor in Swakopmund. Investments into landing structures seemed to solve the entry question, thereby providing the basis for colonization, transformation, and Germanization of the interior; the construction of a railway from Swakopmund to Windhoek followed a similar trajectory. Yet apart from German ingenuity and mostly African labor it became natural forces that defined these setups: ocean currents, flash floods, wandering dunes. Non-human agents, specifically a virus and a mollusk, further shaped emerging environmental infrastructure and with that German colonialism. Animal transfers, most notably the introduction of camels, underscored ef-

forts to rethink existing structures in the face of new challenges. Meanwhile, efforts to solve the water question meant to stabilize transport and expand settlements already hinted at broader visions of the colony. All of these factors, human and non-human, mattered when Herero and later Nama groups widely revolted against German colonial rule in 1904. Environmental infrastructure as an instrument of war, or logistics more broadly, shaped that conflict. African forced labor compensated for Germany's logistical problems and failures—and underscored the close relationship between death and development within this colonial setting. The African reliance on remote locations and hidden precolonial structures captures the importance of such setups for resistance. After *Rinderpest* and genocide, and thanks in large part to the discovery of diamonds, the colony experienced a turning point. Investments into landing structures and railways, as well as irrigation schemes, now provided German settlers with ways to potentially reach world markets; African labor, experimental stations, and other subsidies further sustained their efforts as they created a white settler colony. By 1914 it was thus not surprising that the colony seemed to be on an upswing.

Colonial narratives repeatedly constructed such efforts as the conquest of, or a struggle against, nature. Dramatic episodes such as the construction of the *Mole* became packaged as heroic tales in a faraway, hostile land. Here, the dichotomy between German culture, encapsulated in technology and science, clashed with nature—hostile ocean waters, arid landscapes, backward inhabitants. Heroic storylines of brave German pioneers weathering storms, heat, thirst, and even ambushes to transform land and people soon characterized countless tales. Prior to 1914, toward the end of German rule, such a model colony seemed on the horizon. In line with settler colonialism elsewhere, farms and homesteads, small towns made up of hard-working, pioneering, and self-sustaining *Südwester* people, characterized that vision. Novelist Gustav Frenssen captured the essence of his narrative.¹⁷ Farmer Carl Schlettwein agreed when writing in 1914 that settlers needed to have a certain “diligence and a sense of duty”; they also had to be self-sufficient in frontier environments, upright given all kinds of temptations, and hard working.¹⁸ The use of the English term farmer instead of the German word *Bauer* speaks volumes about a certain identity. They were to “domesticate the harsh nature of the land and to push for technological progress based on machines,” as Birthe Kundrus writes.¹⁹ Land and space, elbow room, according to one narrative,²⁰ or *Lebensraum* (living space) for a people without it, to follow another.²¹ For contemporaries such life meant living in a pre-industrial Germany, a better and more idyllic time, defined by middle-class values like frugality, discipline, modesty, and a certain German manliness.²² The obituary of German settler John Ludwig encapsulates this mentality when stating, “Here he realized with clear eyes what to make out of the Klein Windhuk Valley: The water sources

and the excellent soil seemed meant to create a flourishing settlement. And what moved in the mind . . . developed through iron willpower, courage, and knowledge." In this view, John Ludwig left behind "history and development," setting an example for those to come after him, before returning home in death.²³

German women played important roles in these settings, especially since there was a constant shortage of them in the colony. Similar to men, they framed their lives as struggles against nature. Take the previously mentioned Ada Cramer, wife of Ludwig at the farm Otjisrorindi. In her volume focusing on their years of "learning and suffering," she binds together the struggle against nature at the periphery of the colony with the fight against the indigent population, all in her effort to defend her husband's brutal punishment and the subsequent death of two Herero women.²⁴ On a broader level, and as outlined by Lora Wildenthal, these colonial women were wives and mothers with the duty to ensure racial hierarchies; otherwise, miscegenation laws meant little.²⁵ Women were "to serve as a bastion of national culture, to resist the potential dangers to Deutschtum, and to ensure an enduring German presence in the region," as historian Daniel J. Walther writes.²⁶ Clara Brockmann, a settler herself, agreed: "The fact is undeniable: a farmer with a wife comes ten times farther than one without one."²⁷ Magazines like *Kolonie und Heimat* advertised the colony to women, and in that illustrated their assigned role of the "German homemaker in the colonies," as caretakers of children and overseers of domestic servants in rugged environments. However, women did not just fight nature in supporting roles. As gardeners women were supposed to wrestle flowers and vegetables from the dry arid landscape that had presumably laid barren and unused before they came.²⁸ In that sense, they fought their own struggles against nature.

Most settlers and farmers were dependent on government structures; plus, many did not even live such a "frontier fantasy" in the first place.²⁹ Much more a myth than reality, this identity was a settler narrative. German newcomers certainly faced challenges and toiled on the frontier. Yet they had an array of factors working in their favor. If anything, it had been an unexpected environmental agent in *Rinderpest* that weakened those inhabiting the land economically; that disaster also facilitated the German takeover and settlement of the interior. The German foothold then remained precarious and provisional until genocide, forced labor, and the exploitation of diamonds invited large-scale funding and a greater commitment to settlements and German living space in the metropole. At that point the continuing exploitation of labor, discriminatory laws and daily colonial violence turned the African population into a proletariat subjugated to build and maintain environmental infrastructure. They worked on farms, toiled in mines, and collected diamonds. It had been their blood, sweat, tears, pain, and lives that had created a new homeland for a white German settler minority. A dose of Social Darwinism, this struggle

between a *Kulturvolk* and a *Naturvolk*, at times became a way to justify discrimination, exploitation, and destruction. “There is a fight against sand and rocks,” noted one German contemporary, “a fight of the white race against blacks and yellows; within the white race, a battle between high and low German (Boer) and Anglo-Saxons, a fight between farmer and the big industry of mining towns. . . . This cannot be achieved without hard work, without duty, without love for *Volkstum* (people), and certainly not without Christianity. But if we utilize all moral power then we can unearth a treasure out of the stony steppe, which brings us blessings.”³⁰ Similar justifications describing the destruction of certain groups as “natural” were often added with hindsight. “Just like the times of elephants and rhinoceroses are over,” noted one voice in 1916, “the Bushmen [San] and work-shy indigenous population step aside for the value-creating *Kulturmenschen* (culture people), the days of the extensive uninhabited steppe are numbered.” That description directly tied land to people when adding, “People will come, others that you have provided a safe haven to so far. They will move into your depths and draw the exhilarating water that you have been hiding. The plow will dig wide furrows in your face. . . . Conclude your thousand-year-long dream, sleeping steppe, a young generation of hard-working people, whose homeland does not have enough space for them anymore, will ask for entry into your empire. Open your doors and give them their daily bread.”³¹ Yet many times such reasoning or rationalizing was not even necessary. The struggle to overcome nature, the struggle to transform an arid landscape, the struggle to Germanize a region, all of that had always entailed the destruction of those living there.³²

This mythical storyline was also devoid of non-human agents and natural forces. These factors were more than just passive players repeatedly overcome in some sort of endless fight. Instead, they shaped and reshaped environmental infrastructure throughout this period—and continue to do so to this day. The *Rinderpest* pandemic fundamentally remade the colony; the exploitation of diamonds, combined with other factors, provided the basis for the creation of German living space. Flash floods and mobile sand dunes, silting-in and wood-eating mollusks, all of these players actively shaped logistics and with that the colony. The loss of structures, debates about the value of the colony, calls for more funding, the employment and exploitation of African labor, and even the stress and anxieties German soldiers felt during the war, all of these dynamics speak to an array of cluttered agencies. Stories of conquest, trial-and-error narratives, references to optimistic Germans by outside observers, or the artificial division between nature and culture, do not adequately capture those nuances. Kreike’s concept of environmental infrastructure, on the other hand, the combination of human and non-human factors, can help unpack these muddled and entangled agents, and by doing so it helps deconstruct still prevalent colonial storylines of development and progress.

All of this matters also because such narratives did not end with Germany's loss of the colony. According to van Laak, "German colonialism as *Realgeschichte* real history ended with World War I yet not as fantasy and projection history (*Fantasie- und Projektionsgeschichte*)."³³ Once apartheid South Africa administered Southwest Africa, a nostalgic loss-of-*Heimat* narrative brought idyllic and romantic stories of a far-away paradise all the more into the light. Many government officials, travelers, and seemingly anyone with any experiences in the region began publishing their views; settlers like Voigts, Schlettwein, Falkenhausen, Eckenbrecher, and Brockmann also shared their nostalgia for a lost time and place. Lydia Höpker wrote that "Everything was so dewy fresh and untouched, roundabout loneliness and quiet; only from afar did the call of a bird resound now and again. We hiked silently through this beautiful morning. A dreamlike feeling enveloped me, and I felt enchanted, as if in another world."³⁴ A sense of accomplishment drove many of these tales. As former colonial official Oskar Hintrager wrote in the 1950s, "What the Germans have achieved in Southwest Africa has been acknowledged by leading South Africans."³⁵ After all, German colonialism had accomplished much, so the story went, disrupted only by an unnecessary war triggered in faraway Europe that settlers in Southwest Africa had little to do with. German expeditions to the region eventually resumed as well, including explorations of harbors and coastline.³⁶ Individuals previously involved with the colony stayed connected, such as geologist Range, hydrology engineer Rehbock or former settlement commissioner Rohrbach.³⁷ During the 1930s, former colonial officials actively pushed for the return of "German colonial glory."³⁸ They pointed to the past efforts and development presumably still visible in landing structures, railways, and dams to sustain their claims.³⁹ Decolonization, or even just the inclusion of subaltern voices when it comes to the acknowledgment of African labor, remained largely missing.

German perceptions of Walvis Bay, thoughts about the water question, and other discussions tied to the environment and German ingenuity are cases in point. From that German colonial perspective, a shift to the formerly British enclave just did not make sense. After all, Swakopmund was deemed clean, friendly, and orderly. That entry point included "green areas magically created from the desert along the coastline," to follow one description.⁴⁰ Walvis Bay, on the other hand, although a busy harbor, lacked streets, trees, and bushes. Plus, progress had been made regarding infrastructure thanks to German efforts. "After two decades of investigating and experimenting," to follow one publication from 1938, infrastructure projects moved forward after the war and could do so again now.⁴¹ Similar conversations emerged when it came to the water question. Take one publication from 1919 meant to showcase the current status and overall development. It acknowledged that "high expectations regarding the production of wheat and corn did not materialize due to

the brackish ground [water].” However, that failure was “solely explicable based on the fact that all works were grounded in unscientific and un-technological efforts” by laymen.⁴² Discussions of railway projects, and the role of German colonial engineers as pioneers, also speak to continuities well beyond 1915. In the 1930s, the image of the German colonial engineer as a universal authority and grantor of progress became increasingly dominant and widespread.⁴³ Still pushing colonial narratives of fighting against nature in a transportation-hostile Africa, such glorified narratives and overall hero-making thus continued well beyond 1915 without much scrutiny.⁴⁴

Continuities also define life in Southwest Africa. The South African takeover of the colony and the institutionalization of an apartheid system ultimately changed little for the white German settler community: they kept their privileges, status, and land. This lack of decolonization allowed for the continuation of cattle farming and agriculture, maybe with fewer government subsidies but still the availability of cheap labor. As several historians write, “Much native affairs legislation throughout the early South African period was, like that of the Germans before them, centred around labour procurement for white farmers and colonial industry.”⁴⁵ A rigid apartheid system meant to control black Africans elevated German interests. In the early 1920s, the South African government resettled thousands of Herero from central fertile parts of the colony into so-called Native Reserves. In a way, and to follow one historian, that move just completed their economic disenfranchisement.⁴⁶ Over time the South African government permitted some cattle ownership. However, loss—loss of home, loss of land, loss of cattle, loss of life—remained a key ingredient of Herero identity, especially since apartheid continued to push them to the margins. According to Mutjinde Katjiua, the head of the department of land and property studies at the University of Namibia, land dispossession was not simply about the loss of livestock, resource rights, and so on. “For the dispossessed communities, losing the ancestral land means that they have lost the connection to their ancestors.”⁴⁷

Experiences for German settlers in postwar Namibia were different. German business models often survived South African takeover, such as wool production. Although it became no second Australia, it was a worthwhile economic endeavor.⁴⁸ Stories about the struggles against nature remained prominent as well. In mid-December 1933, for instance, a major flood destroyed a bridge across the Swakop River. According to one recollection, “The inhabitants of Swakopmund in their struggle against the Swakop flood were an excellent example of endurance, diligence, and co-operation.”⁴⁹ *Südwester stories* speak of stranded farmers and the will to overcome nature’s onslaught.⁵⁰ They saved the metal jetty in Swakopmund from ocean currents.⁵¹ And their *Südwester*-centric stories defined textbooks for school children in which Uncle Erhard arrived in “steppe and bush, just like god had created it in primeval

times,” “looked for water,” and ultimately turned wastelands into farmland.⁵² Continuities also exist when it comes to water structures. The Avis Dam, first proposed in 1895 by Ludwig Sander to solve the water issue for a growing Klein-Windhoeck,⁵³ became a reality by 1933.⁵⁴ New “pioneers” such as Heinz Stengel already contemplated future avenues for development.⁵⁵ Such storylines of harnessing nature continue to define current projects. Take Namibia’s newest irrigation site, the Neckartal Dam. Originally envisioned by “father” Theodor Rehbock,⁵⁶ the site holding back the Fish River near Keetmanshoop is now meant to make “a desert bloom.”⁵⁷ However, “[t]he unseen costs of these dams,” according to one critique, “is that communities who traditionally sustain themselves from riverbed farming—a pre-colonial practice—cannot do this any longer.”⁵⁸ A local inhabitant by the name of Willibald Gaseb of Otjimbingwe added, “We cannot dig for the underground water anymore because the rivers are dry. It is also not possible to produce vegetables—grains, watermelons, pumpkins, carrots, those that we used to plant; we can’t do that anymore, the space is too limited and there’s no water anymore.”⁵⁹ In a sense, and in line with broader legacies of colonialism, little has changed.

Leftover colonial structures also continue to haunt modern-day independent Namibia. Land-ownership and broader settlement structures are obvious examples; the forbidden zone still off limits is another. Namibia’s tourism landscape, largely in the hands of and catering to whites, celebrates the remains of German colonialism. Environmental infrastructure still littering the country thus has taken on new meaning as tourist hotspot. Visitors travel to Etosha National Park in the north, a game reserve originally created by Governor Friedrich von Lindequist in March 1907. Like other parks, it is a space for African wilderness, a space feeding European imaginations of empty landscapes, devoid of people and history. They can walk through the abandoned diamond town Kolmanskop outside Lüderitzbucht, to marvel at German efforts to make this hostile space livable—ice was available in the desert, a guide will tell them. Their photographs then capture how sand dunes are “reclaiming” buildings and other remains of empire. Visuals that might capture the importance of African labor are rare, however, and do not play a role during tours. In the town of Lüderitzbucht, a campground now sits atop the former location of Shark Island concentration camp. It comes with a gorgeous view of a quaint bay. Gravestones tell some stories there—but a chat with a local manning the gate is needed for any unassuming traveler. Elsewhere, guest farms such as Deutsche Erde (German soil) actively sell “the good old days.” That still very much includes the struggle against nature. Whole series of publications available in bookstores in Swakopmund are aimed at German tourists and come with a dose of nostalgia.⁶⁰ Visitors of that most German place of all can wander along turn-of-the-century buildings, broad avenues, a lighthouse, and some remaining street names. A failed entry point has transformed into the perfect

seaside resort. Here, visitors can stay at the luxurious *Strand* (beach) hotel located along the silted-in *Mole*. “Where the Namib Dunes meet the Atlantic Ocean,”⁶¹ it advertises, and invites guests to gaze at the constant onslaught of ocean waves. The view inland, to the shanty towns that actually make up Swakopmund, are off tourist minds and maps. Maybe they see workers walk back to the outskirts of town on their way to eat at an upscale restaurant now sitting at the tip of the leftover metal pier. It is appropriately called *Jetty 1905*, “much more than a restaurant, it’s a landmark!”⁶² Environmental infrastructure thus lives on well beyond its intended lifespan, still defined by human and non-human actors, still taking on new meanings and uses. And in Namibia, to follow the voice of Moses Maharero, “The whole country . . . is basically full of things that were left behind.”⁶³

Notes

1. *Deutsch-Südwestafrikanische Zeitung*, “Beschiessung Swakopmunds,” 16 September 1914.
2. *Ibid.* See also W. S. Rayner and W. W. O’Shaughnessy, *How Botha and Smuts Conquered German South West* (London, 1916); Otto Reiner, *Achtzehn Jahre Farmer in Afrika* (Leipzig, 1924), 234; Hennig, *Sturm und Sonnenschein in Deutsch Südwest*, 71.
3. Bravenboer and Rusch, *The First 100 Years of Railways in Namibia*, 217.
4. Olusoga and Erichsen, *The Kaiser’s Holocaust*, 253. See also *Der Südwestbote*, “Die Räumung von Swakopmund,” 4 September 1914.
5. For numbers, see Press, *Blood and Diamonds*, 210.
6. Olusoga and Erichsen, *The Kaiser’s Holocaust*, 252–53. See also *Deutsch-Südwestafrikanische Zeitung*, “Die Besetzung Swakopmunds,” 19 September 1914.
7. Wipplinger, “Sea Water Distillation Plant at Lüderitz,” 281.
8. Hennig, *Sturm und Sonnenschein in Deutsch Südwest*, 69. See also Olusoga and Erichsen, *The Kaiser’s Holocaust*, 254; *Der Südwestbote*, “Die Briten bei Walfischbucht u. Swakopmund,” 24 January 1915.
9. Hennig, *Sturm und Sonnenschein in Deutsch Südwest*, 113–17; Bravenboer and Rusch, *The First 100 Years of Railways in Namibia*, 237. See also Hans von Oelhafen von Schöllenbach, *Der Feldzug in Südwest 1914/15* (Berlin, 1923).
10. The Treaty of Versailles. Retrieved 17 March 2021 from https://avalon.law.yale.edu/subject_menus/versailles_menu.asp.
11. The Covenant of the League of Nations. Retrieved 17 March 2021 from https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/leagcov.asp.
12. Bravenboer and Rusch, *The First 100 Years of Railways in Namibia*, 200.
13. Edgar Schultze, “Hafenbau in den Deutschen Kolonien,” *Verkehrstechnische Woche* 32, no. 24/25 (1938): 286–91, here 289. See also Ludwig Mecking, “Bau und Bild afrikanischer Küstenstädte in ihrer Beziehung zum Volkstum,” Sonderdruck *Zeitschrift für Erdkunde* 6 (22–23) (1938): 13.
14. Hennig, *Sturm und Sonnenschein in Deutsch Südwest*, 233.
15. Erkkilä and Siiskonen, *Forestry in Namibia*.

16. Franz Herrmann, *Ueber die Entwicklung, den gegenwärtigen Stand, und die Ziele und harrenden Aufgaben der Wasserwirtschaft in Südwest-Afrika* (Windhuk, 1919), 8.
17. Frenssen, *Peter Moors Journey to Southwest*, 145–47. See also Kundrus, *Moderne Imperialisten*, 67.
18. Schlettwein, *Der Farmer in Deutsch-Südwest-Afrika*, 62 and 63.
19. Kundrus, *Moderne Imperialisten*, 67/68.
20. Hennig, *Sturm und Sonnenschein in Deutsch Südwest*, 159.
21. Hans Grimm, *Volk Ohne Raum*, vol. 1 and 2 (Munich, 1926).
22. Kundrus, *Moderne Imperialisten*, 43 and 59.
23. *Der Südwestbote*, “John Ludwig †,” 2 March 1913.
24. Ada Cramer, *Weiß oder Schwarz? Lehr- und Leidensjahre eines Farmers im Lichte des Rassenhasses* (Berlin, 1913).
25. Wildenthal, *German Women for Empire*.
26. Walther, *Germans Abroad*, 46.
27. Clara Brockmann, *Die Deutsche Frau in Südwestafrika: Ein Beitrag zur Frauenfrage in unseren Kolonien* (Berlin, 1910), 6. See also Walters, *Germans Abroad*, 47.
28. *Kolonie und Heimat*, “Die deutsche Hausfrau in den Kolonien,” 10 November 1907 (Brandeis). This and similar series appeared in the magazine *Kolonie und Heimat* countless times. See also BArch-B, R 1002/2579, Besiedelung, Heraussendung von Frauen usw. durch die Deutsche Kolonialgesellschaft.
29. Olusoga and Erichsen, *The Kaiser’s Holocaust*, 237.
30. Henkel, *Der Kampf um Südwestafrika*, 181–82, as quoted in Kundrus, *Moderne Imperialisten*, 44.
31. Eugen Deitz in *Kolonial-Kriegerdank-Kalender 1916*, 71, as quoted in Kundrus, *Moderne Imperialisten*, 161.
32. Assertions about improvements, self-sufficiency, and environmental friendliness have to be contextualized with that in mind. See Botha, “People and the Environment in Colonial Namibia,” 173–74.
33. Dirk van Laak, “‘Ist je ein Reich, das es nicht gab, so gut verwaltet worden?’ Der imaginäre Ausbau der imperialen Infrastruktur in Deutschland nach 1918,” in *Phantasiereiche: Zur Kulturgeschichte des deutschen Kolonialismus*, ed. Birthe Kundrus, 71–90, here 71 (Frankfurt, 2003).
34. Lydia Höpke, *Um Scholle und Leben: Schicksale einer deutschen Farmerin in Südwest-Afrika* (Minden, 1927), 21, as quoted in Walther, *Germans Abroad*, 93.
35. Hintrager, *Südwestafrika in der deutschen Zeit*, 179.
36. Erich Obst, *Grundzüge einer Geographie der südafrikanischen Seehäfen* (Hannover, 1935), 1.
37. Paul Range, “Zur Wasserstellenkunde des Namalandes,” *Sonderabdruck aus “Mitteilungen aus den deutschen Schutzgebieten”* 32 (Berlin, 1920), 23–32; Theodor Rehbock, “Genereller Entwurf einer Talsperren Anlage bei Avisport für die Wasserversorgung von Windhoek und für die Bewässerung des Windhoeker Tals,” (manuscript; memorandum to the mayor Julius Hebenstreit, Windhoek, July 1926), 35 as referenced in Heinz Walter Stengel, *Bibliographie Wasserwirtschaft in Südwestafrika* (Basel, 1974); Paul Rohrbach, *Afrika: Beiträge zu einer praktischen kolonialkunde* (Berlin, 1943).
38. Hugo Blumenhagen, Franz von Epp, and Heinrich Schnee, *Südwestafrika einst und jetzt* (Berlin, 1934); Paul Rohrbach, *Deutsch-Afrika—Ende oder Anfang? Briefe an*

- einen Jungen Deutschen (Potsdam, 1935); Paul Leutwein, *Die deutsche Kolonialfrage* (Berlin, 1937); Paul Rohrbach, *Afrika heute und morgen: Grundlinien europäischer Kolonialpolitik in Afrika* (Berlin, 1939). For unpublished manuscripts, see BArch-K, N 1030/17, Nachlass Viktor Franke, Schreibmaschinenmanuskript; BArch-K, N 1145/4, Nachlass Paul Leutwein, *Im Banne Afrikas: Romantisches Geschichtsbild des alten Südwestafrika*; BArch-K, N 1669/1, Friedrich von Lindequist, *Südwestafrikanische Erlebnisse, 1895–1906*.
39. Wilhelm Solf, *Kolonialpolitik: Mein politisches Vermächtnis* (Berlin, 1919); Hellmuth Forkel, “Das Küstengebiet Südwestafrikas und seine wirtschaftsgeographische Bedeutung” (PhD diss, University of Rostock, 1926); Johannes Steinbach, *Die Siedlungsmöglichkeiten im ehemaligen Deutsch-Südwestafrika*, intro. Friedrich von Lindequist (Berlin, 1929); Paul Leutwein, *Afrikanerschicksal: Gouverneur Leutwein und seine Zeit* (Stuttgart, 1929); Theodor Seitz, *Vom Aufstieg und Niederbruch deutscher Kolonialmacht* (Karlsruhe, 1929); Berthold von Deimling, *Aus der Alten in die neue Zeit: Lebenserinnerungen* (Berlin, 1930); Paul Leutwein, *Die Gründung von Deutsch-Südwestafrika* (Reutlingen, 1940).
 40. Mecking, “Bau und Bild afrikanischer Küstenstädte in ihrer Beziehung zum Volkstum,” 13–14.
 41. Fr. Allmaras, “Verkehr der Kolonien,” *Verkehrstechnische Woche* 32, no. 24/25 (1938), 262–65, here 262. See also E. Randzio, “Kolonial-Bahnen,” *Verkehrstechnische Woche* 32, no. 24/25 (1938), 261–74.
 42. Herrmann, *Ueber die Entwicklung, den gegenwärtigen Stand*, 8 and 9.
 43. Edgar Schultze, “Allgemeine Verkehrsprobleme in Afrika,” *Verkehrstechnische Woche* 26, no. 24/25 (1938): 309–21; Erich Röhlke, “Ausbildung und Fortbildung von Kolonialingenieuren,” *Verkehrstechnische Woche* 24/25, no. 24/25 (1938): 300–5.
 44. Sebastian Beese, “Heroen des kolonialen Fortschritts? Praktiken der Selbstheroisierung deutscher Kolonialingenieure in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts,” *helden, heroes. héros. E-Journal zu Kulturen des Heroischen* 7 (2019): 39–46, here 42–43. Actually, and as demonstrated, those storylines reached a broader audience during German colonial rule already, thus arguably forming some sort of collective identity well before the 1920s.
 45. Bernhard C. Moore et al., “Balancing the Scales,” 6. The authors specifically point to water infrastructure in this context.
 46. Erichsen, *What the Elders Used to Say*, 45.
 47. Elizabeth Kimmmerle, “The Land that Never Was,” *The Namibian*, 8 January 2020.
 48. Wieden, “Wollschafzucht in Deutsch-Südwestafrika,” 86.
 49. Heinz Walter Stengel, “Die große Flut in Swakopmund,” *Namib und Meer* 7 (1976): 47–64, here 64.
 50. Scherz, *Südwesten Geschichten am Lagerfeuer erzählt*, 59.
 51. Anonymous, “Swakopmund: Landungsbrücke vor dem Aus?” *Namibia Magazine* 14, no. 2 (2003): 4.
 52. Ernst-Ludwig Cramer, “Onkel Erhard baut eine Farm auf,” 44–46, here 44, in Tilla Kellner, ed., *Heimat Südwest: Ein Lesebuch für Südwestafrika* (Hannover, 1969). Similar storylines litter textbooks like *Heimat Südwest* as well as other *Südwesten* or *Deutsch-Namibier*. Klaus Rüdiger, *Die Namibia-Deutschen: Geschichte einer Nationalität im Werden* (Stuttgart, 1993); Walther, *Creating Germans Abroad*; Jeremy Silvester,

- “Sleep with a Southwester’: Monuments and Settler Identity in Namibia,” in *Settler Colonialism in the Twentieth Century: Projects, Practices, Legacies*, ed. Caroline Elkins and Susan Pedersen, 271–86, (New York, 2005).
53. Sander, *Vorschlag zur wirtschaftlichen Erschliessung Deutsch-Südwest-Afrikas*, 8. Plans emerged in the 1910s—*Der Südwestbote* reported widely. See also Schneider, “Bewässerungslandwirtschaft in Namibia und ihre Grundlagen in der Kolonialzeit,” 139–40 and 164–65.
 54. W. Buthut, “Wasserwirtschaft in Südwest-Afrika,” *Wasserkraft und Wasserwirtschaft* 18, no. 5 and no. 18 (1933).
 55. Margarete Kreuzberger, “Heinz Stengel—Ein Pionier der Wassererschliessung,” *Nachrichten (Gesellschaft für wissenschaftliche Entwicklung Museum Swakopmund)* 30, no. 1 (1998): 2–6, here 2. See also Heinz Stengel and Otto Wipplinger, *Wasserwirtschaft in S.W.A./Waterwise in S.W.A./Water Affairs in S.W.A.* (Windhoek, 1963).
 56. *Namibia Focus*, “Theodor Rehbock, Vater des Neckartal-Damms,” Retrieved 7 November 2021 from <https://namibiafocus.com/theodor-rehbock-vater-des-neckartal-damms/>.
 57. *We Build Value* (digital magazine), “Neckartal Dam: Making a Desert Bloom,” 7 April 2016. This publication comes from the Italian construction company. Retrieved 9 November 2019 from <https://www.webuildvalue.com/en/stories-behind-projects/neckartal-dam-making-a-desert-bloom.html>. See also *The Namibian*, “Neckartal Dam Finally Complete,” 19 October 2018; *Windhoek Observer*, “Construction Work on Neckartal Dam Now Complete,” 19 October 2018; *The Namibian*, “Neckartal Dam Completed . . . Work on Ohangwena Aquifer Begins,” 23 October 2018.
 58. Erichsen, *What the Elders Used to Say*, 62.
 59. *Ibid.*
 60. Kalb, “Reprinting German Colonial Settler Narratives in Namibia Today.”
 61. Strandhotel Swakopmund. Retrieved 24 March 2021 from <https://www.strandhotels.wakopmund.com>.
 62. Restaurant Jetty 1905. Retrieved 24 March 2021 from <http://swakopmund.life/place/jetty-1905-restaurant>.
 63. Erichsen, *What the Elders Used to Say*, 53.