NAMIBIA UNIVERSITY
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Faculty of Human Sciences

Department of Communication

Ambivalence in *Parts Unknown* and *The Lie of the Land:* a post colonial approach

By

David Masene Masiziani

200442546

THESIS PRESENTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ENGLISH AND APPLIED LINGUISTICS AT THE NAMIBIA UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (NUST)

Supervisor: Prof. Sarala Krishnamurthy

March 2021

AUTHENTICATION OF THE THESIS

I certify that this candidate has successfully completed all the research work for this degree and that:

1. the thesis conforms to NUST postgraduate rules as stipulated in the Year Book 2021 and submission of theses for higher degrees;
2. the thesis includes a certificate indicating the extent to which the research has been conducted by the candidate;
3. the thesis is properly presented and is prima facie worthy of submission;
4. instances of inadequate presentation were pointed out to the candidate for correction before the thesis was bound;
5. the candidate has completed an approved program of study and research as required;
6. an abstract of not more than 300 words has been included in the thesis;
7. both hard/bound and soft copies of the thesis have been submitted to NUST Library's open access digital archive.

Name of the supervisor: Professor Sarala Krishnamurthy

Signature: _____

Date: March 2021

DECLARATION

I, David Masene Masiziani, registered student number 200442546, hereby declare that the work contained in the thesis, entitled **Ambivalence in *Parts Unknown* and *The Lie of the Land:* a post colonial approach** is my own original work and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it at any university or other higher education institution for the award of a degree.

March 2021

_____ _____

David M. Masiziani Date

RETENTION AND USE OF THESIS

I, David Masene Masiziani, a candidate for the degree of Master of English and Applied Linguistics accept the requirements of the Namibia University of Science and Technology relating to the retention and use of theses deposited in the Library and Information Services.

In terms of such conditions, I agree that the original of my thesis deposited in the Library and Information Services will be accessible for purposes of study and research, in accordance with the normal conditions established by the Librarian for the care, loan or reproduction of theses.

March 2021

_____ _____

David M. Masiziani Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Honour and glory be to God for the health, strength and peace of mind during the writing of this thesis. I would like to thank Professor Sarala Krishnamurthy, for her indispensible contribution and guidance. I also appreciate Professor HZ Woldermariam for being very understanding. I acknowledge the constant words of encouragement from my fellow students at the Namibia University of Science and Technology. My loving wife, Pumulo, and our children Shiloh and Manna, for the moral support, peace and understanding maintained throughout the course of the study. I also take the pleasure to thank my friends; Mr. and Mrs. Kandjinga, and also Morgen Mukowa, for their time and willingness to help throughout this work. I thank my father in-law, retired pastor Mishake Mukubonda, for consistently checking my progress and encouraging me. I am grateful to Mr. Elijah Mukubonda and his family for their readiness and willingness to host me repeatedly. And finally, my mother, Alice Mubu Masiziani, better known as Bana Patrick, and entire family for the solid foundation they laid during my childhood.

Thank you all.

DEDICATION

With love to my wife, Pumulo, and my daughters: Shiloh and Manna.

To the descendents of the victims of the genocide.

ABSTRACT

Africa was colonised and subjected to brutal colonial rule. Namibia, is no exception, in fact, the country went through two brutal colonial powers; imperial Germany, and the South African regime, which subjected Namibia to an apartheid rule, a localised form of colonialism fitted to oppress Africans. Between the two, the imperial German rule was crueler, resulting in genocide.

The 1904-1908 genocide by the Germans against the Ovaherero and Nama people of Namibia is a horrible and unforgettable history. This dark history, forgotten and ignored by the Germany government for over a hundred years, has seen much criticism over the resent past year. Many critiques argue that the Germany army committed acts of annihilation, which the current Germany government need to pay reparations for. This history has seen four novels published about it, and hundreds of articles and research papers interrogating the genocide. This thesis explores ambivalence in two of the four published Namibian literary works on this history: Zirk van der Berg's *Parts Unknown* (2018) and Jaspar Utley's *The Lie of the Land* (2017). These works of literature explore acts of rape against black women by the German army, acts of discrimination and inferiority complex painted on the natives by 'superior' Germany. They record acts of annihilation aimed at depopulating the country of its natives. They record a slaughter of innocent women and children, and unarmed surrendered men.

The study explores the shifting nature of the relationship between the coloniser and the colonised. It traces the ambiguities by examining the language used by the characters, and the cruel descriptions of the colonial war. The aim of this research is to enable the reader to understand how colonisation impacted the relationship between blacks and whites.

This is a qualitative, desktop study grounded on Homi Bhabha's postcolonial concept of ambivalence as its theoretical framework.

Key words: postcolonialism – ambivalence – genocide – reparations – culture – identity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce the study. Sections 1.2 up to 1.8 provide the background to the study, statement of the problem, research objectives, significance, delimitation, limitations and key terms of the study, respectively. Section 1.9 provides this thesis' chapter layout. This chapter is concluded in Section 1.10.

1.2. Background of the Study

Namibia went through two stages of colonial struggles against foreign colonisers: first, the struggle against German colonial rule, a colonial war that saw a brutal slaughter of the Ovaherero and Nama peoples by the Germans in the period 1904-1908, and then the struggle against South African apartheid regime which was eventually defeated by the South West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO), leading the country to independence in 1990. However, the struggle against South African apartheid seems to be better known than that of the German colonial rule (Krishnamurthy, 2018; Melber, 2005). Recent years have seen four fiction works that describe the time period of the German-Ovaherero and Nama war; the four novels are *Mama Namibia* (2001) by Mari Serebrow, *The Scattering* (2016), by Lauri Kubuitsele, *The Lie of the Land* (2017) by Jasper Utley and *Parts Unknown* (2018) by Zirk van der Berg. The first two novels were written by Namibians, with the Ovaherero being protagonists; while in the last two, the protagonists are Europeans who have come to German-South West Africa (GSWA) in the time of the war. There have been several other publications on genocidal studies before and after these novels, such as Steinmetz (2005) who argues that the German-Ovaherero and Nama war is the first genocide of the 20th century. Harris (2013) also wrote about the struggle in the claims for reparations by the affected communities. Moreover, Baer (2018) also made her contribution publishing *The Genocidal Gaze* (2018).

However, Schlettwein still believes that "there has been very little research and commentary available on both Namibia/German literature and Namibian literature at large" (Krishnamurthy & Vale 2018, p. 327-328). Looking at the fact that little research has been done on the novels, in particular *The Lie of the Land* (2017) and *Parts Unknown* (2018), in terms of the relationship between the coloniser and the colonised; this researcher, thus, sees opportunities for literary enquiry into such Namibian post colonial literatures; in that the struggle against the Ovaherero and Nama is

undermined over the one against South African apartheid regime, which is magnified as the grand narrative of the time in Namibia.

1.3. Statement of the Problem

The portrayal of the relationship between the colonised and the coloniser is always characterised with tensions concerning the educational, social, and political powers. The research aims to see how Namibian post colonial literatures: *Parts Unknown* (2018) and *The Lie of the Land* (2017) portray the colonised and coloniser's relationship. It further endeavours to examine how the colonised regards the coloniser and/or how the coloniser regards the colonised. The judgement of the two novels can be good for advocating the notion of ambivalence in colonial relationships. This means that characterisation within the two novels could be geared towards the ambivalent or shifting nature of the colonised and the coloniser.

This study will focus on how the characters are depicted in *Parts Unknown* (2018) and *The Lie of the Land* (2017), from an ambivalence perspective. The study will also evaluate the extent to which the cultural values in the modern day are either challenged or echoed in the two novels through their portrayal of characters. Suffering cannot be divorced from colonisation, and the effects are far-reaching; thus studying the ambivalent nature of the colonised and coloniser's relationship will reveal the extent of such effects. As Krishnamurthy (2018) puts it, "postcolonial writers usually explore trauma of the individual and the community as a central theme in their fiction because colonisation is coterminous with violence and destruction."

1.4. Research Objectives

The main objective of this research is to investigate ambivalence in Zirk van der Berg's *Parts Unknown* (2018) and Jaspar Utley's *The Lie of the Land* (2017).

The specific objectives are to:

- explore the conflicting relationship between the colonised and the coloniser.
- investigate the cultural fault lines generated between white and black distributions in a colonial relationship.
- examine the simultaneous repulsions and desires that exist at the interface between the self and the other.

1.5. Significance of the Research

Ngugi (2012, p. 60), in his attempt to define literature, views it as a kind of enjoyment that shapes the "raw material" of life, stretches one's mind, deepens one's experiences and heightens one's awareness. This research will provide a platform for one to think deeply about how the colonised and the coloniser define themselves and how they respond to various circumstances they find themselves in. Through literature, society can also revisit its own views and practices as far as colonisation issues and the place of the colonised and/or the coloniser in society is concerned. Namibian post colonial literatures can therefore be used to fight against stereotypical perceptions associated with both the colonised and the coloniser, and help combat cultural misunderstandings, which may always result in the marginalisation of the relationship between the colonised and the coloniser.

1.6. Delimitation of the Research

Cross-reference will be made to other literary texts throughout the research. However, this study will confine itself to exploring, investigating and examining *Parts Unknown* and *The Lie of the Land* from a post colonial eye, using in particular Bhabha's concept of ambivalence. There are four novels published so far on the Ovaherero/Nama geneocide: ***Mama Namibia*** (2011) by Mari Serebrov, ***The Scattering*** (2016) by Lauri Kubuitsele, ***The Lie of the Land*** (2017) by Jasper Utley and ***Parts Unknown*** (2018) by Zirk van der Berg. The research is limited to the last two novels with an interest to explore the point of view of none-Namibian protagonists, unlike the first and second novels which are from the point of view of Hereros who are also the protagonists.

1.7. Limitations of the Proposed Research

The outbreak of corona virus, commonly known as COVID'19 in late 2019, has led to extended country wide lockdowns and curfews which have affected the researcher, in that resources became limited due to the closure of bookshops, and many other institutions including both the Namibia University of Science and Technology (NUST) libraries and other (public) libraries.

1.8. Key Terms

postcolonialism – ambivalence – genocide – reparations – culture – identity

1.9. Layout of chapters

There are six chapters in this thesis. Chapter 1 introduces the study and its objectives. Chapter 2 reviews related literature, and sets up the study. Chapter 3 discusses ambivalence, the theoretical framework on which this research is founded. The research methodology employed in this study follows in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 offers an intense analysis and interpretation of Zirk van der Berg's *Parts Unknown* and Jaspar Utley's *The Lie of the Land* from Homi Bhabha's ambivalence standpoint. Chapter 6 is a summary of the research; it provides recommendations and also concludes the study. Finally, a reference list of all works cited in this thesis is attached.

1.10. Conclusion

This chapter introduced the study and its orientation. It presented the problem statement, research objectives, significance, delimitation, and limitations of this research. The next chapter discusses the literature that the researcher reviewed for this study.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

The following literature review examines literature related to this study of Zirk van der Berg's *Parts Unknown* (2018) and Jaspar Utley's *The Lie of the Land* (2017), to show whether or how these selected texts have been previously studied, and identify gaps in previous researches, and thereafter address them. Reviewing related works is useful to a very large extent; as such works serve as resources for the researcher and inspire this and other future research papers.

The literature review chapter has been divided into sub-sections arranged thematically, beginning with a discussion on Namibian literature in relation to the Ovaherero and Nama genocide, with a view to understand the consequences of the genocide on the societies of both Namibia and Germany, and how this has recently led to the rise of discussions and studies. Thereafter, it will include among the themes: coloniser-colonised relations, acts of rape, violence and annihilation, inferiority complex, reparations and simultaneous repulsions and desires. These themes have been selected because of their relation to the objectives of the research, and are recurrent in the selected texts. Though these themes are discussed separately to aid understanding, they form part of the thesis as a whole. Scholars have explored these themes in relation to their studies of the genocide from various theoretical standpoints; this researcher, however, seeks to identify gaps in literature that previous studies may have overlooked.

2.2. Namibian literature and the Ovaherero and Nama genocide

Schlettwein, writing about Namibia-German literature, believes that "there has been very little research and commentary available on this literature." In fact, she says, "If one considers contemporary Namibian literature at large, one has to admit that the corpus is not very large" (Krishnamurthy & Vale 2018, p. 327-328). Orford concurs with Schlettwein, stating that little research has been done on literary production in Namibia (Krishnamurthy & Vale 2018, p. 39). Melber relates this problem to "the challenge of finding opportunities to publish" (Krishnamurthy & Vale 2018, p. 30). Whether Melber's reason is true or not, the fact remains that there is very little research done on Namibian literature at large; that is, in terms of writing it, and researching on the little that has been written or published. Harris (2013) is saddened by the fact that only a handful of

materials with regard to the Ovaherero genocide have been researched by Namibian authors, stating that most works on the subject matter are of foreign origin.

Eckl (2008) also does a critical and methodological consideration of sources used by academics concerning the German-Ovaherero and Nama war with intent to contribute to a previously much neglected history. He says that there are manifold reasons for controversy in the evaluation of the German-Ovaherero and Nama war, and admits that research regarding the war is still infant. In other words, there is not much written or there is still a lot to be done. Contrary to this, he also says that it (German-Ovaherero and Nama war) is the most popular topic from German colonial history because of the controversy surrounding it, that some regard the war as "a normal colonial war" while others regard it as "the first genocide of the 20th century and of Germany history". He reiterates such controversy to the scarcity of sources related to the war: "there are hardly any documents or accounts from the Herero's point of view, and German sources are not abundant either" (p. 33). Eckl argues that to look at the German-Ovaherero and Nama war as only about "genocide" would blind researchers from "many other facets that could assist in analysing the phenomenon of German colonialism and how it played out in German South West Africa" (p. 57).

The two novels being studied are thus victims of what the researcher will call "research failure," possibly for the obvious reason that both novels were published just recently: *Parts Unknown* (2018), and *The Lie of the Land* (2017). Other than Krishnamurthy's study on the latter, the researcher has not come across any other study on the two novels. In her analysis, Krishnamurthy used "witness bearing" and adopted the concept of "the Other" from Postcolonial theory and feminist criticism with the hope to trace the transformation of the narrator, Samuel, from being a "witness" to the historical events taking place around him to becoming an "agent provocateur" who deliberately steps in to rescue a Nama girl from the Germans to restore her to her family in Kuiseb, the South of Namibia (Krishnamurthy, 2018). However, there are a number of literatures found on the subject of Ovaherero-Nama genocide. Krishnamurthy (2018) believes that "even today, the after effect of this genocide is felt in independent Namibia and expressed as demands for reparation from the Germans." Evidence that the subject of the genocide is crucial and relevant to the life of Namibians cannot be disputed. These literatures will be reviewed under the subheadings below.

2.3. Coloniser-colonised relationship

Nujoma (1995) writes in his autobiography, "the chains of slavery and colonialism were at last broken, but for the future there were other chains to be wrenched apart" (p. 423). Sam Nujoma, the first president of Independent Namibia understands that though the country is indeed free from

colonial wars, there are still conflicts to resolve. And rightly so, since independence, the Ovaherero and Nama people of Namibia have pushed their fight for reparations against Germany for the 1904-1908 genocide. The evidences above show that there has been, and suggest that there will always be conflict between the Ovaherero and Nama people against the Germans. This conflict involving the denial from the Germany side to take responsibility in apology and restitutions for the past crimes, results in even a sour relationship between the two countries. The colonised feels that the coloniser must pay for the crimes, but the coloniser is reluctant to even accept that genocide was committed. Baker (2019) believes that to attain stability and prosperity in the future, Namibia must deal with its tumultuous past. He examines the effects that historical changes have had on the country and what role those effects play in the future of the country (p. 654). It is clear that as long as Germany is unwilling to accept responsibility, and pay reparations, there will still remain a conflicting relationship between them and the affected communities and the country at large. Reparations are also not the solution to the conflict, for money cannot bring back the dead, and this is the reason the Germans wanted the Blue Book to be totally destroyed, so that that dark history will not be revealed.

Eckl (2008) believes that "for Namibian German-speakers, the interpretation of this history has very real and personal relevance in the post-colonial context of Namibia" while to their "academic counterparts in Europe, this history is devoid of any personal-biographical dimension" and that their "interpretation is positioned in the context of German history and a European academic and intellectual framework" (p. 55). In other words, the results of the war affect both the coloniser and the Ovaherero and Nama as subjects.

Haker (2019) in her article "towards a decolonial narrative ethics" concerning German-Ovaherero and Nama wars and reparations claims, believes that the present generation, that is, of Germany, should take responsibility of its past, even though it was not directly involved. She emphasises that Germany should not only listen to the sufferings and humiliating accounts, but must respond in a practical way. Only by doing this does she affirms can Germany help bring about true reconciliation, and thus transform both parties.

Correa (2011) states that the history of both Namibia and Germany has gone under a process of decolonisation, by means of petitions for reparations, or protests in front of monuments of the (post) colonial period, or commemoration rituals (p.85). Correa reveals that the first president of independent Namibia, Sam Nujoma, held the view that the Ovaherero genocide was not considered a national trauma, he was quoted saying "such initiatives belonged to the Herero representatives

and not to official Namibian representatives" (cited in Melber, 2004, p.218). What is conflicting about the character former president who made this revelation is that he went on to substitute many German related colonial routes into his own name. It is therefore clear that he had no consent for the history of the Ovaherero, who were yet subjects under his rule (p.89). Correa also records a removal or demolition of colonial monuments for new ones, but also admits that there are still many German monuments and signs (p.93).

Kössler (2008) refers to issues surrounding the genocide or past between Namibia and Germany as an "entangled history and politics." He calls it so because there was at the time of writing and still is today a denial on Germany's side as to whether the German-Ovaherero and Nama war was indeed "genocide," and also that Germany avoids appropriation. On the Namibian side, the debate concerns the descendents of the victims on the one hand, and the German-speaking Namibians on the other (p. 313). Kössler compares the debate between the two countries to "sounding boards throwing impulses and themes back and forth" (p. 313). This means that there are no serious considerations to the debate. He further cites the apology by a German cabinet minister in 2004 as a turning point in the debate.

Sawant (2012) sums up the meaning of post colonialism as a theory that deals with cultural contradictions, ambiguities and perhaps, ambivalences (p.126). He states that both Postcolonial Literature and theory investigate what happens when two cultures clash and one of them with accompanying ideology empowers and deems itself superior to the other (p. 120).

Owens (2008) records that Germany set up an education system, known as the Südwester, a system of schools built for German children in Namibia (p. 240). About these schools, Baker (2019) writes:

> "The schools became a symbol of separation between whites and blacks in Namibia, and set up an additional cultural barrier between Germans and black Namibians. They became the best schools in the country, and since they only allowed German to be spoken, German became the language of the upper-class. The German schools instilled German tradition as the superior culture from a young age, and the exclusive German-speaking schools sent a message to more native Namibians in the area that they had to adapt to German culture or be subjected to a worse life for them and their children" (p. 13).

Baker further argues that the effects of the Südwester were far-reaching, to the extent that even today, tension between black and white (German speaking) children is still felt in Namibia.

Unfortunately, these schools were eventually forced to segregate by the government after Namibia became independent, and as a result, the impacts of German colonisation were made even more apparent because black Namibians were not welcomed at these German schools (p. 13).

Kössler (2008), records that the consequences of German colonisation and the genocide in particular, are still evident in central and south Namibia today. He believes the Germans used the genocide to radically reorganise Namibia into a spatial and socio-economic order that paved a way for apartheid 40 years later. This is evidenced by the words of Rosa Namises, the leader of the Damara Cultural Heritage Forum: “the genocide made us to lose our humanity; it alienated us from our culture, where today our younger generation is completely new people with a modern mindset and culture” (p. 331). The affected indigenous people feel that their culture was lost as a result of the genocide. Conflicting, however, is her statement because by recognising Germany as “modern” could be interpreted as accepting inferiority or as a reference to her own culture as primitive.

2.4. Acts of rape, violence and annihilation

Stone (2001) gives evidence that the German soldiers were so cruel, that they did not only murder Ovaherero men, but they brutally raped and bayoneted women and children (p. 34). This ambiguous conduct by the German armies and administrators is somewhat conflicting, in the sense that they raped the Ovaherero women and children, and yet still murdered them. This attitude implies both a sexual desire for the Ovaherero women, and a desire to get rid of them. He also reveals that “before 1900, the Ovaherero were positively portrayed by the German colonisers as “noble warriors” because their skills in cattle farming differentiated them from the ‘lower’ Bushmen or Hottentots (Namas). The Germans envied the Ovaherero’s cattle, and became frustrated in their refusal to sale. Because of this, they were later looked at as unreliable, lazy and ungrateful to the benefits of German civilisation.

In the case by the Herero in a US court against the Federal Germany Republic, the plaintiff claim that Germany continue to refuse to include representatives of the Ovaherero and Nama people; the primary victims of the atrocities perpetrated by the German colonial authorities. And by denying these indigenous people the right to participate in decision-making, Germany as a signatory to the U.N. Declaration of Rights of Indigenous Peoples adopted by the U.N. General Assembly on September 13, 2007, in Articles 11 (2) and 18, Germany is contradictory to its beliefs (McCallion & Associates LLB v. Federal Republic of Germany, 2017). The court document states plainly that the

German general staff were aware of the atrocities that were taking place; citing its official publication, named *Der Kompf*:

> "This bold enterprise shows up in the most brilliant light the ruthless energy of the German command in pursuing their beaten enemy. No pains, no sacrifices were spared in eliminating the last remnants of enemy resistance. Like a wounded beast the enemy was tracked down from one water-hole to the next, until finally he became the victim of his own environment. The arid Omaheke [desert] was to complete what the German army had begun: the extermination of the Herero nation" (cited in McCallion & Associates LLB v. Federal Republic of Germany, 2017).

De Jong (2018) argues that German-South West Africa served as a laboratory, and calls the then Germany government a "bureaucratic administration of death." According to Gavers (2019, p.6), the blue book estimated that out of between 80,000 and 90,000 souls only about 15,000 starving and fugitive Ovaherero people were alive at the end of 1905. He believes that the central purpose for the blue book was achieved, that was to remove Germany's colonies in the interests of the native populations' (p.19). Adhikari (2008) refers to the Shark Island, which the Germans made a concentration camp for the Ovaherero and Nama captives as 'The Island of Death', describing the circumstances on the island as decidedly lethal because of the brutal treatment and severe conditions which people were forced to live under, and that it is also "the world's first death island." And in the desert, where the Ovaherero were forced to flee, conditions were so harsh, that many of them drank the blood from dying cattle in desperate attempts to stay alive (Zimmerer & Zeller 2003, p. 49).

Steinmetz (2005) believes among other reasons that Germany's denial of the Ovaherero and Nama genocide is that it is ignorant to the definition of the term "genocide," thus confusing it with the "lack of an exact number" of victims, and that they are also afraid of the official responsibilities of another genocidal case that they should be obliged to perform. He points that evidence is, however, against the Germans showing clearly from other evidences and General von Trotha's own extermination order was that indeed the war was genocide because, evidence shows intent to destroy (p. 1-4).

Burden (2017) believes that imperial Germany used the tenets of social Darwinism and eugenics to justify the genocide of inferior races as a positive good. He states that their genocidal policies marked a newfound level of violence and barbarism in the history of colonialism (p.25). Such as the notions of 'survival of the fittest,' these popular notions allowed the armies to feel empowered to

kill because they were able, in that they had guns with them. Thus, that is how the so called 'uncivilised nations', which were not equipped technologically and in terms of weapons lost themselves into colonialisation.

Zimmerer & Zeller (eds.). (2009) in their review of E. J. Neather's translation *The colonial war of 1904-1908 and its aftermath* also reveal Germany's fears of "financial compensation of the Herero" a contributing factor to the genocide's lack of recognition and apology (p. 123). Here, the notion that the Ovaherero and Nama brought calamity upon themselves by taking arms is strongly refuted, stating that as early as 1894, the policy of total control over the indigenous population was at the heart of German colonial rule. It is also argued that the atrocities in the camps were calculated to "reduce the cost of future deportation" (p.127). Based on these and other views, Neeather is believed to argue that the war of the Ovaherero and the Nama against the Germans became a self-fulfilling prophesy.

2.5. Inferiority complex

Hartmetz (2011) presented a lecture on the history of what she refers to as the 'Herero Nation' and its transformation pre, during and post colonial genocide. Her argument puts to rest the belief that the Ovaherero were a mere 'primitive' or a static pre-modern society before German colonisers came. Instead, she writes that the Ovaherero were the 'Other' created by the European Self (Germans) who thought themselves to be civilised. After all, the German colonisers only started their venture of formal colonisation of South West Africa in 1884, and History shows clearly that they found the Ovaherero established economically, to the extent that the Germans even admired their farming skills. In an attempt to secure some cattle from the Ovaherero, the Germans even allowed intermarriages between the German troops and the daughters of wealth Ovaherero families. Similarly, Bracht (2015) also reveals that the Germans used concentration camps as a way to "cleanse the Herero of their culture and raise a new generation sympathetic to the German settlers" (p. 17). This they also achieved by introducing Christianity in the concentration camps and taking out of the camps children, turning them into mascots, servants and later helpers. Thus they brainwashed the Ovaherero.

Stone (2011) in trying to prove whether German anthropology had any influence in the Ovaherero and Nama genocide, concludes that the racist view of the German colonisers in the then South West Africa had not come from nothing, it was as a result of influence from anthropologist; who despite being 'liberals' in the context that they did not hate and condemn other groups in the way that

outright racists did; they nevertheless firmly believed in the objective reality of race, and in the value of conducting research into it (p. 43-44). Stone further states that their concepts and assumptions were indeed legitimatising and driving the work of colonial administrators (p. 44). They championed an understanding of race that encouraged hierarchical thinking, which saw blacks or Ovaherero and Nama people being viewed as primitive and culturally inferior by the Germans. Stone (2001) says that just as the German colonisers were ambivalent in their conduct against the colonised, the German anthropologists were too, in that they claimed to be "liberals," yet influencing the armies and colonial administrators in belittling the colonised. Their "concepts or assumptions" gave some element of power to the German colonial administrators to do at liberty whatever they desired because they were dealing with people, who were in their eyes "savages." Similarly, Smith (1991), writes in reference to German anthropology, that its theoretical patterns of cultural science were intimately connected to the political and ideological currents that shaped imperialism within Germany, but only relating to the actual administration of Germany's real colonies (p. 40).

Paulose & Rogo (2018) discuss the kinds of reparations and their appropriateness for state crimes committed during the colonial era; and unanimously agree that such crimes, (and in particular, the Ovaherero and Nama genocide) have "a lasting and detrimental impact on the people who survive." They claim that Germany's attitude towards the Jewish people, and Ovaherero and Nama people has raised questions among many scholars on the difference between the two. As Harring (2002) puts it "what is the legal – or moral – distinction between German genocide directed at the Jews and the German genocide directed at Africans?" (cited in Paulose & Rogo, 2018). These scholars see that Germany does not take the Ovaherero and Nama genocide as serious as it took the Jewish holocaust, and they question whether it is because of the of colour of the Ovaherero and Nama people. Paulose & Rogo (2018) further dismiss as "amiss" the idea that "the Germany government may not understand that reparations are critical to addressing the poverty and class structure that was placed upon the Ovaherero and Nama people through the genocide." They thus defend reparations claim as legitimate, and emphasise that Germany should not confuse or hide behind developmental projects, when the same Germany is paying individual Jewish people reparations.

However, Hull (2008) who studied the German military campaign in GSWA dismisses race as the main cause of the genocide, pointing that it was the result of a conventional European-style military campaign whose principles and natural tendencies to go to extremes developed out of imperial Germany's military culture (p. 7). Similar to other scholars in this paper, he reiterates that the revolt by the Ovaherero came as a result of their land and livestock which were being taken away, as well

as the treatment they received from the settlers and colonial officials. Hull writes that Leutwein had a light approach at the war, where he inflicted “sufficient damage on rebels”, nevertheless he was relieved of his duty, and in his place they placed General von Trotha, who propelled the war. He asserts that von Trotha was not given clear directives, but he was only urged to “defeat the uprising by all means” (p. 9). He further states that the war was indeed planned in advance, calling it “a well-thought-out plan” (p.9). But he also argues that though the war was planned, the genocide itself was not, it also developed as the war continued.

Brehl (2005) argues that the inferiority complex painted over the black ‘Other’ (Ovaherero and Nama) is seen as suitable and fitting his incapacity. This logic helps us understand that as far as the Germans were concerned, “the killing of the Ovaherero and Nama people was in no way a moral, ethical or even a legal problem” (p.158). This thus justifies the extermination command given by the General Commander von Trotha, and even the denial by the Germans today that they committed genocide.

Kößler & Melber (2004), writing about the Ovaherero genocide, reveal that Germans had a tendency to see their human enemies as aliens, or an inferior race. Such dehumanising is believed to have preconditioned the genocide. They also say that the few skulls returned to Namibia in 2011 are part of many of the Ovaherero skulls that still remain in Germany universities; taken by anthropologists as samples for study to confirm their inferiority theory.

2.6. Reparations

The Namibian newspaper reveals that Ovaherero and Nama reparations talks between the governments of both Namibia and Germany have been going on. It is reported that the Germany government recently offered to pay €10 million to the Namibian government. However, the president of the Republic of Namibia, Hage Geingob, responded, referring to the offer “an insult” (Iileka, 2020). The president stated further that a delegation from Germany would come to offer an official apology, and he called for calm and patience from all Namibians, and especially the descendents of the victims of the genocide. *Deutsche Welle* also confirms that the offer was indeed declined, saying the Namibian government's special envoy, Zed Ngavirue, would continue to negotiate for a "revised offer." Geingob also took exception to Germany's use of the phrase "healing the wounds" in place of the word “reparations,” saying the terminology would be debated further (“Namibia rejects Germany's reparations,” 2020). Meanwhile, in Germany, the government is reluctant to comment, with Foreign Ministry spokesman Christofer Burger telling journalists in Berlin

that talks were indeed progressing, but that both negotiating teams had agreed “on confidentiality” (Pelz, 2020). On apology, it is revealed that Ruprecht Polenz, the German envoy for the talks with Namibia said in February 2020, that the two governments were close to agreeing on a joint declaration about the killings. "We would have preferred to apologize today rather than tomorrow," said Polenz at the time. (Pelz, 2020). These changes happening currently, were hinted in January 2020, when Germany’s new ambassador to Namibia said “important political developments might be about to happen” (Becker, 2020).

But back in 2017, *The Guardian* had reported that there was no assurance that the proposed aid by Germany would actually reach the minority communities directly affected. And concerning reparations negotiations, the lawyer representing the affected communities stated in their disapproval of such negotiations that “there can be no negotiations or settlement about them that is without them” (“Germany sued for damages,” 2017). Though Germany has consistently denied paying reparations, their recognition of the genocide was slowly becoming clear, as some top officials had begun using the term “genocide” in reference to the 1904-1908 Ovaherero and Nama slaughter. In September 2019, Germany’s Development Minister, Gerd Mueller, said clearly that “the crimes and abominations from 1904 to 1908 were what we today describe as genocide” (“Germany minister calls,” 2019).

The challenge with the negotiations around reparations is that the directly affected communities claim to be sidelined, so they do not support government initiatives to negotiate on their behalf. Meanwhile, the Germany government has indicated its willingness to negotiate only on a state to state level. Former president of the Republic of Namibia, Hifikepunye Pohamba was aware of this, and said back in 2005, that “agreement could not be finalised until the affected Herero, Nama and Damara groups were consulted” (“Germany’s Herero reconciliation,” 2005). He said this to put on hold a Germany proposed deal that would have seen Namibia benefit a €20 million in developmental projects. BBC news also confirms that the descendents of the victims are angry that there has been no apology and no agreement of reparations, as well as the claim that they are not part of the negotiations (“Germany returns skulls,” 2018). It is clear that the genocide which took place more than a century ago has brought and still brings conflict today between the two nations.

It also states that German has made it clear that it will not pay reparations in its negotiations with the Namibian government, an action aimed at striping the Ovaherero and Nama their “international right to claim or be heard before an impartial and fair tribunal” (McCallion & Associates LLB *v.* Federal Republic of Germany, 2017).

Leistner (2019) writes and insists on the reparations by Germany to the Ovaherero and Nama people; arguing that the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) is liable for reparations to the Ovaherero and Nama people of Namibia for the atrocities committed between 1904-1908. She criticizes Germany for recognising its atrocities against these groups as genocide only in 2015, 110 years after they were committed. She also criticizes Germany for distancing itself from the atrocities and blaming them on Lieutenant-General Lothar von Trotha, calling him and his armies "oppressors and agents of violence, discrimination, racism, and annihilation in Germany's name" (p. 4). Leistner gives several reasons why reparations should be paid by the Germans, the most popular being the land issue. "The access to land remains one of the pressing issues, specifically because German farmers still own the majority of arable land" (Leistner 2019, p. 10). She further states bluntly that unless the FRG engages the people affected specifically, there should expect no reconciliation. She makes this argument because she believes that it is wrong for the FRG to negotiate reparations with the current Namibian government because the ruling party, South West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO) is dominated by the Oshiwambo speaking people of northern Namibia who were not affected by the genocide, thus it (Government) does not take the interests of the Ovaherero and Namas at heart.

Shigwedha (2016) examines what he calls a "growing acrimonious relationship and re-emerging trauma, pain and suffering of the affected people" aroused by the discussion and handling of repatriations. He records that Germany portrayed a disappointing gesture by failing to welcome a delegation that went in 2011 for the collection of skulls, citing that there was only one delegate from German hierarchy, who also left the meeting before the leader of the delegation could deliver a speech, which later resulted in the delegate protesting. He also traces both Namibia and Germany governments' ignorance on the issue of repatriations, saying the former through its aid benefits from the latter has failed to take the issue serious, resulting in the latter's reluctancy about it. Some evidence for Namibia's blind eye toward the issue is that in period 2011-2012, Germany provided Namibia developmental aid amounting to "N$188 million." He reveals, however, a conflicting attitude in Germany's handling of the issue, its recognition of genocide coupled with its insincere apologies (p. 201-206). It is clear in his study, that once again, the effort from both the two governments to building "good bilateral relations" continue to neglect the concerns of the affected communities. But he also clearly points out that it is still an issue today in the eyes of the descendents of the victims, this is clear in their unheeded efforts to negotiate privately through a US court and also in their reaction to Germany's poor behaviour over repatriations negotiations.

Hartmetz (2011) further states that the Germans also took advantage of the divisions among the Ovaherero and were only able to penetrate the Ovaherero society by supporting the young Samuel Maharero who in turn began giving them land rights. The Germans did this for gain, they remained racists, and this was seen in their letters and reports (p. 4). And later, the 'rinderpest' destroyed over 95 percent of the Ovaherero livestock, left them poor, and without many options but to sell their remaining cattle to the Germans in order to survive.

Sarkin & Fowler (2008) analyse the events in Germany-South West Africa (GSWA) at the time of the genocide and investigate whether indeed the "historical" case of the Ovaherero and Nama against the Germans qualifies for reparations. Like many other studies in this review, they also believe that the war was indeed genocide (p.333). However, they conclude that the case submitted before US courts by the Ovaherero community to pursue Germany to pay reparations was not even considered on the bases of jurisdictions, with Germany asserting "its right to not submit to US jurisdiction as determined by the Act of State between Germany and USA" (p.358). Despite that, Sarkin & Fowler remain confident in the fact that the case which has been suppressed for years is now receiving and continues to receive attention; that Germany will not be able to ignore entirely, citing a motion tabled in March 2007, in the German parliament when several members asked the government to "accept its 'historical responsibility' and to 'acknowledge the right of the Hereros and Namas to repatriations' due to the genocide committed by the German Schutztruppe" (p.359).

Melber (2017) reveals German's ignorance in the genocide issue by their clear tendency of not responding to judicial systems, such as that in the US. He also shows on the contrary, that the German government, though reluctant, is willing to negotiate with the Namibian government, thus he confirms that there have been five such meetings between the two government envoys until mid-2017, but that in all such meetings, no concrete results came out, with the Germans showing a lack of diplomacy. Melber notes further that both governments have failed to meaningfully represent the interest of the affected communities. He records that there is no apparent sign of a solution to the continued negotiations, with many Germans taking the genocide as only "the deeds of their soldiers" or just like any another colonial war (p.13-15, 17).

Zollmann (2007) who in his review article considers many writings on the genocide issue polemics, take himself a highly biased polemic position in that all he does is attack mostly the exponents of the Ovaherero and Nama genocide, with the aim to undermine scholars and clearly deny the widely unanimous Ovaherero and Nama genocide. His ideas are somewhat shallow and contradictory in that he insinuates based on records that the Germans and other Europeans started settling in GSWA as early as 1840, and that "substantial numbers of natives started to appear in the protectorate from

early 1880s" (p. 120). Yet, he fails to say where they "arrive" from, and unsurprisingly, he again calls them "natives." Because of his contradictory statements and his undermining attitude toward other scholars, he is himself highly biased and a polemic scholar, who eventually brings nothing new or significant to the debate, apart from noticing inadequacy in other researchers.

Gewald (2003) analyses the ways in which the genocide had been used in the 20th century by various people and organisations to further their own cause. He writes that the Ovaherero political actors, for example, have used the genocide to further their positions and resist colonial and current post-colonial dominion (p.303). He also records rather an ambivalent statement in 1995, from the then Foreign Affairs Minister Theo-Ben Gurirab, who in an interview said that "the injustices committed against the Namibian people by the former German colonial power would always remain a 'festering sore.'" While denying that it was not the right time to discuss such matters then, he pointed that Namibians must have the courage to discuss the matter "when the time is right" (p.301). Gewald (2003) further states that the SWAPO party which liberated the country and took over government has its most support base in the northern parts of the country, so it put aside the German-Ovaherero and Nama struggle, and put forward its own war against Apartheid South Africa as the grand narrative of the country, and recognised mostly its heroes. Gewald also attests to the legitimacy of the Bluebook, in where appear the records and pictures of the atrocities of the genocide, and narrates how the white parliament of 1929 was influenced by one Mr. Stauch, who tabled the motion to impound and destroy its copies, with intent to hide the German history, citing that its removal would allow "mutual trust and cooperation in the country" (p.289). This shows that the Germans understood that their atrocities once kept open to the public would bring conflict.

Gewald (2004) still emphasises in another of his papers that the current Namibian government has halted efforts to claim reparations because of its tendency to sideline the genocide issue or exploit it for their own end, claiming that all Namibians suffered the hands of Germany. He likens the current Namibian government to the British government which after conquering the Germans at the time, ended up using the "Blue Book" to prevent Germany from regaining its colonies, instead of using it to insure that the Ovaherero get their lands or compensation (p. 73). Drawing his conclusions from von Trotha's extermination command, he states clearly that the "Herero genocide and associated atrocities were indeed officially sanctioned" (p. 3).

In their examination of contemporary Namibia's post colonial memory politics, Hamrick & Duschinski (2017) reveal divisions existing among the Ovaherero community, the self-exclusion by the Nama community as well as the negative role of SWAPO on genocide reparations. They state that the Ovaherero community is divided into two groups or committees fighting for the same cause, while

the Nama community seeking to distance itself from the Ovaherero politics stands alone as a committee. Meanwhile, there are complaints of SWAPO, which is basically the government, channelling "German development aid away from the Herero and Nama communities" (p.6-7). They believe that the SWAPO government with its liberation struggle as the grand narrative in the country's colonial history, has sidelined the Ovaherero and Nama genocide, under its slogan "One Namibia, One Nation", promoting unity among its many ethnic groups. They also reveal that since Germany launched the German Special Institute (GSI), to give Namibia development aid, aiming specially at the Ovaherero and Nama communities, such an initiative has been halted by reports and complaints that the money is not reaching the affected communities (p. 8).

De Wolff (2016) reviewed Reinhardt Kößler's 2015 book titled *Namibia and Germany. Negotiating the Past*, which "reflects on the postcolonial situation, raising some urgent questions such as: where is the space of the affected communities in transnational memory politics? Do the descendents of the genocide victims have a voice in existing bilateral talks?" (p.1). Kößler calls Germany's reluctant attitude toward such talks a "colonial amnesia" which is causing "persistent trauma" on the victims (p.1). Kößler zeros in on many aspects of the conflict, such as the apology issued by Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul in 2004, the skulls and repatriations issues among others. He also presents a map and figures showing the unequal land and wealth distribution in postcolonial Namibia, revealing the deep consequences of the genocide (p.3). De Wolff (2016) concludes that the book is a timely contribution that enables further critical understanding of the transnational negation process and ongoing struggles for recognition in view of postcolonialism and social (in)justice in the realm of memory politics (p.3).

Dyck (2014) argues that there was no "Herero revolt" as claimed by many writers, stating instead that German military initiated the war out of "paranoia and rumours" of such a revolt. She records that the "classic Maharero quotation "let us die fighting" was even spoken after the shooting against the Ovaherero civilians had already begun (p. 159). She finally asserts that the genocide resulted in the Ovaherero losing a significant representation, thus putting the community at a "demographic and political disadvantage" in Namibia even today.

Hull (2008) argues against the notion by scholars such as Drechsler, who believe that the genocide of the Ovaherero and Nama was planned. She concludes that "great human disasters may develop from routine beginnings." By this she implies that the genocide which began and stayed within "normal bounds of a colonial conflict" as long as Leutwein was in power, escalated unplanned under von Trotha, who in her eyes was trying to protect his soldiers from the Ovaherero and Nama warriors. She reasons that von Trotha had no choice because he could not differentiate who was a

rebel and who was not; because they did not have a particular army uniform, nor did they carry with war ammunition. (p.7-11). She may be right to state that the genocide may have developed from routine beginnings, but does this mean such routines were unplanned? This clearly shows that every move von Trotha took was with consequences which he was aware of. It is one thing to deny completely that the genocide was planned based on evidence available; it is another to justify von Trotha's actions under some so called "routine beginnings." The fact that von Trotha was sent to GWSA to change the then status quo abruptly, is also proof that it was by intent.

Brehl (2005) looks at the "strategies of exclusion" in the German colonial discourse concerning the Herero genocide, and he concludes from literatures such as Frenssen's *Peter Moor*, that German colonial literatures view the genocide as an issue of superiority between black against white, "nature versus culture, desert versus arable land, heathenism versus Christianity, unproductive versus productivity, stagnation versus progress, decline versus future", etc., these he establishes as the binary arguments contained in colonial strategies of exclusion. In agreement, Bargueño (2011), after examining the discourses of the Protestants and Catholic missionaries, believes that those that were in Namibia, and elsewhere often acted as "frontiersmen of forces they could not control." He believes the missionaries developed 'meaning systems' with Africans in a 'reciprocal process' which reshaped African consciousness (p.27). They persuaded the people to accept a religion which promotes 'humility' to allow the Germans to take advantage of them.

2.8. Simultaneous repulsions and desires

Hartmetz (2011) reveals that the tension between the Ovaherero and the German colonisers came as a result of dept the Ovaherero owed the Germans. The Germans demanded to be paid back in the form of land and, or cattle, but this did not go down well with the Ovaherero. It is not however clear as to who fired the first shot when violence broke out on January 12th, 1904 (p. 8). This also means that the war was brought about by the Ovaherero's desire over what the Germans could offer, and the latter's subtle ways to get land and cattle.

Moreover, Madley (2004) studied the genocides of the Aboriginal Tasmanians, the Yuki of California and the Ovaherero and Nama people of Namibia. Though his analysis concludes that similar patterns led to the genocides in all three cases; for the Ovaherero and Nama genocide in particular, it was "as a result of economic and political pressure" that threatened the Ovaherero that they decided to attack the Germans. The Germans were taking most of the land and the livestock (cattle) that belonged to the Ovaherero by unfair means of trade, the natural resources were taken from them

that they saw fighting as the only means to get back what was rightfully theirs (p.181, 189). What is ambivalent about the attitude of the Ovaherero, he mentions is that they "sold cattle for European goods," which did a great deal in undermining their own society (p.183). Madley (2004) also reveals a conflicting nature in the European men, that because of the imbalance in gender population between the Europeans, the men resorted to raping the Ovaherero women; and they made it seem so common, that they used expressions such as "going native" when they intended to rape Ovaherero women. European men were about 3,970 and their women were only about 712 (p.183). "Going native" is in itself conflicting because it suggests that they recognised it was not their country of origin, which by implication should mean they understood they did not belong there, and also in the sense that they knew they needed the natives, the same people they slaughtered. Similarly, Zimmerer & Zeller (eds.). (2009) reveal a conflicting nature in the roles of women in the war, where Kruger is quoted using the phrase "breasts and victim" signifying that women were used for sexual pleasure and also murdered or left to die. It is in fact, stated that that by Henrichsen that post-war marriages between the Ovaherero and Germans were short lived, which proves just how far-reaching the effects of the genocide were or are on the minds of the both the victims and the oppressors (p.129).

Kirchner (2011) observes the conflicting thought the there is no other German colony with closer ties to German than Namibia. This argument he bases on the fact that there is still a number of colonial buildings in Windhoek and Swakopmund and thousands of people of German descent in the country today. This he believes is due to the fact that the current Namibian government is more interested in the maintenance of "good political relations with Germany." He points out that the Ovaherero are a minority in Namibia, and thus lack government support on the genocide issue. He further assumes that the only possible solution would be for Germany to increase aid to Namibia and for the Namibian government to channel such aid toward the Ovaherero and Nama people (p.2, 5).

Bracht (2015) records that during the German rule; the Ovaherero were made foreigners in their own country, and that to date these natives' land remains in the hands of the minority white farmers. She reveals that at independence in 1990, "six thousand one hundred twenty-three out of the total six thousand one hundred ninety-two farms were white owned" and that these farms cover 95% of the surface area of the commercial district. It is thus clear that the war against the Ovaherero and Nama had far reaching effects, because, today, the majority of Namibians are without land.

2.9. Research gap

A survey of various literatures written on the theory of post colonialism or ambivalence in particular, show that research on the concept of ambivalence and the Ovaherero-Nama genocide exist, but not in the context of the two Namibian post colonial literatures understudy; namely *The Lie of the Land* (2017) and *Parts Unknown* (2018). Other than Krishnamurthy's on the latter, there has been no other study found. The researcher thus sees a gap, and endeavours in this paper, to evaluate ambivalence in the two literatures.

2.10. Conclusion

This chapter began by giving a review of related literature organised according to themes that arose from the selected works, such as coloniser-colonised relations, acts of rape, violence and annihilation, inferiority complex, reparations and simultaneous repulsions and desires. Although all literature reviewed discuss the genocide in various contexts, including that of ambivalence; they do not examine *The Lie of the Land* (2017) and *Parts Unknown* (2018), with the exception of Krishnamurthy, who analysed the former. One needs to understand how the colonial relationship is portrayed by both Namibian and none-Namibian authors in their works. What is interesting, however, is the fact that most of the works discussed were written by none-Namibian authors. The role of these writers in general, and in establishing identity and negotiating spaces in society for the colonised and coloniser in particular, was presented.

CHAPTER THREE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1. Introduction

For purposes of this research, the researcher will utilise Bhabha's concept of ambivalence. This section will first define postcolonialism, which houses ambivalence as one of its tenets. It will then define ambivalence and highlight its main tenets. The term 'ambivalence' will be discussed further to ensure full understanding of this theoretical framework and how it applies to selected works.

3.2. Postcolonialsm

The Post-colonial Literature and theory investigate what happens when two cultures clash and one of them with accompanying ideology empowers and deems itself superior to other. The term as originally used by historians after the Second World War such as 'post-colonial state', where 'post-colonial' had a clearly chronological meaning, designating the post-independence period. As Bill Aschcroft, Griffith & Tiffin (1989) suggest: "The semantic basis of the term 'post-colonialism' might seem to suggest a concern only with the national culture after the departure of the imperial power" (p. 1). However, from the late 1970s the term 'Postcolonialism' has been used by literary critics to discuss the various cultural effects of colonization. Thus the term postcolonialism is itself ambivalent; because it has both historical as well as ideological significance; it has been substituted in the 1970s for the post-independence concerns throughout the world.

Homi Bhabha is one of the leading and most influential personalities within the postcolonial movement. Habib (2005, p.750) states that Bhabha has extended "certain tenets of poststructuralism into discourses about colonialism, nationality and culture." Habib (2005, p.750) observes further that these tenets are a challenge to the notion of fixed identity, the undermining of binary oppositions and an emphasis on language and discourse together with the power relations in which these are imbricated as underlying our understanding of cultural phenomena." According to Huddart (2006), Bhabha argues against the consideration that the history of colonialism is "as something locked in the past," instead, he shows how colonialism's history and culture "constantly intrude on the present" thereby transforming the understandings of "cross cultural relations" (cited in Arabian & Rahimineshad, 2016, p.3050). They also assert that Bhabha's belief is that colonialism is not a "straightforward oppression of the colonized by the colonizer," rather; they say he argues

strongly that it is an "ongoing" period of interaction between them (p.3050). They further observe that "the meaning of culture is not simply imposed by the colonizer" and that "the colonizer's cultural meanings are open to transformation by the colonized population" (p.3050).

Huddart (2006) in Arabian & Rahimineshad (2016, p.3050) notes that Bhabha points to the element of "negotiation" of cultural meanings during the interaction of the coloniser and the colonised that can structure their identities and marks colonialism by a "complex economy of identity" in which the colonised and the coloniser "depend on each other." McEwan (2009) in Arabian & Rahimineshad (2016, p.3050) quoting Bhabha in his book, *The Location of Culture* (1994), says that the source of the western compulsion to colonise is the result of their traditional representations of foreign cultures; therefore, he attacks the western philosophy of binary oppositions which include "center/margin, civilized/savage and enlightened/ignorant." Huddart (2006) argues that the reason for the western philosophy is to "undermine the simple polarization of the world into 'Self' and 'Other'" (cited in Arabian & Rahimineshad 2016, p.3050). In Edwards (2008), Bhabha argues that once the binary oppositions are destabilized, cultures can be understood to "interact, transgress and transform each other in a much more complex manner than the traditional binary oppositions can allow" (cited in Arabian & Rahimineshad 2016, p.3050). Accordingly, Bhabha generates a series of concepts, as Al-Taee (2010) states, such as 'hybridity', 'third space', 'ambivalence' and 'mimicry' into colonial discourse to argue that "cultural production is always most productive where it is most ambivalent" (cited in Arabian & Rahimineshad 2016, p.3050).

Another interesting scholar worthy of consultation today in postcolonial studies is Africa's own, the Cameroonian, Achille Mbembe, who is rated as one of the most brilliant postcolonial theorists. In his most provocative piece, *On the Postcolony*, he profoundly renews our understanding of power and subjectivity in Africa. Mbembe, in his description of the influence of colonialism on the African nations shows similarities between the colonial period and the post-colonial period. In the context of Namibia, the dominant traits of the colonial thought are carried over to the post-colonial period in the sense that the colonialist whilist absent still envisages the presence of the colonial systems in postcolony Namibia.

Mbembe is interested in place, not space. Not simply "where is Africa?", but "where is it possible to be African in the post-colony," or, "where is the post-colony?" If we think spatially, this place is a nothing, an absence, a "displacement" (Mbembe, 2001:15). Historically it was no-where, at least

until it was mapped and claimed as a resource. And, much of *On the Postcolony* rehearses the modes of lack, of loss, of being no-where.

And yet, that is not the final message from Mbembe. Existence is still exercised; it has, or finds, its place. But we are not yet at this place. Tragically, the exercise of existence is fraught with violence. Mbembe puts the visible and the invisible in tension in an attempt to show the domination under which people live. "Being-there" (real presence) and "being elsewhere" or "non-being" (irremedial absence) are juxtaposed in these representations, and inasmuch as they are part of representation, they are also part of life (Mbembe, 2001:144). All actions have "simultaneous multiplicities" (p. 146), seen as underground protests and civil disobedience (or corruption?), "fixes" (or informal political and economic arrangements that retain the sheen of civil society) and the misdirected and subterranean nature of business relations in society (p. 147-8).

Mbembe's account of the hollowness of the colony is fairly standard, and touches on the emptiness of the land (from the colonist's point of view) and the metaphorical emptiness of those already there, morally and socially. Subjection to these conditions produces a place where little matters or little can be cared about, and this is an ideology that paves way for exploitation and violence. For if something is less important, it does not need to be cared for.

> "The colonized cannot be defined either as a living being endowed with reason, or as someone aspiring to transcendence. The colonized does not exist as a self; the colonized is, but in the same way as a rock is, that is, as nothing more. And anyone who would make him/her express more finds nothing, or, in any event, finds he/she expresses nothing. The colonized belongs to the *universe of immediate things,* useful things when needed, things that can be molded and are mortal, futile and superfluous things, if need be" (Mbembe, 2001:187).

The colonised is, then, a "hollow object and a negative entity" (p. 189). The real question, and Mbembe's attempt to account for this negation, is this: "how does one get from the colony to 'what comes after?'" (p. 196). The time after the colony is a new kind of negation, that of death, which comes in many forms.

"The object of this book has been to see if, in answer to the question 'Who are you in the world?' the African of this century could say without qualification, 'I am an ex-slave'" (Mbembe, 2001:237).

The important word, or letters, are of course "ex". Mbembe clearly wants to claim that life in the postcolony is brief and dissipated, that it is shot through with negative forces and excess, death and pain. But he also wants to underline that the point of the book has also been to "discover what "spirit" is at work in this turbulent activity" (p. 240).

There is inevitable evidence that Postcolonial Namibia shows a body of thought predominantly accounting for the political, aesthetic, economic, historical, and social impact of European colonial rule. Political in the sense that colonisation changed the political land scape that existed pre-colonialism, such as is described in Chinua Achebe's *Things Fall Apart* and the beauty that comes with it, introducing some new form of governance bringing about the fall of things. The colonised's economy was self sustainable, but new forms of trade which involve the taking of native land by unfair means crippled the economy, to the extent that the formally self sufficient natives had to live at the mercies of the coloniser. Seggregatory policies from the coloniser also impacted native societies which historically had no social boundaries; including the introduction of class structures from grassroot levels, such as in schools. Within this context, it is safe to say colonisation is preparation for a new form of colonisation in post-colonial period, which makes it almost impossible for many so called postcolonies to escape the far-reaching effects of colonisation.

3.3. Ambivalence

Ambivalence is a term first developed in psychoanalysis to describe a continual fluctuation between wanting one thing and wanting its opposite. It also refers to a simultaneous attraction toward and repulsion from an object, person or action (Young 1995: 161). Adapted into colonial discourse theory by Homi Bhabha, it describes the complex mix of attraction and repulsion that characterizes the relationship between coloniser and colonised. The relationship is ambivalent in the sense that the colonised subject is never simply and completely opposed to the coloniser. Rather than assuming that some colonised subjects are 'complicit' and some 'resistant', ambivalence suggests that complicity and resistance exist in a fluctuating relation within the colonial subject. Ambivalence also characterises the way in which colonial discourse relates to the colonised subject, for it may be both exploitative and nurturing, or represent itself as nurturing, at the same time (Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 2000:10).

Bhabha (1994) in Arabian & Rahimineshad (2016, p.3052) defines ambivalence as a duality that makes a split in the identity of the colonised. He believes that ambivalence presents the colonised as

those who are a mixture of their own cultural identity and the coloniser's cultural identity. Bhabha explains that colonial signifiers of authority only acquire their meanings after the "traumatic scenario of colonial difference, cultural or racial, returns the eye of power to some prior archaic image or identity. Paradoxically, however, such an image can neither be 'original' by virtue of the act of repetition that constructs it nor identical by virtue of the difference that define it" (p.3052). Accordingly, the colonial discourse remains ambivalent and makes a split between its appearance as original and authoritative and its articulation as repetition and difference. This leads to the two dimensions of colonial discourse. The first one is characterized by invention and mastery the coloniser and the second one is characterized by displacement and fantasy- the colonised (p.3052).

Most importantly in Bhabha's theory, however, ambivalence disrupts the clear-cut authority of colonial domination because it disturbs the simple relationship between coloniser and colonised. Ambivalence is therefore an undesired aspect of colonial discourse for the coloniser. The problem for colonial discourse is that it wants to produce compliant subjects who reproduce its assumptions, habits and values; that is, 'mimic' the coloniser. But instead it produces ambivalent subjects whose mimicry is never very far from mockery. Ambivalence describes this fluctuating relationship between mimicry and mockery, an ambivalence that is fundamentally unsettling to colonial dominance. In this respect, it is not necessarily disempowering for the colonial subject; but rather can be seen to be 'two-powered'. The effect of this ambivalence (the simultaneous attraction and repulsion) is to produce a profound disturbance of the authority of colonial discourse (Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 2000:10).

Ambivalence therefore gives rise to a controversial proposition in Bhabha's theory, that because the colonial relationship is always ambivalent, it generates the seeds of its own destruction. This is controversial because it implies that the colonial relationship is going to be disrupted, regardless of any resistance or rebellion on the part of the colonised. Bhabha's argument is that colonial discourse is *compelled* to be ambivalent because it never really wants colonial subjects to be exact replicas of the colonisers, as this would be too threatening. For instance, Bhabha gives the example of Charles Grant, who, in 1792, desired to inculcate the Christian religion in Indians, but worried that this might make them 'turbulent for liberty' (Bhabha 1994: 87). Grant's solution was to mix Christian doctrines with divisive caste practices to produce a 'partial reform' that would induce an empty imitation of English manners. Bhabha suggests that this demonstrates the conflict within imperialism itself that will inevitably cause its own downfall: it is compelled to create an ambivalent situation that will disrupt its assumption of monolithic power (Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 2000:11).

In Robert Young's words, the theory of ambivalence is Bhabha's way of turning the tables on imperial discourse. The periphery, which is regarded as 'the borderline, the marginal, the unclassifiable, the doubtful' by the centre, responds by constituting the centre as an 'equivocal, indefinite, indeterminate ambivalence' (1995: 161). But this is not a simple reversal of a binary, for Bhabha shows that both colonising and colonised subjects are implicated in the ambivalence of colonial discourse. The concept is related to hybridity because, just as ambivalence 'decentres' authority from its position of power, so that authority may also become hybridized when placed in a colonial context in which it finds itself dealing with, and often inflected by, other cultures.

The present study's central focus then is on the reading of *The lie of the land* (2017) and *Parts unknown* (2018) in the light of the concept of ambivalence which is chosen as the theoretical framework of this study.

3.4. Application of ambivalence to the research

This researcher has chosen ambivalence as the theoretical framework to study the two selected texts to describe how conflicting the colonial relationship is. Ambivalence gives rise to a controversial proposition in Bhabha's theory; the fact that the colonial relationship is unavoidably always ambivalent generates the seeds of its own destruction. This implies that the colonial relationship is going to be disrupted, regardless of any resistance or rebellion on the part of the colonised (Bhabha 1994:87). The researcher aims to explore the ambivalent nature of the colonial relationship.

Ambivalence will thus be applied to a comparative study of Zirk van der Berg's *Parts Unknown* (2018) and Jaspar Utley's *The Lie of the Land* (2017), to explain the significance of the texts in the context of the topic of this research. This researcher will argue that colonisation affects both the coloniser and the colonised in a negative way, and hence prove that explorations of colonial matters are vital for social change. Through the ambivalence perspective, this researcher seeks to explore the conflicting relationship between the colonised and the coloniser, investigate the cultural fault lines generated between white and black distributions in a colonial relationship, and examine the simultaneous repulsions and desires that exist at the interface between the self and the other. Particular attention will be paid to how, through the ambivalence approach, blacks and whites negotiate spaces for

themselves in a colonial environment. Though other postcolonial tenets can be applied to the study of the select texts, this research is limited only to ambivalence in the analysis of the selected texts.

In line with the research objectives, in applying ambivalence principles to the study of the two selected texts, ambivalence's main goal, that of a destabilised colonial relationship will be the main guiding principle throughout the research on this topic. With cries reparations for the Ovaherero and Nama genocide on the rise, in the context of Namibia, ambivalence seeks to explore the main cause and perhaps call for an end to colonisation. This research will deal with this aspect in detail as this contributes greatly to the significance of the study.

3.5. Conclusion

In this chapter, ambivalence theoretical framework which will be applied to and guide this study was discussed and its major tenets identified. This theory allows researchers to critique post colonial literatures. This chapter will guide this researcher in interpreting selected works from an ambivalence perspective, as well as guide future research in the same field.

All scholars, except for one, whose works have been reviewed in this and the previous chapter, agree that the German-Ovaherero and Nama war was genocide. These scholars have not necessarily examined the selected text from ambivalence or any other perspective; they have focused on whether or not the war was genocide. Only Krishnamurthy (2018) has examined Jaspar Utley's *The Lie of the Land* as an *Illustrative Nama Genocide Narrative* (p.396). Of the two selected texts, *Parts Unknown* had not been studied from any other perspective at the time of writing, partly because of its recent publicity, and there have been a few studies on *The Lie of the Land* as indicated earlier. This leaves researchers with so many gaps to study the selected texts in. As such, this research will be the first study of the two selected texts together from an ambivalence standpoint.

In the next chapter, the research methods employed in this study will be discussed.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1. Introduction

In this chapter, it is presented the research methods and ethics utilised in this study. Rosnow and Rosenthal (2008) assert that the purpose of carrying out research is to increase our understanding of a phenomenon which we find of interest or concern, and they define research as a process that is systematic in collecting, analysing and interpreting data. Their further observation is that research seems to be a cycle to which there is no end, as more insights continue being shed on the same subject. The research question probes the researcher into clearly stating the research problem for which solutions are to be found through reasonable hypothesis, which directs the researcher to appropriate data, which is then collected, organised and interpreted, thus solving the problem, but yet at the same time creating another gap and research problem that begins another research, and so the research cycle continues.

It is crucial to understand the research design first; therefore Section 4.2 highlights the research design and provides a justification for the desktop study employed in this research. Section 4.3 outlines the procedure that this researcher followed in carrying out this study. Section 4.4 explains how the data collected was analysed. In Section 4.5, ethical considerations are presented. Finally, Section 4.6 summarises this chapter.

4.1. Research Design

Research design refers to how conditions for collection and analysis of data are arranged in line with the research purpose (Kothari, 2004). Similarly, Vosloo (2014, p.316), defines the research design as "the functional plan in which certain research methods and procedures are linked together to acquire a reliable and valid body of data for empirically grounded analyses, conclusions and theory formulation." The methods and procedures are determined by the research problem. The research design outlines the process of research, followed by the researcher right from the research question up to the analysis and interpretation of data. In other words, the research's blueprint is the research design, which ensures that all research operations function smoothly.

The research design aids the researcher in achieving research objectives or answering research questions. For purposes of this study, this researcher did not carry out any field work, but conducted

a desktop literature study of both the select texts and related literature. The two selected texts for this study provide a small sample necessary for an in-depth study and interpretation, which Jupp (2006) regards as the nature of qualitative research. Therefore, this makes this research a qualitative study aimed at achieving in-depth understanding of Zirk van der Berg's *Parts Unknown* (2018) and Jaspar Utley's *The Lie of the Land* (2017), related works, and the contexts in which they are written. This is meant to deepen understanding of ambivalence in the select works.

The meaning and interpretation of various aspects of social life is the major concern of qualitative research. Mack, Woodsong, MacQueen, Guest and Namey (2005, p.vi) affirm that "the great contribution of qualitative research is the culturally specific and contextually rich data it produces." They also argue that "intangible factors, such as social norms, socio-economic status, gender roles, ethnicity and religion" are effectively identified through qualitative methods (Mack et al, 2005, p.1). In other words, qualitative research makes it possible for a specific phenomenon or social context to be fully comprehended, and one can extend findings to other social groups with similar characteristics to those in the research population. The meaning of the data collected in relation to research objectives was the impetus behind this research. This study adopted a qualitative approach because it examines ambivalence which is also an aspect of social life, in the select works.

Quantitative research cannot achieve this research's objectives because it deals with quantities and its rigid cause-and-effect relationships constrain the researcher, and hence the justification for qualitative research, which searches for meaning and deals with words. Qualitative research also gives the researcher some flexibility in terms of how the complex data is analysed, and hence providing rich, explanatory, and unique findings (Mack et al, 2005). Since the participants' and not the researcher's perspective determine the data obtained, the findings can be regarded as dependable and substantial (Amora, 2010). The selected texts inform the research's results; therefore, one can consider these findings as verifiable, well-grounded and sound.

The next section presents the procedure followed in this research.

4.2. Procedure

This study involved in-depth reading of the two selected texts and a desktop collection of related data to determine the extent to which colonial relationships are ambivalent. No field work was carried out in the literary analysis of the selected texts. Peer-reviewed, published and relevant sources available were read and analysed in order to draw conclusions.

Related themes in the selected works guided the research; therefore all ideas discussed are thematically linked. Rooted in secondary sources, the presentation of these themes in the selected works in relation to research objectives was carefully examined by this researcher. While Zirk van der Berg's *Parts Unknown* (2018) and Jaspar Utley's *The Lie of the Land* (2017) were the primary sources of data, crucial to the study were insightful secondary sources from literary critics. A number of credible, recently published scholarly journals, particularly on the Ovaherero and Nama genocide, were studied for this study to be firmly grounded and substantiated.

To achieve the research objectives, this researcher also employed content analysis, which is defined as "a detailed and systematic examination of the contents of a particular body of material for the purpose of identifying the specific characteristic of a body material" (Leedy and Armrod 2010, p.44) Echoing the same definition, Krippendorf (2013, p.40) describes content analysis as "a systematic reading of a body of texts, images and symbolic matter not necessarily from an author's or user's perspective." The researcher deemed content analysis appropriate because the subject under study cannot be mathematically quantified, therefore no statistical evidence was given in this study.

Vosloo (2014, p.299) postulates that "a theory describes the relationship among key variables for explaining a current state or predicting future concurrences." In other words, previous information can be summarised, and the course of future action guided, by the theoretical framework. The ambivalence theoretical framework was employed in stimulating knowledge advancement and analysing the data, which was presented in narrative form and categorised thematically. Ambivalence strongly presents itself in all two selected texts as the relationship between the colonised and the coloniser is found always conflicting. For example, this researcher argued that the major cause ambivalence in Zirk van der Berg's *Parts Unknown* (2018) and Jaspar Utley's *The Lie of the Land* (2017), respectively, is the coloniser's undermining attitude towards the colonised, which is respectively represented by the whites' oppression over blacks. Thus, content analysis enabled the researcher to closely examine the tenets of ambivalence manifested in the two selected texts.

How the data collected was analysed is presented in the next section.

4.3. Data analysis

Cresswell (2007) claims that "data analysis in qualitative research consists of preparing and organizing the data (i.e., text data as in transcripts, or image data as in photographs) for analysis, then reducing the data into themes through a process of coding and condensing the codes, and finally representing the data in figures, tables, or a discussion" (p.148). Content analysis was employed because no statistical evidence was given in this research, thus accommodating different

interpretations of the selected texts, which enhanced meaning through the researcher's close encounter with those texts in an effort to thoroughly examine the details. Cresswell (2007) further notes that the data collection, data analysis, and report writing processes are interrelated, not independent; hence usually occur concurrently in a research project (p.148).

Qualitative analysis heavily depends on the analytic and integrative skills of the researcher as well as the researcher's awareness of the data source's social context (Bhattacherjee, 2012). The researcher makes sense of what they are analysing and draws conclusions which are presented in narrative form. The data collected in this study of the selected texts was interpreted incorporating tenets of ambivalence and reduced to smaller, manageable chunks by categorising it thematically. The conclusions which were drawn from the critical analysis of selected texts and interpretations will be presented in the following chapter of this study.

The next section presents the research ethics which guided this researcher.

4.3. Research Ethics

In relation to social research, Edwards and Mauthner (2002, p.14) refer to ethics as "the moral deliberation, choice and accountability on the part of researchers throughout the research process." Objectivity was made certain by this researcher through fully reporting findings, citing all sources consulted, avoiding plagiarism, and strictly following the APA referencing guidelines stipulated and strongly recommended by Namibia University of Science and Technology (NUST). Furthermore, ethical clearance was obtained from NUST and its code of ethics was strictly adhered to. The researcher also declares that this is his original work and has not been published or submitted elsewhere as part of his studies.

The fact that the research is based on works of fiction whose characters are imaginatively created, the literary analysis is based on the principle that makes references to real places, people, events, organisations and establishments in the source materials are used in the novels, thereby enabling the researcher to observe literary research ethics. Also the researcher has and will still acknowledge all sources used and still to be used to avoid plagiarism. Ethical clearance is sought from the Namibia University of Science and Technology, which the researcher will use as a guide in order to remain on the ethical path.

4.4. Conclusion

In this chapter, the researcher set out the research method followed in this study, which is a qualitative, desktop content analysis of selected and related works. Zirk van der Berg's *Parts Unknown* (2018) and Jaspar Utley's *The Lie of the Land* (2017) are the primary sources of data, while works by critics cited in this research worked as secondary sources in which the research is concretised. The research procedure and how the data was analysed were also presented in this chapter. Ethical considerations were also observed by the researcher who acknowledged all sources consulted for purposes this study; thus ensuring objectivity and integrity.

The next chapter will present the analysis and interpretation of data collected from the study of the two selected works.

CHAPTER FIVE: DATA ANALYSIS ANS PRESENTATION

5.1. Introduction

This chapter presents an analysis of Zirk van der Berg's *Parts Unknown* (2018) and Jaspar Utley's *The Lie of the Land* (2017), from an ambivalence point of view. With insight drawn from the literature review chapter of this research, this chapter relies on qualitative research methods as discussed in the previous chapter. In all sections of this chapter, the researcher will analyse the selected texts, beginning with the latest publication. This means that in all sections, Zirk van der Berg's *Parts Unknown* (2018) comes first, and then followed by Jaspar Utley's *The Lie of the Land* (2017).

Firstly, the researcher will provide brief summaries of each novel, emphasizing the main characters. Secondly, the researcher will present a full discussion under the following themes: Identity, colonised-coloniser relationship, acts of rape, violence and annihilation. Finally, a conclusion summarises the chapter.

5.2. Summary of *Parts Unknown*

Set in GSWA in the genocide period 1904-1908, Zirk van den Berg's *Parts Unknown* (2018) describes five people: Siegfried Bock, a German with Jewish descent, white male, and 24 years of age. He is the protagonist. Lisbeth Löwenstein is a German lady, also with Jewish descent. Doctor Albert Pitzer is a self-professed doctor from German coming to test his assumptions in German-South West Africa. Alvaus Luipert is a native, a Nama who speaks fluent German; he was sent to German and now is a schoolmaster. Mordegai Guruseb is also a native, a Damara and prisoner who escapes from a concentration camp. The fates of these characters intertwine, and each one's humanity gets tested to the limit.

The novel begins with the feeble soldier, Siegfried Bock, who lends on the German-South West African (GSWA) soil, not at his own will, but at that of his father and Traudl's. The two fathers, despite their very different ideologies, were able to agree to send Siegfried to join the army to get him away from Traudl Dehlinger, following their disapproval of a relationship they had assumed to exist between their 'children'. Though coming to Africa was not his idea, he had convinced himself the idea might work out in his good, and that he should have an opportunity to prove those who

looked down at him. But soon after witnessing the atrocities by his army on the natives, he cannot forget the scenes and becomes disillusioned.

Lisbeth Löwenstein arrives together with Siegfried, and like him, she does not come entirely at her own will, but at that of her impoverished parents back in Germany. They had sent her to Africa to marry a man she hardly remembers, a settler who had sent them money in exchange for her hand in marriage. Though appearing innocent, with a desirable structure and notable beauty, her past reveals she went through a number of rapes and had been a prostitute back in Germany, where she had worked herself out to make ends meet for the family.

Doctor Albert Pitzer, arriving together with Siegfried and Lisbeth, considers himself a scientist who hopes to gather enough data to prove his degrading theory that the natives are savages or less human than the Germans. However, Alvaus Luipert, a local schoolmaster who stands against the doctor's arrogant assumptions and demeaning methods assembles some youths and attack the German-police station situated in his village where the doctor is housed and does to him (doctor) the exact things he does to the natives, and then causes the whole village to flee, assuming retaliation from the authorities.

Mordegai Guruseb is a native, a Damara who escapes from a concentration camp where prisoners are dying from hard labour and deprivation. Outside the concentration camp, he hopes he can survive, but it is not long before his freedom is threatened once again, he is always on the run.

5.3. Summary of *The Lie of the Land*

The novel is also set in German-South West Africa (GSWA). It depicts the German-Ovaherero and Nama war of 1904-1908, with the central character being Samuel, a linguist who occasionally acts as an agent for British intelligence. His mission in GSWA is to spy whether the Germans have intentions to take over Walvis Bay, a then British territory. Samuel is supposed to be a neutral observer, and he manages to maintain that for some time; but eventually he is forced to take sides after witnessing the atrocities of the Ovaherero and Nama genocide, and above all, he meets Leah, a young Nama woman who enchants him. It is a love story which explores the "shifting nature of the oppressor and the oppressed" (Utley, 2017).

It begins with a proverb 'old sins cast long shadows;' which implies sins should not be underestimated because they have long-term unintended consequences. The proverb fits the

context of the narration, revealing the perplexing acts of annihilation by the Germans against the Ovaherero and Nama people, and also the context of the research which analyses the conflicting nature of the colonial relationship between Germany and Namibia. Evidence is inevitable that the genocide of more than a hundred years ago has its far-reaching effects visible even today.

5.4. Identity

This section looks at identity in the two selected texts and how it affects both the colonised and coloniser. Bhabha believes that identity forms not from a self-reflection in human nature or a place to show the self in culture and nature, but in relation to the other. He states:

> The question of identification is never the affirmation of a pregiven identity, never a self-fulfilling prophecy - it is always the production of an image of identity and the transformation of the subject in assuming that image. The demand of identification - that is, to be for an other - entails the representation of the subject in the differentiating order of otherness (cited in Mostafaee 2016, p.164).

Bhabha believes that the "mirror stage" as called by Lacan, "encapsulates what happens in colonial discourse's stereotyping productions: the mirror stage is at least a good model for the colonial situation" (Mostafaee 2016, p.164). Bhabha also suggests that like "the mirror phase the fullness of the stereotype _ its image as identity _ is always threatened by lack" (Mostafaee 2016, p.164). The implication of Bhabha's statements in the context of the two selected texts is that the coloniser forcefully asserts his superiority to the colonised; the feeling of fear is created concerning identity, which is imposed on them.

The first identity encounter in *Parts Unknown* (henceforth: PU) concerns Siegfried, the protagonist who before he sets foot on Germany-South West African (GSWA) soil, he encounters a black man, who stands arm stretched, reaching out to help him (Siegfried) out of the ship. Siegfried's hesitation to extend a hand and get help from a black man, already portrays a natural dislike for blacks; the man poses no harm to him. Apparently, he knew there were black people here, but "hadn't expected to see one so soon, so close" (PU, p.9). What should Siegfried have expected to first see in a country he knew was dominated by a black population? The 'sudden' appearance of the black man makes Siegfried to ignorantly forget to even utter a word of appreciation for the help offered him. Assumptions could be made as to why Siegfried behaves as such, but it is clear that from the beginning that though he is portrayed as a good man, different from his fellow cruel German soldiers, inwardly he looks at the natives with negativity. In other words, like all the Germans,

Siegfried thinks, he is too white to get help from a black man, thus the hesitation. Eventually, he accepts the help, but says no word of appreciation. Siegfried's action here does not separate him from the other Germans, they would never ask help from a black man, but rather, they would force the black man to work for them. This supremacy 'Self' attitude Siegfried assumes at his arrival undermines the black man and makes him the 'Other'. The fact that Siegfried hesitates, but takes the opportunity is a sign that his own identity begins to trouble him.

However, this attitude is not surprising from Siegfried, because "what he had expected to find in Africa was exactly what he had found here so far – an uninviting place of discomfort and struggle, populated by savages and servants" (PU, p.44). This implies that Siegfried had in his mind an undesirable picture of Africa and its *people*, partly because he had not planned on being in Africa or GSWA. When his fellows dreamed of it as a paradise and a land of opportunity, he remained negative about it. So what he sees when he lands, only confirms what he had imagined, so he reduces the description of the natives to savages, servants and creatures of low status, just like any other German person does. This clearly shows that the picture the Germans paint about the natives is formulated in their minds; there is nothing sensible or substantial that the Germans provide to make such assumptions about the natives, it is a stereotype about the inferiority of the black race that they hold.

The Germans believed that they were turning a wild country, where warlords kill each other for scarce resources, into an orderly one where one day there will be enough for everyone (PU, p.81). The Germans intend to make use of the land they obtain for agriculture, to provide food, which they believe would be able to carter for everybody. They claim that the way it had been is not sustainable in terms of food production. They had forgotten that the natives had been self sufficient for thousands of years without the so called western or Germany farming practices. It is conflicting to claim that the country would be enough for everyone, when they are killing the natives. It is reasonable to conclude that the 'everyone' referred to are the Germans, because the natives are savages, not 'quite human.' The implication here is the coloniser looks at himself as civilised and at the colonised as uncivilised. This is because he claims to be able to bring about order. It is interesting because there is no record presented by the Germans that proves that there was disorder before they came into SWA. Kößler & Melber (2004) reveal that this attitude by the Germans; their tendency to see their human enemies as alien, or as an inferior race propelled the genocide.

The failed doctor, Albert Pitzer, who considers himself a scientist with intentions to prove his fellows back in Germany, had arrived in a small Nama village, Hochnamib, with his scientific equipment, with the intention to prove his research hypothesis that the natives were less human than the Germans. Hosted right at the police station, his subjects must comply. His study is to simply take measurements of most parts of their bodies. But this act requires each subject to come naked before him. He even sticks his fingers in their mouths to count the teeth. In other words, there is nothing that he wants to see that does not see. Stripping someone of his clothing can be equalled to taking someone's identity away from him. It is even more demeaning when a man who does it to women, it is like exposing their nakedness to a stranger.

Some of his preliminary findings were:

> "They (Namas) were a race of small people, thin boned, and the hands of the young women could be described as dainty. Their level of hygiene was found to be on the level of animals, except that many animals at least licked themselves clean" (PU, p.146).

Pitzer's research is demeaning, as suggested by its hypothesis. He wants to prove how "less human" the natives are. It is clearly meant to dishonour the natives, and partly influence German authorities to justify their barbaric acts. No one would bother to question Germany's actions against the natives if it is proved that they are animals. It is conflicting that even his conclusions seem to suggest to him that they are human already, he can clearly identify that this is a 'young woman.' And he talks about hygiene, which proves nothing as far as his theory is concerned. Dirty, unhygienic people are found everywhere. By suggesting that the natives are "less human," he is clearly saying they are animals. He confessed that he was not looking at them as individuals, but was only interested in them as a racial group. He also concludes that the natives are "lower life forms" (PU, p.147). Pitzer is conflicting in the sense that he believes the blacks are a race, implying that they are humans who are just different from him in terms of colour.

Following an encounter, when he is struck hard in the face by young mother, after he had also struck her child's face after biting his fingers for performing a teeth count (PU, p.146); Dudeck, the police station head, ignorant of the fact that Pitzer had struck the innocent baby first, reasons that the mother should be punished for her attack at him.

> "We can't let cheekiness go unpunished or we'll soon have a rebellion on our hands. If a dog nips your hand, you have to punish it right there and then, so it knows who's boss. The people are primitive and understand only violence (PU, p.147).

The police, who are supposed to protect the people, seem only to protect the interests of the Germans. Dudeck, without listening to the native lady's side decides already that she deserves to be punished, and he does not seem to target one individual who had an encounter with Pitzer, but his threats go to the whole native village of Hochnamib. The fact that he admits they are capable of rebelling against them does not testify Pitzer's innocence in the matter. It is also unfair that Dudeck concludes the matter in favour of Pitzer, when in truth he gave the slap first to the child. The officer is taking away the voices of the native people: how can they speak when they are not heard. This concept is discussed by Spivak, who asks: "Can the subaltern speak? Will she be heard?" (Sawant, 2012, p.124). She concludes that the Subaltern cannot speak because their words cannot be properly interpreted, thus the silence is the result of interpretation, and not articulation. The result of this is seen as all the natives flee the Hochnamib village. The reason is that they know that the police will not listen to their side of the story.

Pitzer claimed to have been studying genetics; the development of the human race, analysing and comparing the backward races of Africa with the highly advanced state in Europe (PU, p.148). This statement from Pitzer is conflicting because he begins to call them "backward races of Africa" before his research, which raises a question: if he really believes they are backward, why should research be carried out? His research is conflicting and biased in its nature, because it is about black and whites races, when the researcher is white. It is not surprising that his hypothesis seems to favour that the white race is superior to the black. Again we see the same principle repeated by the Germans, as Brel (2005) argues, that inferiority complex painted over the black 'Other' (Ovagerero and Nama) is seen a suitable and fitting in his capacity (p.158).

Dudeck is one of those people who believe in taking over the native land, he contemplates buying a farm and settling in here, after his services are no longer required. He does not mention returning to Germany. In his confession: "I've never owned land, but I think there can't be many things to beat it" (PU, p.150); it is shown the hunger for land the Germans posess. He does not express clearly how he will get the farm; the expression to get land does not obviously imply buying land. The confession reveals Dudeck's sad identity. How can he consider himself superior when he has no land? What is he superior in or about? Mostafaee (2016, p.164) refers to this conflicting situation a feeling of megalomania and atonement, which arises in characters so that colonisers feel that they are superior in affinity with blacks, while at the same time there also exists the feeling of atonement, which pose a threat to colonisers, thus this new identity seeks maintenance and dominance, which will lead to more aggression and oppression of the natives.

Alvaus Luipert, the school master and most learned Nama in Hochnamib village, after getting naked before Pitzer for 'apparently' research purposes, is commended for his hygiene after an examination of his body shows cleanliness. Luipert admits hygiene and some "many great things" are from the whites, he is basically admitting that civilisation is from the whites (PU, p.152). Luipert, who actually leant to speak the language, had been to Germany for six months. The fact that he speaks the white man's language makes him a threat. "He behaves as if that makes him our equal" (PU, p.154). The Germans who reasoned to rid the natives of their indigenous languages and cultures and impose their own now feel unsafe at the fact that a native understands their language. Though it is supposed to be a positive thing, they feel he has gotten too Germany, so they are threatened to share a language with a native.

Pitzer reasoned that his research subjects being alive did not allow him to go further into his study, because they would lie to him when asked questions. Dudeck, does not hesitate to suggest that they should get dead bodies (PU, p.154). When Dudeck suggest "dead bodies," he implies that they should kill Namas and bring to Pitzer for research purposes.

> "The size and shape of the cranial was key to his work. If he could get hold of a couple of heads [...] He could complete his research, prove his theory, and earn glory. Pitzer imagined himself in a lecture hall, showing the audience that skull. He would remember the man whose head it had been. And he would know that this was not only vindication of his thesis, but also revenge for the humiliation he had suffered (PU, p.247).

Pitzer seems to do the research for his personal glory. He is interested in Luipert's skull in particular for revenge; which is very conflicting because being with an enemy's skull does not cause that person any pain or shame, he is dead. Also, proving that the his race is the most evolved and that the natives are closer to more primitive life forms will justify what the Germans are doing in the country and the other colonies, and affirm that they are their rightful masters (PU, p.250).

Luipert brought in to Pitzer a few young men, supposedly to be examined, but their real intention was to do to Pitzer what he had been doing to the whole village; strip him naked, and measure everything about him.

> "We only want to take a few measurements to ensure that we're dealing with a human being.**'** They took off all his clothes, including underpants, socks and shoes from him. 'Pitzer felt humiliated beyond belief. It was demeaning to lie like this, his dignity stripped away together with his clothes" (PU, p.158).

Pitzer was humiliated, and when Pitzer threatened that they would never get away with it. The reply was: “Remember, we have done nothing to you that you have not done first, to us and our parents and wives and children. He felt disrespected, even raped” (PU, p.159). Luipert further reminded Pitzer about the Colonial Exhibition in Berlin where the audience expected him to act like a monkey, but could not, and instead recited Goethe. “We may have Goethe or Bach, but this country did not spring into existence the moment you set foot here” (PU, p.160). Luipert concluded saying it is sad and pathetic when a man tries to justify his own worth, and the only measure he can produce is the race into which he was born (PU, p.161). This statement by Luipert reveals that race is nothing to be proud of; because it is something one cannot change. Pitzer’s dignity had been stripped off him, lying there naked in his own excrement. He had spent the last two hours washing himself and the table, disgusted by the evidence of his base humanity (PU, p.169). Pitzer reasoned that he should shift his research from the Nama to the Damara. He hadn’t taken much notice of this tribe before, but during his time here, he had learned that they were the most primitive of local people, so backward that even the other tribes looked down on them (PU, p.171). Possibly it was the result of fear that Pitzer was directing his research to another tribe, the Damaras, but still it would not make sense because they were already looked down upon, even by other native tribes.

There was no unity among the natives; the Germans found that there were already divisions and tribal wars. Chaibis, the place where Mordegai had settled with Lisbeth and her farm workers was destabilised when Luipert and the entire Namas of Hochnamib village appeared. Their presence made Mordegai feel that it was not his place any more, he and his people, the Damaras, were outnumbered.

> “Just like the Hereros, the Namas had always treated Damaras as underlings, and he had overheard murmurings among the newcomers who resented sharing with the Xou-Daman, the Shit-People, as they referred to his tribe (PU, p.202).

The Damaras were seen as the lowest of life’s form, to the extent that even other black people undermined them. They were the ‘Other’ created by both the locals and the Germans. Immediately after settling at Chaibis, they started mistreating the Damaras they had found there, who had accommodated them. This conflicting nature of the natives does not allow them to hold together and fight outside forces like the Germans.

Lisbeth, whose Germany background is something she desires to forget because of the oppression, felt so comfortable in Chaibis, an African wilderness where they were settling with Mordegai. There were “no white men around, for the first time, she felt free of the oppression of men. Mordegai treated her as an equal” (PU, p.183). Here, the writer portrays German man as oppressors, not only

to the natives here in GSWA, but to the women back in Germany. This patriarchal domination is seen when they come into Africa, women are molested and raped by the soldiers. This passage also has the implication that she was not free or happy in her own marriage here in Africa, which is not surprising because she hardly knew the man. Even after learning about the death of her husband, she does not show remorse, because she was just getting to know the man.

Alvaus Luipert had written the following: "How do you keep your humanity in fundamentally inhumane circumstances?" (PU, p.234). Siegfried thought hard about Luipert's words, and knew that his own situation was undoubtedly worse, because in a way, it was less complicated if one was the victim of injustice, like Luipert – one would easily choose to rebel. But what would one do when one was part of the establishment that perpetrates the evil, as its instrument or even as a beneficiary? Does one turn on one's own people and culture, or does one stay quiet and work insidiously to further the cause of justice (PU, p.234)? This troubled Siegfried, because it was just a matter of time, from the way things were moving, that he would have to make a decision that would require him to turn against his own Germany army if he intends to further the course of justice. The truth of it struck Siegfried, that "in his attempt to save the lives of these people," that is, the Namas who were with Mordegai at Chaibis, "he might have led his countrymen to their death" (PU, p.268).

Like Mordegai, a Damara who shoots two of his own people to save the life of a German woman, Lisbeth. Siegfried had a very similar encounter, eventually, he had to face his fears and fight Grajek in attempt to save Mordegai's life. This ended up in the death of Grajek (PU, p.282). Though Siegfried admitted that most of his fellow soldiers were not like the rapist and cruel Grajek; that they were simply men who did what they were told, he still believed that they were guilty of the sin he called "the weakness of all men: being human and ignorant" (PU, p.270). This implies that they had the power of choice; just as they were able to blind their eyes to their morals, they should have been able to ignore such command and stand like he did. In the end, he remarked that this war took a special kind of man; "the kind who'd murder innocent people" (PU, p.275). For Siegfried, it was not a normal thing to murder innocent people, he did not have to kill, but witnessing such atrocities was enough for him to make a clear decision. But for most German soldiers, as long as the command came from the top, they would execute. He concurred with Isa Viitanen who had said that the Germans' very presence in Africa was in itself an injustice, but instead of thinking it was not something he could undo, he took the necessary steps to at least relieve himself from the army, so that he does not see the atrocities committed, but he could not escape because the war was all over. When he could not escape witnessing these crimes, he eventually confronted the perpetrator.

The conversation between Luipert and Mordegai reveal two conflicting ideas which rise as Mordegai, sensing the danger to fall on camp Chaibis, sends Lisbeth's workers back to the white man's farm 'for their safety' (PU, p.244).

> 'You're sending people back into slavery.' Alvaus Luipert's hand clutched at his forehead now.
>
> 'I've seen slavery. The farm is not so bad.'
>
> 'Why should our people work for the whites on land that is rightfully our own? I want our people to be free.' (PU, p.244).

Luipert, on the one hand, disputes working for the white man, and calls it slavery, especially in Africa on a black man's land. He advocates for freedom, and does not believe that it can ever be attained if blacks work for whites. Mordegai, on the other hand, who had seen depth of the war, and had been to the concentration camp understands the nature of the war, and thus argues that to be found on a white man's farm and work for him is better than to be dead. Luipert has no experience in war, so, he is deceived to think that the few youths with him can help him fight against the Germans.

Dudeck's observation over Feinauer's decision to marry a black woman is conflicting. He says that "Feinauer developed a taste for dark chocolate" (PU, p.111). The statement is conflicting in the sense that the metaphor used "dark chocolate" implies that black women are sweet; at least that is what we know about chocolate. While sounding disapproving of Feinauer's behaviour, he admits that the woman he married is good. There is no sense in discouraging someone from getting "dark chocolate" without giving a negative reason about it. The implication of Dudeck's words to himself is that he has also the desire for black women, he would have used ugly words to describe Dudeck's wife, but, instead he uses a positively powerful metaphor. The conflict is that he admires black women, and yet sound negative about a white male who marries one.

In *The Lie of the Land* (henceforth: TLOL) there is an effort from the Germans to suppress the culture of the natives and bring about the so called 'civilisation.' The theme of identity first appears through the exploration of language. It cannot be denied that culture is imbued in language. Krishnamurthy (2018:398) states that language is not merely a means of communication but a repository of knowledge and culture. She argues further that to deny people their language is to deny them their identity and existence (p.398). The Germans believed that if they knew and spoke the native languages, it would propel their intention for civilisation with promptness. The advantage would be that communication is not impeded.

> "Learning the languages of the savages might well be a good thing as it will not be long before they fully accept German civilisation and our language. You must examine their heathen tongue before they vanish altogether" (TLOL, p.5).

The concept of repulsions and desires is seen in the statement above, in the sense that the Germans have interest in learning native languages, but at the same time intend to exterminate its speakers and also the language itself. This makes their intention conflicting because there seem to be no benefit in learning a language, when one intends to completely get rid of it. The statement also allows readers to deduce that the Germans intended to use the native languages to infiltrate the natives, so that they would get access to land. A language defines identity, for a native to hear his language spoken by the Germans; it would create mixed feelings about the identity of the Germans. It will bring conflicting questions: what does he (a German) intend to do with my language? Or, does he want to be part of us? Learning someone's language implies that you have interest in them, but clearly, we know the Germans had no interest in the natives, but had interest in the natives' resources. The statement also identifies the natives as 'savages,' which implies animals, and their language as 'heathen tongues.' A heathen tongue points to a language not spoken by humans.' Why would the German attempt such a language? The conclusion is unavoidable, that they had other interests.

The Namas never felt comfortable being called Hottentots. In fact, Thomas, a Nama who transported Samuel to GSWA from Walvis Bay expressed his resentment towards the term. According to Thomas, the Germans and the people in the Cape Colony, referring to the British in South Africa call his people Hottentots. "I don't like the name. We call ourselves Nama" (TLOL, p.21). He appealed to Samuel to use their rightful name, Nama. This suggests that identity is an important aspect.

A Nama man, after seeing despicable acts by the Germans in Lüderitz Bay, describes it as a "place of pain and darkness. It is the home of the dead and the near dead" (TLOL, p.109). He was convinced that none of his people would willingly go there. Even a white man, like Samuel, the Nama man felt he needed to protect his spirit (TLOL, p.126). In the trains, they (Ovaherero and Namas) would be carried like goods. "They don't need tickets, of course. Do we give tickets to cows and sheep?" (TLOL, p.127). The likening of the natives to the animals again comes out, just to emphasize that they are not human, over and over. Here we see 'othering' again; a concept that according to Ahmed (2020, p.53) the 'Orient' or 'non-Europeans' along with their specific traditional cultures are presented as the unreachable, uncivilised, unreasonable, mysterious, barbaric, and backward terming them as the 'Other' whereas the 'Occident' or the 'Europeans' especially the white western

people including their cultures are unquestionably considered as more reachable, civilised, reasonable and advanced in terming themselves.

5.5. Colonised-coloniser relationship

Ahmed (2020) believes that the colonised-coloniser relationship is always characterised by "the colonial practices of master and slave and European and native, the colonised 'others' resist and rebel against power of the coloniser" (p.53).

"As soon as the crane set down goods on the jetty, they were picked up and carried landward by black men in oversized clothes." Meanwhile, "a sergeant (white) stood on the jetty with a pencil and a note book" (PU, p.9). The description of the nature of work done by the natives (blacks) and the whites is very distinct; the black men carry heavy goods offloaded by a 'crane,' while the white sergeant stands just to take records. This suggests the white man has supervisory power over the black men, thus that the relationship between them is indeed that of a master and slave.

> From the haze, a black woman appeared, wearing an unbleached canvas cloak, leaning forward, holding a thick rope over her shoulder. Behind her was another woman, hauling a rope with another [...] something moved beside him, a second raw of women echoing the first. And then the heavily laden cart they were hauling came to view. A uniformed man sat on the driver's seat, idly playing with a whip in the wind (PU, p.11).

This is one of the first scenes Siegfried witnesses that reveal the inhumane treatment of black people at the hands of the Germans, in this particular case, it is women who suffer abuse. The job these women do, whether remunerated for or not, must be done by animals, period! What is striking about the character of the white man in the driver's seat is that he has with him a whip, portraying an exact picture of a man with his animals yoked, guiding them wherever he desires. It therefore does not surprise for the Germans to call the natives animals, because that is exactly what they had made them be. Siegfried reasons later on, that those women seemed to have been literally "stripped of their will to live, reduced to reticent, and silently suffering beasts of burden" (PU, p.58). The fact that he mentions them suffering in silence implies that they do not have a voice, they cannot complain. Even when they speak, they cannot be heard, because the he holds a whip, which implies oppression and force, so their voice is suppressed as well. Siegfried goes further to call them "emaciated, broken, creatures from the underworld" (PU, p.58). Underworld is synonymous to hell

and hades, implying that they are less than human, and do not deserve to live on earth. Siegfried may have looked at German rule and oppression with distaste, but views and assumptions over the plight of the natives show that he does not sympathise with them. He still stands as a neutral individual or observer who does nothing about the overwhelmingly disgusting scenes he witnesses.

Mordegai's expression of joy over the fact that his previous oppressors, the Ovaherero are also now oppressed is conflicting in the sense that he expresses happiness in the extermination order which awaits him as well. The joys come because as a Damara, his people had long been subject to the Hereros, tending their goats. Now, the reality was that they were all being exterminated (PU, p.13). Mordegai simply wants the Ovaherero to feel how he and his people felt, when they made them servants. "These people had been at war with other tribes for decades, and it seemed that after every setback they came back more determined to free their country from the European invaders" (PU, p.61). The conflicting nature of the relationship among blacks allowed the Germans to manipulate and destabilise the natives even more. The Germans seem to understand that they are invaders, and though they claimed that the natives were nothing but savages, they respected the fact that 'these people' had fought many battles to be free. This portrays a sense of fear in the Germans, because they knew that though the natives may encounter setbacks, history showed that they would come back very strongly.

When Siegfried gets to Windhoek, it amazes him that so many of their support personnel are blacks when the war is being waged between races. It seemed to him that "whatever their racial alliances, many individuals saw benefits for themselves in helping Germans" (PU, p.76). The conduct of the natives was conflicting; he wondered why the natives continued to work for the white people who were killing their people. However, it was because the Germans had planned everything well; they caused so much deprivation in the people, so much so that the natives had to go back to the Germans in order to work for food in order to survive.

The Germans were interested in getting the land for themselves, many of Siegfried's countrymen believed that the colonial empire was a paradise of owe-inspiring scenery, exotic people and animals, not to mention great riches. For them, Africa was the romantic dream of a lost childhood, of innocence and adventure. This perception about Africa is interesting because it suggests an uninhabited place, and such a conclusion is draw from the use of words such as lost childhood, innocence and adventure. They would take the land, and in doing so exalt their pitiful lives to something grandiose (PU, p.43). They perceived Africa as an empty place; the natives were not in the

picture. In Siegfried's eyes, however, it was difficult to bear the merciless heat and the lack of civilisation. This shows that they were Germans who hand interest in the land; they had not only come to be soldiers, but intended to stay, and retire here. And there were those like Siegfried, who were here only for war, never intending to settle. Lieutenant Berghammer also did not have intentions to settle here, he tells Siegfried that he does not "want to die in this godforsaken place" (PU, p.75). This attitude is conflicting in the sense that it is on this same land where they feel that the natives should be kicked off. In other words, the natives are viewed as inferior, savages undeserving of the good of the land.

As white people celebrated Lisbeth's wedding, there was a group of black children in a distance, sitting under a tree, watching the white people cavort. As it got dark, and the black children were also coming closer, Lisbeth walked over to them and took one of the girls by the hand. 'Come. All of you.' She led them to the dance floor, and a bush fell over the guests (PU, p.54). One may understand why, Lisbeth has sympathy towards the black children; she is described as a "woman of low birth," which reveals that she grew up in a struggling family back in Germany (PU, p.46). She did not look at herself as very different from the black, she identified with them.

When Herr Kamre fell off his horse and died in an encounter with Mordegai, the later is portrayed as less evil than the Germans, because he has no intention to kill (Pg.98-99). The conversation below between Eva and Lisbeth reveals that the relationship between the whites and blacks is conflicting; there is a tendency to blame the blacks for every wrong act. There is also an attitude to silence the natives, because, when they express themselves, they are not heard, and the reason is very simple, because they are blacks.

> 'He was worried the police would think one of us had killed Herr Kamke .'
>
> 'But why?'
>
> 'We're black, he was white.'
>
> 'If I believe you, why won't the police?'
>
> Still Eva didn't look her in the eye. 'You haven't been here long' (Pg.128).

In this encounter, all the native workers on the farm had to disappear to avoid getting accused of having killed their boss. Lisbeth is surprised by the thinking that the police will not believe a native, and yet they are the law enforcement. How can their policing be fair if they take only one side?

After the death of Herr Kamke, the Damaras took Lisbeth with because they were afraid she would talk. Nevertheless, they treated her with deference; the habit was hard to break. Though it is

suggested that their politeness to her was as a result of habits they had developed during their stay at her farm, it could also be that they had received the same kind of treatment from her at the farm. This level of tolerance from the natives is conflicting, accommodating someone who is at war with you. The only exception is the leader, Mordegai, he did not disrespect her, but afforded her no special treatment and ignored her most of the time. He was the one who had locked her in the trunk and later abducted her. The Damaras are portrayed as better people, different from the Germans and Ovaherero and Nama people. He behaved correctly though, given that she was in his power and, to his mind, probably an enemy of some sort. He could have taken her as the spoils of war, but she never had impression that this had even crossed his mind. Lisbeth knew what had brought about her presence, if anything; she felt a burden to him (PU, p.119). She was a problem, and though he knew he would have to get rid of her, he didn't know how. If he took her back to her people, she would talk. If he left her in the wilderness, she would die. If he kept her here, he would be reminded day after day of white people (PU, p.128). Mordegai, in his reasoning does not portray hatred for whites, at the same time; he confesses that having Lisbeth around in the camp reminded him of "white people." What he remembers about white people is their brutality; because that is what they have showed him, and the sight of innocent Lisbeth would just be bring such brutalities fresh before him. So, while the boy Abel tied up the two German soldiers who had appeared in search of Lisbeth, Mordegai comes over to her:

> 'This is your fault. I cannot let them go back now, because that will bring many soldiers.'
>
> 'They don't deserve to be captured or to die.'
>
> 'I have seen many captured and dead who deserved it less,' he objected.
>
> He talked to her not as a person, but merely as a representative of a race.
>
> 'We have to be better people than that,' she said.

In their brief conversation, Lisbeth knows how reasonable and humane Mordegai is, and challenges him that such innocent soldiers do not deserve to die. The statement is conflicting in the sense that Lisbeth cannot really testify in truth of their innocence, unless she argues that they had not threatened anyone. And that as well may not be a valued argument because they did not know Lisbeth was here, had they had the opportunity to know, they would have taken a different approach. So, to declare them innocent would be too quick. After all, the fact that they had not killed anyone here in the camp does not mean they are innocent; they may have killed some black people the day before. However, Mordegai who had seen so many innocent lives lost reveals to her that many people in this war, who deserved it less, had been killed. This he implies those who never

bore arm against the Germans, who can be said were never even part of the war, but were shot and killed anyways, old men, women and children.

He continues:

> "Have you seen what your army does? If they come, there is not one person here who'll be alive a year from now. Those children will be dead. Their mothers will be dead. The lucky men will die before they see any of these things happen to the ones they love' (PU, p.130).

These are the actions of the German army Mordegai had witnessed all along, so to tell him now that based on "innocence," he must not do anything to the police men, would be stimulating his anger and reminding him about the really innocent people who had died without cause. He challenges her that if he decided to be good and let these soldiers go free, it would bring about terrible suffering upon the camp because they would come back with a whole army, which would come and kill everyone. He then asks her what good that would bring about (PU, p.131).

As Siegfried conversed with Lisbeth about her knowledge over the death of a husband she hardly knew, she tells him what that it was an accident, and the reason everyone had decided to leave the farm is that they were worried that any of them would be held accountable for his death. Asked whether she believed that it was an accident, she replies:

> "I don't think Eva would lie to me, and not Mordegai either. In his way, he's an upright man. It's strange to say this of someone who abducted me, but it seems that he did this out of necessity rather than malice. He's always been fair to me" (PU, p.137).

It is amazing how, in her short encounter with Mordegai, she has learned to trust him. She also has full trust in Eva, her assigned handmaid that she would never lie to her. This shows how a relationship has been created among these people, they have defied race, and their anger about the current war and learned to tolerate each other based on their innocence towards each other. She even tells Siegfried that her abduction was the only solution Mordegai had. She makes clear that his intentions had not been and would never be to harm her. A little walk and talk away from the others by Siegfried and Mordegai sees the two police men freed, leaving Lisbeth standing beautifully and smiling bravely, to their discomfort (PU, p.138).

When every other German distasted the natives, Siegfried found in Mordegai a friend, someone he liked. "Siegfried felt an extraordinary affinity with Mordegai Guruseb. Separated by nations and notions, they still found some commonality" (PU, p.172). There is indeed a special likeness between the two, they both hate the evil happening in the country, and they favour justice. Unlike every other German in GSWA, but Siegfried was not sure how to relate to the natives that he encountered

in everyday situations; “he wasn’t yet comfortable with the assumed superiority of his race, but worried that if he were too familiar, it might weaken his position” (PU, p.187). Siegfried has a conflicting nature within himself, he does not want to accept that he is superior over the blacks, at the same time, he is worried that should he appear equal in relation to the natives, maybe they will not take him serious as a police officer. It is interesting that he worries about how that will affect his official role, that of being a police officer within the community, and not his personal capacity as a German or white. This is the same Siegfried, who upon his arrival and first encounter with a black man shows hesitation to receive help from a black person; the hesitation perhaps testified the role he intended to keep in the community. In other words, if he accepted an offer to be helped by a black man, would that make him a weak soldier or police officer? This was the nature of the battle within him. He finds himself negotiating between the space, to be like other German, or to keep his the morals he had brought with.

“‘I was here before you people and by the looks of it I might be here after you’ve gone. I bring things that the people want,’ Van Jaarsveld, the trader said” (PU, p.211). The presence of traders meant that people enjoyed buying goods from the whites, in the name of civilisation. Taking into consideration that the two races were at war, was it fair to support white businesses? This is the question. As long as white businesses were running, the white would also remain in the country. Were their clothes even needed? What had the people been wearing before the whites came? This shows a rather conflicting nature in the natives’ character, because they desire to own and use German made products, and yet distaste the Germans. The natives imply that they love the services offered by the Germans, but hate them. It is a strong sense of repulsion and desire.

“This country needs more women, so that the men won’t bother black girls, like Feinauer” (PU, p.215). The statement, drawn from the conversation between Lisbeth and her host reveals that white or German women are jealous about the fact that their men are going for black girls. One wonders whether it is a race issue or an issue of jealousy. Does Lisbeth’s host say this because she does not want the whites to mix with the blacks? She obviously disapproves Feinauer’s marriage to a black girl. Jealousy should not be the issue because she is married; it is not that she is missing on something.

The conversation between Isa Viitanen, Reverend Viitanen’s daughter, who knew the whereabouts of Luipert shows her disapproval of the oppression of the Germans upon the natives in the country. “‘Something I’ve learned here – these people don’t need us,’ said Isa” (PU, p.225). Isa believes that the natives can do just fine without any foreigners. It makes more sense from a historical point of view, colonisation is not necessary. This also questions the reference of savages at the natives. Isa’s

argument is that the natives had lived here in the country for hundreds of years without the Germans. There should be nothing to suggest that the natives may need the Germans.

The story ends with Pitzer treating Mordegai's bullet wound. This is something he admits he had never thought would happen (PU, p.291). His help was preceded by the doubt, which Siegfried countered with a promise for a skull. It is safe thus to conclude that he only helped in exchange for the skull.

The Lie of the Land, like *Parts Unkown*, reveals that there was wars between the Ovaherero and the Nama people. The Herero are the ones to watch: they dominate the centre of the country and they are resistant to our people acquiring land and cattle although their land is ideal for settlement. To penetrate the natives, the Germans used such divisions and Christianity as opportunities. According to Mostafaee (2016, p.165), white missionaries make endeavour to change the religion of the natives into Christianity by forcing them to emulate how to read the Bible. In fact, Bhabha asks a fundamental question in *The Location of Culture* concerning the spread of the English Bible in India: "how can the word of God come from the flesh-eating mouths of the English?"

"Our missionaries are doing sterling work to educate them to our ways" (TLOL, p.6). Apart from using force, the Germans also used the Christian religion to propel their agenda. It clearly reveals that the Ovaherero did not want to sell their land and cattle to the Germans; missionaries were therefore brought in to brainwash the natives, to 'educate them to our way,' and not the Bible's way. It is therefore true that missionaries, in particular, acted as "frontiersmen" for the armies and settlers to oppress the locals. The acceptance of a new religion meant that they lose or sacrifice their dignity in part. The Ovaherero's denial is partly what led to most of their cattle to be "swindled away" from them (TLOL, p.6).

However, the nature of the missionaries was also conflicting, and led to distrust from the Germans. The Germans supposed that missionaries were only necessary if they converted the natives to the Germans' way of thinking. They were convinced that this conversion would make the natives more submissive. But the Germans feared that the missionaries in their education of the natives sometimes gave them the idea that they were equal to the Germans, and this equality was presumed to lead to insubordination and uprisings (TLOL, p.7). This supposition from the German army placed the missionaries in a position where they had to take sides in the war. They were to teach word of God in truth, or use it as a means to oppress as desired by the German army. They were trying to negotiate their space in the war.

Furthermore, it is stated later on in the story that missionaries were already buzzing into the country leaving no doubt that "the native inhabitants would soon be colonised body and soul just as they have been in South Africa" (TLOL, p.30). This statement is explicit about the work of missionaries in GSWA; it reveals their true nature and intention. It cannot be denied that they were responsible for preparing the natives for colonisation. The army supported Samuel's initiative to study the native languages thinking that the more people learn the native language, the more they could "translate God's word for the benefit of the pagans in this country" (TLOL, p.38). Meanwhile, they promoted a religion of meekness, humility, contentment and all the other virtues that would turn a person to total submission. This statement is rather conflicting, because the same people who claim to bring this 'good news' do not seem to live up to these virtues. The missionaries selected texts from the Bible that were suitable for their course, and used those to bring the natives into slavery.

Reichs Kommisser's way of instituting order in GSWA presents an unconventional form. He believes the best way to deal with the natives is at a gun point. By this he implies that negotiations with the natives are fruitless, not because of the problem of language, but because he perceives them as "unruly and uncivilised" (TLOL, p.5).

Land is portrayed as the main reason that caused the Ovaherero uprising against the German settlers and armies. Taking into consideration that land and cattle were probably the only riches the natives had, they were determined to fight for them. "The natives have had their lands taken away from them" (TLOL, p.16). What worsened the issue is that the Germans failed to handle the issue with caution. "The Germans have been none too gentle about it and have stirred a lot of resentment. It'll be a bloody business" (TLOL, p.17). The Germans used force, and this in turn led the native to resent them and their ways. And, as far as their confrontation with the natives was concerned, morals were not needed. Whatever they thought could be done to get what they wanted and to silence the victims, they did, calling it "scratch to survive" (TLOL, p.19).

The Germans violated the rights of the blacks who worked for them, they were cruel to them, and their motive was to instil fear.

> As fast as a striking mamba, Hartmann's arm whipped out and struck the young gardener full in the face. He must have worn a ring, for immediately a fierce cut appeared on the lad's cheek. He staggered back a couple of paces, tripped over his rake and landed on his ragged rear upon the stony soil. His face was confronted with fear and pain (TLOL, p.29).

This reveals the conflicting nature of the relationship between the Germans and the natives. The Germans need the blacks as workers, and yet, they oppress them and abuse them. The character of

the black man is conflicting because of the service he offers, he works for the white man, who is hunting and killing other natives. Much more abuse follow as Hartmann hits his gardener who had not heeded to his command in haste as expected by his master. The gardener had been instructed to clean up skulls and park them into boxes, and this had to happen because the authorities were demanding them to use in German to study. “And if you damage them, I’ll damage you. Lazy stupid idiot. These people are useless” (TLOL, p.33). Here, Hartmann sounds to overprotect the skull of a black person, but distaste the black gardener who helps in the garden. The conclusion is that, he treats the skull special, because it is like a medallion.

The strategy carried out by the Ovaherero in the war shows that they had one intention, to get back their lands. This is because they only targeted the Germans who owned land and those who fought against them. They said they “will attack only German settlers and soldiers and leave missionaries and the English alones” (TLOL, p.35). This gives insight to how different the two groups perceived this war. For the Germans, Von Trotha’s Extermination Order was to execute all, and for women and children, he specified to fire above their heads. For the Ovaherero and Namas, it was aimed at the German settler (farmers), excluding women and children, and on the German army. The English were also specified to be spared. In conclusion, for the Germans, the intention was to destroy the nation, to commit genocide. But for the Ovaherero and Namas, it was about getting back what was rightfully theirs. Had it been returned to them promptly, they would not have been any annihilation.

It is not surprising that the natives felt they had no identity, even inside the ship when Sam had taken Leah to the toilets; he was reprimanded and reminded where the toilets for blacks were. “Toilets for blacks are down below. Take your boy away” (TLOL, p.163). At hospital, in Walvis Bay, British territory, a doctor told him that there were “no isolation wards for the black” people. The same doctor reminded him to expect death. “I’m afraid you must prepare for the worst” (TLOL, p.166).

Reverend Karl Martin, who serves the natives, upon realising that Samuel was among the villagers feels obliged to ‘rescue him from the natives, suggesting that they were too poor to host a white man, he even calls them ‘heathens,’ the same people he ministers to (TLOL, p.174).

5.6. Acts of rape, violence and annihilation

In this section, we look at some acts of the Germans in GSWA, to show the intention of the army and to prove whether they were genocidal. Bargueño (2012, p.396) presents and analyses the three most persuasive arguments for reparations for the Herero genocide commonly encountered in

genocide studies, Namibian and international history, and international law. He does this to confirm that the acts by the Germans were not ordinary. He states that the most common position begins by explaining how the German colonial administration committed genocide. Second, he says the legal historians and lawyers argue that the customary international law of the early twentieth century, in addition to bilateral and multilateral treaties of that period, forbade mass killings such as that of the Herero community, a violation for which Germany should now be held accountable. Third, historians cast light on the parallels and linkages between the Holocaust and the Ovaherero and Nama genocide, and then compare the successes of Jewish claims with the failures of the Ovaherero and Namas. Often the latter are explained by racism and the fact that "the Jews are White; we are Black"(p.396).

"Grajek took the woman's breast in his two hands, gave it a squeeze until a white drop appeared on the black nipple. 'Anyone for milk?' The big man was laying on top of the woman now, hands over her mouth" (PU, p.68 & 69). German soldiers are portrayed to inflict needless pain to an innocent Nama woman, and make fun out of her breasts, before she is eventually raped by Grajek. This act of rape shows an unusually hush or cruel desire for sex. Cruel in the sense that there is an act of violence prior to the act of the rape, his subject is despised, she is an 'object.' His action after the rape confirms this; he gets rid of her by strangling her. In fact, the record suggests that she was being strangled during sex. Grajek action shows mixed feelings, he desires to have sex with the Nama woman, but distastes her to the extent of killing her.

After witnessing the rape and murder of this Nama woman, Siegfried had mixed feelings within himself, he asked whether this was simply the way this war was being fought, and thought about the encounter with a white lady whose husband had been killed by the Namas. He was certain that that had also been done to her, "they may have raped the woman." But wondered why it had not filled him with the same outrage as the rape and murder of the Nama woman behind the dune (PU, p.73)?

> "Perhaps because he had seen it happen, and had been unable to stop it, unable to do something bolder and smarter than making pathetic appeals to the higher selves of people intent on giving their worst impulses free rein" (PU, p.73).

Siegfried comforted himself by comparing the rape to the killing of the baby, reasoning that what had happened to the woman was no less evil, because she, at least, must have been able to understand that she was confronted by a handful of bad men. After all, it was rape, which must have been a common thing in time of the war. But, that child he thought "had no idea that its life wasn't

the entire universe, and that what was being done to him was only an aberration." Siegfried saw that evil had indeed filled that child's entire world (PU, p.73).

In reference to the woman's rape, and the soldiers' murder of the baby, Siegfried labelled the soldiers as 'animals,' which do not deserve to live among men. He suggested that they should either be killed or be in prison. "These animals ought to be locked up, or worse" (PU, p.71).

Siegfried was haunted not by the rape alone, but also by murder of that Nama family, flashbacks assailed him constantly, they were triggered by the most trivial sight or sound. He struggled with the thought that the abhorrent crimes were probably done for "military reasons, to extract information and not for revenge" (PU, p.73). Though he comforted himself with the fact that the Nama did the same thing to the Germans, because he had heard many tales of captured German soldiers being tortured to death, with ears and genitals hacked off and eyes gouged out, it was clear that witnessing the events had affected him much more than it had when merely heard them being spoken or thought of them being done.

To affirm his thinking and doubt, when he complained to Lieutenant Berghammer, he was plainly told that he had not experienced it yet. In fact, he was told that those were acts of bravery and that they needed to count on him and every other man "to be true and brave" (PU, p.75). This, of course, is conflicting because he was being truthful, but being truthful in the Lieutenant's sense was standing together with the army, and not necessarily doing something morally right.

> "I don't approve of what you say those men did, nobody would, but the enemy aren't angels either – just ask some of the settlers' wives and daughters. When men are asked to break the most sacred of taboos, to kill other people, other morals fall by the wayside too. It cannot be otherwise" (PU, p.75).

The Lieutenant, who had always emphasised unity in the army, justifies the actions of his men, reasoning that the enemy does the same thing. Then the Lieutenant utters a very conflicting statement, that there are no morals in war. From the general standpoint, it makes sense, because if one keeps one's morals, one may not even fire a single shot at the enemy. However, should war amount to the random shooting of innocent people? Siegfried would not buy the Lieutenant's argument anyways, and insisted that he would take the issue further.

They have been many questions concerning the Ovaherero and Nama genocide, such as whether it is indeed genocide, who fired the first shot and the nature of crimes committed at the time.

> The people of the protectorate are nervous. Settlers have been killed, one hundred and twenty-six of our countrymen in the first days of the Herero uprising alone, innocent people slain in their beds and homes and places of work, women and children among them, good people. Our people want to see the Fatherland deal with these rebels (PU, p.13).

With this the writer leads the readers to believe that the Ovaherero fired the first shot. It implies that German actions were acts of retaliation to the cruelty done to their innocent men, women and children. It suggests that the acts of the Ovaherero had made Germany unhappy, hence, the reaction. The fact that the natives are referred to as 'rebels,' confirms the assumption that the natives had fired first. Whether it is true or not that the natives fired the first shot, it just makes sense that they did. For the one oppressed must be the one to react and show disapproval.

After witnessing the brutal treatment and slaughter of the natives, it was clear to Mordegai Guruseb that to survive, he had to surrender to the Germans, an action which saw him end up in a concentration camp. But while in the concentration camp, Mordegai was certain that if he stayed, he would not live through the winter. In the six weeks he had stayed in the camp, he had already seen too much death to expect anything else. "The Germans gave them too little food and shelter, and too much work" (PU, p.13). Deprivation and hard labour were the norms within the camp, thus he was forced to escape, and these norms reveal that the concentration camps were a means the Germans used to kill even more natives.

The first scene of murder by the German army reveals some new levels of barbarism. Siegfried stood open-mouthed, shocked by what he saw and the fact that by 'association,' he had a hand in it. He was powerless to stop what he describes as "the whistling sound and a wet slap as the leather bit into the prisoner's back" (PU, p.66). After such torture, then he sees the woman's husband and father to the child, hanging from the tree, his back stripped of skin and flesh (PU, p.71). This Nama man and his family had come straight to the German army, thirst to death for water and some food, unarmed.

The men had a suckling baby, while its mother was being abused and raped; it lay against the side of the dune. The soldiers play a game over the life of this innocent baby:

> The four men formed a square against the side of the dune, and tossed the baby from one to the other. The child gasped as it flew – arms outstretched, more ungainly than a kori bustard – then someone caught it badly, and it began to cry. The four soldiers stood further and

> further apart, stepping ankle deep in the loose sand. The passes grew wilder, the catches rougher. They weren't even catching it by the torso any more, started using only one hand. The baby was flung by the arms, caught by the legs. It screamed, a high-pitched sound, and then the screaming stopped, its mouth gaped wide open, but no sound came forth (PU, p.70).

Then Grajek, who is now done with the act of rape against the baby's mother, joins in the game, he takes the baby in both hands, holding it above his head the way you would throw a soccer ball back into the field of play. He steps forward and throws. The baby sails towards the waiting man in an arc, arms flailing. The soldier lifts his rifle, gives a few shuffling steps to get into position, and catches the baby neatly on the bayonet, skewering it with a sucking thug. Then the show ends in some hooting and laughter. Eventually, the young man swings the rifle like a fishing rod, sliding the baby off the bayonet, and fleeing it through the air, now completely limp, the baby lands in the sand four, five metres away (PU, p.70). Meanwhile, "Muller had his foot on her (baby's mother) throat. In his hand he held a dark pouch, dripping blood. "In his hand he held a dark pouch, dripping blood" (PU, p.70).

Siegfried, to whom the Nama family appeared first, could not be content with Lieutenant Berghammer's defence of the army's despicable actions, and argued for his case to be heard in Windhoek. There he continued his argument stating the fact that the woman and child did not certainly bear arms against the German army, so there could be "no excuse for what was done to them" (PU, p.79). Oberst Adendorff, like Lieutenant Berghammer, also justifies the actions of army with the following claim:

> "Unfortunately, there are bad people, and the war tends to bring out the worst in them, just as it often brings out the best in the good ones. The situation takes us beyond the cosy confines of our established morality, into *parts unknown* to ourselves. Who can say beforehand how anyone will react to that? Men like you and I who retain a moral compass must try to do our best. I would like to be able to punish these criminals; but in this case, you're not going to be able to prove it, with only your word against theirs" (PU, p.80).

Adendorff's claim is conflicting in the sense that he believes war brings the worst in one and in another the best. How does he argue that war takes people beyond the "established morality" when it brings out the best in others? And he calls the immoral actions "parts unknown," hence the title, to imply that these are actions, the army itself did not think or plan of doing. He again conflicts himself when he likens himself to Siegfried, claiming that the two of them are able to maintain morality amidst the war, but he fails to sympathise with him in the matter at hand. Adendorff further claims that despite such acts such as the killing of the Nama family, the Germans did more good than evil, and he refers to the current war situation as "birth pains." The Germans use this

expression to imply that a new nation would be born after getting rid of the natives. And the "more good than evil" points only to Germany's side (PU, p.82).

Adendorff argues that Siegfried's challenge is that he cannot live with injustice. He suggests that the ability to do so will help get him ready for war. He encourages turning a blind eye to "many things" as the best solution in war time. "We have to close our eyes to many things in a time of war" (PU, p.81). Adendorff's thinking is that of all German soldiers, it seems it is the attitude they have carried to GSWA. Their barbaric actions testify such ignorance. However, this does not prove that they are not emotionally affected by their actions. Ignorance does not cancel the wrong or make it right.

Stempsky, Seigfried's companion, shares in their conversation about that war, after their release from the camp, an incident, his own experience, but also one which defines some of the acts of the German army.

> "I shot a child once. He came to us carrying an empty bowl, and I shot him in the face... It was just after the Battle of Waterberg. We chased most of the Hereros into the Omaheke and then we waited at the water holes for them to come out of the desert. They had two choices – die of thirst or face us. Thousands chose to die in the desert, or were too weak to get out at once they had decided to. Those that did come, anything could happen to them. Most were packed off to concentration camps. Some were killed then and there. A few were played with a bit first" (PU, p.142).

This passage describes the climax of the Ovaherero and Nama genocide, that in the end of it all, the native had only three choices which all led to the their death; it was either one dies in the desert or in the hands of the army, or one is taken to the camp, where the chances of survival were zero. Stempsky justifies his action, stating that he did so because it was a command. "The message from on high was to shoot Hereros on sight, you know, Von Trotha's extermination order" (PU, p.142). Like Siegfried, he confessed that the incident and the guilty conscience would not allow him to continue in the army, thus he "asked for a transfer to police duty not long after" (PU, p.143).

Siegfried wondered why anyone would kill people who posed no threat. And Stempsky's attempt to answer him seems to suggest that because it is war, "everyone is strung out and challenged to test the limits of horror and endurance" (PU, p.143). Each side seems to imagine the other not to be quite human, and treats them that way. "We are not who we want ourselves to be" (PU, p.143). It seems the reasoning is alike among the Germans; that war seems to bring out the worst in people. The statement is conflicting because we have others like Siegfried and Stempsky, who cannot stand the atrocities committed against innocent people. One wonders whether Stempsky's statement "we

are not who we want ourselves to be" stands for all German soldiers, because some do not show remorse at all. They continue from one barbaric action to the next, in excitement and with much zeal.

Siegfried, looking at the horrors by the German army in general and that of Grajek, which he labels "an aberration," and all the other stories Stempsky who had been long in Africa had told him, he concludes that they "all formed part of the same pattern, and it suggested that this colonial venture carried the seeds of evil" (PU, p.196). For Siegfried, calling these acts "evil" was most fitting, he could not think of any other fitting description. When he suggest that "history will judge us harshly" (PU, p.198), it signifies that the Germans knew that their deeds were genocidal, and would haunt them in future. Seigfried confessed that he loved the land, but also admitted that there were people before him, the native, "who loved it as much as perhaps more," and the Germans were "pushing them aside" (PU, p.198). Considering the population then, of both the natives and the Germans, there was no need to fight over land, because there was enough for everyone, and Siegfried admits this saying, "it's the one thing this country has enough of" (PU, p.198).

Two Nama men took advantage at the wondering away from the camp of Lisbeth and raped her. They used their masculine power to tie her hand together, rip apart her clothes, and then did the act. "A gunshot cracked, and another, four gun shots. It was Mordegai" (PU, p.205). Modergai had come to Lisbeth's rescue, and in the process killing two fellow black men, Namas. Mordegai is portrayed as a fair player in the game, earlier in the story; he had saved Siegfried from a snake bite, at a moment when Siegfried was a threat to him. Here he goes to the extent of ending the lives of his fellow black man, for the wrong act against Lisbeth, a white woman. Mordegai's main acts in the story really crack a headache. He has two encounters with German people, in both cases; he makes a decision in their favour. In this particular one, he tells Lisbeth that he could not think of any other way to stop them. He fires four shots at two men, this can be interpreted differently, and could conflicts with his statement that he does not think of a way to stop them. A warning shot aimed at nobody is obviously a way he could have chosen. But he chose a difficult course, to kill. His act is conflicting in the sense that, one does not really figure out whether Mordegai has hatred towards the Nama or did it out of a good sympathetic heart for women. But, the bottom line is that, in his effort to defend Lisbeth and stop the rape, he takes two people's lives. This leaves the reader with the question: Is the life of Lisbeth more important than the lives of the two native Nama men? The statement: "I couldn't think of another way to stop them" (PU, p.206), is conflicting, especially when we consider that the last shot was meant to finish off someone who was still alive. "This one... he wasn't dead, but he wouldn't live anyways, so I had to shot him again (PU, p.206). If Mordegai's

intention was not to kill, but to rescue Lisbeth, why would he fire at a helpless soul, a soul that would die anyways?

> "Mordegai wondered if he could have done something else, but in that moment, he had been so outraged; he had seen too much violence to tolerate any more of it. There had been a surge of righteous joy when he fired and saw those two stopped in their tracks, a very basic satisfaction. Now it bothered him. Was this heady sense of power, this primeval indulgence, what people felt when they forced their will on others? Was he any better now than the people he despised" (PU, p.207)?

Mordegai, burdened by his act, asks a fundamental question: Was he any better now than the people he despised? He hated the Germans for their acts of violence against the natives, yet here, he has done exactly what they were doing. He has killed two people, of his own race. In other words, is the answer to violence, violence? Was he right to commit a crime in order to prevent another? This was his burden. Before asking himself this question; he had first wondered whether he did it out of rage, resulting from seeing so much violence before. In this case, it is reasonable to claim that a strong sense of "righteous joy" had filled him after taking the lives of the two Nama men, because they posed a danger to another life. However, 'righteous' here can be debated. Had he defended her without causing loss of life, his righteousness would not be questioned, but now, he had taken two lives to save one. How conflicting!

Mordegai had to explain to the people at the camp what had happened leading to the gunshots. He takes a fair and bold step, stating that he could have done it for any woman in the camp. But these were sons of the land. The response from the people should have been expected.

> 'Her people rape our women,' old Hendrik Luipert reminded everyone.
>
> 'Are we to be like them? Besides, this woman had done nothing to us. When your neighbour's dog bites you, do you kill his goat?' Mordegai looked at the old man (PU, p.208).

Mordegai defended his position well, but it was such a conflicting defence, in the sense that the implication of his figurative expression suggests that he had just done what he condemns. Mordegai suggests that the Germans should be treated individually, in other words, when one German soldier kills the whole village, we should not hold the others responsible. It may also imply that a crime should not be committed to prevent another, because the same thing is being done, just differently.

Mordegai had to take Lisbeth away from the camp because she was now looked at as the reason for the death of the young man. Lisbeth never mentioned about her rape when she lodged with a white family. The reason for her silence was 'shame.'

> It hadn't been the first time it had happened to her, but what made it worse this time was that she had begun to feel that she deserved better. The feeling had probably arisen because in this country she was mostly treated with a respect she had never known before, but she realised it was more than that. It was because of the lack of social structure and strictures since her husband had died (PU, p.214).

This passage reveals that the acts of rape were not only unique to the natives against the Germans, but also to the Germans against Germans. It also suggests that she had gone through the same experience several times back in Germany, to the extent that she no longer felt shameful about it. It had been part of her life. But her arrival in Africa and her marriage had changed the status quo. She was now looked at with value, and this made her feel important in society. This hierarchical thinking made her believe that she was now someone who did not deserve to be raped. Back in Germany, like here in Africa, she did not have a voice, she had accepted to live with it, so she eventually chooses to be silent about the act of rape.

Mordegai sums up his actions accepting guilt:

> 'I kept her too long.' Mordegai said to Eva, who now missed Lisbeth. I killed two people, he thought. I have become like the worst of them. Can there be any hope for me now?' (PU, p.234).

Unlike the Germans who take pleasure at shooting and killing the natives, Mordegai is grieved by his action. This evidence suggests that he had indeed rushed the decision, and that had there been an opportunity, he should have figured something else. He concludes that he is not different from the Germans who go about slaughtering innocent people.

'Once a native chooses that paths... you have to shoot him before he starts shooting at you' (PU, p.212). This statement by the Germans cannot be proven right? Mordegai is an example of a rebellious native who has not attempted to shoot at the Germans though he has had such opportunities. This attitude shows paranoia from the German side, it makes them quick to kill out of the fear of being killed first. But the records of their killings show that the subjects were unarmed, and that there was no threat posed at the Germans.

In the conversation about the presence of the Germnas in Africa, Isa observes:

> 'Do you know what happened at the so called battle of Hoornkranz, the first one? The Namas were in church, as they walked out, the soldiers shot them, people armed with nothing more than Bibles and Psalm books. It's not something your people like to talk about.

> Captain Witbooi and some of his men eventually got their weapons and fired back, but at first it was a massacre (PU, p.228).

Isa describes to Siegfried one of the horrors of the war. It is easier to believe her because he had seen with his own eyes the despicable acts the group of soldiers he had been part of had done. The accounts are similar, both cases involve innocent lives. But what he hears from Isa is even worse, because these are worshippers being killed. The Germans had planted these churches to lead people to God, now they have turned them into grave yards.

In *The Lie of the Land*, the Germans sent false news over to Berlin in the pursuit of this war, that the natives were killing the Germans and taking their land, when in truth it was the Germans doing it. They did this in an attempt to compel imperial Germany to send the resources and human resources.

> "The natives in the Protectorate are killing German settlers and taking their land... Marines were eager to take revenge. They cut off the private parts of our wounded men while they were still alive. They are totally uncivilised. We shall civilise them" (TLOL, p.29).

It is true that the natives did these acts, but further evidence seems to suggest that worse such acts were administered by the Germans upon the natives.

As Samuel walked in the company of Hartmann, his host round about in the garden, he was distracted by the "sun glinting on a rather unusual row of a large white stones forming the border of one bush. He nudged one with his foot and immediately stepped back with gasp. It was a bleached human skull" (TLOL, p.29). Hartmann and other Germans had skulls of the natives in their gardens and elsewhere; they were either hanging somewhere visible to act as a mark of pride and power. Power to scare of the natives, sending them a clear signal that should they fail to comply, their skulls would be brought this far.

This appears in his answer to the question where he had found the skulls.

> 'I didn't find them. I claimed them. After a skirmish a few months ago, I had them cleaned and brought them here. A lot of fellows did the same. After all, we had great sport hunting them down" (TLOL, p.34).

Hartmann unapologetically confesses that killing the natives was a game to the German army; this justifies their many heartless actions. He also reveals that the army had cautioned them to stop using skulls as outside ornaments.

The issue of skulls struck Samuel, and he remembered that "most people who have spent time in Africa return with hunting trophies of one kind or the other. How long will it be before there would be nothing left to hunt" (TLOL, p.34)? Samuel's realisation implies many things, among others; it refers to the looting of resources from Africa. But in this particular case it refers to the skulls as trophies. This confirms Hartmann's earlier answer that he got the skulls when he had gone on the hunt with the army. It is revealed in Samuel's conversation with Pienaar, the man who shoots a baboon and sticks the skull in the open that "sticking the skull where they can see it" is Africa's way (TLOL, p.123). Pienaar's treatment of the baboons does not differ in any way from that of the Germans, he explains to Samuel that the reason the baboon tend to hang around the place is because it is their territory, and he had found them there. Now he uses guns to scare them off, but they keep coming back, and forth. Eventually he shoots the leader of the gang and places the skull where they can see it, confident that they shall now leave for good.

Likening this to the German encounter in GSWA, they also come into the country and destabilise the natives, and when the natives opt to fight for what is rightfully theirs, they are murdered in cold blood. The fleeing of the baboons is symbolic to the fleeing of the Ovaherero and Nama people from their lands into the desert and eventually Buchwana (modern day Bostwana) land for the few survivors.

The army heads need skulls for some kind of scientist who has arrived from Berlin, a Doctor Fischer, who wants them for some scientific study; where he apparently intends to examine the so called 'savages' for physical signs of degeneracy.

> He actually wants to prove that they are animals and inferior to us Germans. We already know they are not far above the apes. What else is there to study? We should concentrate on getting rid of them (TLOL, p.34).

Hartmann does not see the necessity of proving what he believes is already clear. He suggests that instead of wasting time, the Germans should focus on getting rid of the natives, thus conflicting Dr. Fischer. The suggested research is also a biased one, because the researcher already claims that they are savages, and that he just needs to prove it. He does not suggest a hypothesis which leaves room for them being human. Overall, the Germans agree on one thing; that is, the natives are less human.

Governor Leutwein's reign in GSWA was lenient, compared to that of General Von Trotha who succeeded him. Leutwein made it clear that he intended the natives to "either work for our German settlers or be restricted to rather limited services" (TLOL, p.37). He understood the main aim of his government, which was to "prepare the country for colonisation and that the natives are only of

secondary importance" (TLOL, p.37). The last part of the statement is highly conflicting, because he admits that these people he is fighting against are 'natives.' The implication of 'native' here is that it shows clearly that the land is originally for the blacks. What is conflicting is making them of "secondary importance" in the land he admits it is their own.

Samuel, observes:

> About a quarter of the way to the Waterberg, I saw my first Ovaherero 'in the wild'. It turned out they were only men and women. According to Hartmann, this was why they had been taken in. If there were no young men, then it meant they were off fighting. So these wretches were guilty by association. They carried themselves well but were clearly frightened by the sight of so many armed men. They have admitted that their families are fighting against us and that makes them all traitors and enemies of the Empire. In any case, they are half-starved and not fit for work. Hang them. I turned round and all their bodies, men and women, swinging from the thorn tree (TLOL, p.41-46).

In this passage, Hartmann sounds apologetic in his attempt to find a reason for executing the Ovaherero men and women. He believes that because there are no young men with them, they had gone to fight the Germans; he makes the argument that because their young men had gone to fight, the men and women were therefore "guilty by association." This implies that because they are related, the guilt of the young men rests on them. They are addressed as 'wretches,' implying their despicable and poor state of physical appearance. As Samuel remembers, "Pastor Reinhart in Windhoek had said the Ovaherero women were often abused by settlers and traders and these people had obviously heard the stories" (TLOL, p.43). Their withdrawal from eye contact symbolises unknown fears and uncertainties.

However, the war is portrayed with equal consequences for both the Germans and the natives in the statement below:

> Some German farmers have seen their families killed and their cattle stolen or killed. On the other hand, many of the natives have their land and cattle stolen from them by settlers and unscrupulous traders. And their wives and daughters have in some cases been defiled (TLOL, p.55).

This raises many questions as far as the nature of the war is concerned, especially whether it is genocide or not. It appears here that the both parties do to each other exactly the same things, but while the Germans are out to kill everybody, the natives only deal with those who are directly the cause of the war, those that have taken something from them. As far as the Germans are concerned,

the natives are seen as cowards, because of their approach to the war; instead of meeting the Germans face to face, they attacked from ambush. “That is what cowards do. Now we shall fight them like men, face to face, and we shall crush them under our feet” (TLOL, p.67). The Germans fail to acknowledge the fact that the natives are far behind in terms of weapons, thus meeting the German army face to face would be a massacre for the natives, and this is why they opt for ambush attacks. The words ‘crush them under our feet’ show a level of aggression that is without mercy. They further stress that those they do not kill would be made prisoner and would work for the Germans to build the new colony of South West (TLOL, p.69). This statement, is in agreement with the above argument that the Germans are not out to spare any life; as long as they cross paths with the natives, they will kill you of take you away.

The Germans do not even differentiate between Nama and Ovaherero, in terms of the war. They also threaten the Namas, who are at that moment portrayed to be fighting the Ovaherero. And the Namas, who are portrayed to have been fighting the Ovaherero until this point in the war, cease fire against the Ovaherero after witnessing the brutal German tactics against the Ovaherero, and thus come to a realization that the Germans are out to kill all. They also begin to regroup to prepare for an encounter with the Germans because they believe they will come after them when they are done with the Ovaherero. The scene at Waterberg presents an evident act of annihilation, because “despite their superior numbers, the Ovaherero seemed to have been acting only in self defence, giving way to cannons and machine guns” (TLOL, p.72), thousands of the Ovaherero give up their lives to the machine guns.

Similarly, the character Phillemon, an Otjiherero, had been a guide to the Germans all along, but only now when he witnesses the scenes at Waterberg does he realise how gruesome this war is. One wonders how he has been able to bear with the scenes of these atrocities until now. He cries out “My people are going into the Omaheke. There is no water, no grass. My people will die. My people have avoided dying in battle only to die in the desert” (TLOL, p.73). Knowing how dry the Omaheke desert is and witnessing the fact that his people are fleeing straight into it, leaves him with a new perception about the kind of war the Germans are undertaking. It is a war aimed at killing all his people.

Samuel describes this war as follows:

> I had been in colonial wars before. I had heard of the Indian Mutiny where savages reigned on both sides and where the British soldiers took a terrible vengeance upon the mutineers and all those they thought had helped them. But this war was different. The dead were not only those killed in battle but also their families and their cattle. The snarling of the jackals

> fighting over corpses and the humming flies was a vile hymn to the end of a nation (TLOL, p.74).

The short passage sets this war apart from other wars Samuel has experienced and even heard of. What sets it apart is that it included not all the Ovaherero and Nama armies, but their families and their cattle too. It was corpses all over left to the mercies of the wild beasts. It left none alive to bury the dead. It was aimed at the extinction of not only the lives of the people, but all life form connected with the natives.

When Reverend Max Schmidt prayed about the war, he gave thanks for the divine assistance given to the German forces and for the "German souls who died for their country" (TLOL, p.76). The reverend's prayer reveals what type of a religion they had brought to the natives. It was a religion which believed God was for the whites alone, yet they practised that religion among black people and even used it to target black people.

General Von Trotha's Extermination Order sums up why 'herero nation' as he refers to it was almost extinct. He makes it clear that it was a war aimed at civilians.

> I, the great general of the German soldiers, send this letter to the Herero nation. The Hereros are no longer German subjects. They have murdered, stolen, have cut off the ears and noses and other members of wounded soldiers, and now they are too cowardly to continue fighting. I say to the nation: every person who delivers one of their captains to one of my posts as a prisoner shall receive 1000 marks. Whoever brings in Samuel Maharero shall receive 5000 marks. The Herero nation must leave the country. If the people do not do so, I will force them to do so with our great cannons. Within the German borders, every Herero, with or without a rifle, with or without cattle, with be shot. I will no longer receive any women and children, but will drive them back to their people or will have them shot. These are my words to the Herero nation (TLOL, p.76).

This order would reach the Ovaherero tied round about the necks of their own people, women and children, after the execution of the men with them. For women and children, he commanded specifically that shots should be fired not at them, but over their heads so that they would run into the Omaheke desert (TLOL, p.76). He understood clearly that the stretch of the Omaheke from GSWA to Botswana would leave only a few alive. He did not have to shoot them directly, but firing above their heads was like firing indirectly at them. It was only a matter of time, they would die.

The Ovaherero resorted to unconventional means to quench their thirst, and stay alive. How helpless is to know that you are dying, and there is nothing you can do about it. Most of them were actually dying before their death. Samuel records:

> We came across the corpses of cattle, some of which were little more than skin and bone. Others apparently had their throats slit. We found our first bodies. No attempt had been made to bury them. They were a woman and child, lying where they had fallen. Skins already blackening under the sun, they were cradled together in a grotesque parody of sleep, their eyes already lost to scavengers and lips drawn back in mirthless grins (TLOL, p.78).

The Omaheke desert became the grave yard where corpses of both *man* and animal lay in the open. The harsh condition of the desert could not spare the weak in both *man* and animal. It was beyond traumatising to the helpless living to see their families and friends dying and doing nothing about, because your own death smelled a few seconds away. Some corpses appeared to have died in motion, they just attempted to take the next step, and that was it.

Some, in desperate attempt to dig a well with their hands in order to find water, led to its collapse turning into a fatal grave for them.

> We came across huge holes dug in a frantic hunt for water. More copses indicated the extent of their failure. In one place, a desperate attempt at a well had collapsed on top of the men digging it; we could still see an emaciated and desiccated arm sticking out at the surface as if waving to us (TLOL, p.78).

The scenes were horrible, to the extent that Hartmann, who earlier at the appointment of Von Trotha had announced him a celebrity, confessed that the general had gone too far.

> Don't misunderstand me. The General is a great man but in my opinion it is wrong to kill all these people off. This is a huge land and our colonists are few in number. We need these blacks to work for us and build our colony. It could save us millions or marks (TLOL, p.78).

Could this suggest that Von Trotha could have been also surprised by his own actions? Even the armies after witnessing the course of their action, knew that they had gone beyond the boundaries of a normal war. Nevertheless, with all the mixed feelings about the way, they still continued to undertake the course. After a long pursuit into the desert, it was clear that only a few must have reached to British Bechuanaland.

The extermination order was being carried out to the letter. Those few Ovaherero and Nama who remained in their villages were also followed.

> Many, maybe 20, 000, were still in their ancestral lands; in small groups, mostly. The General knew this and ordered us to find them and deal with them. We were to sweep the area moving towards the ancestral lands as we did so. We are called the Cleaning Patrols (TLOL, p.81).

Those that had not headed to the Omaheke were equally hunted down through their ancestral lands, and they perished at the merciless German army. The fact that this group of army men dealing with this group had such a name (Cleaning Patrols) just shows how simple the Germans took the lives of the natives. Their motto was "clean out, hang up, shoot down till they are all gone" (TLOL, p.82).

Violence came in all its form:

> Once we found signs of a group that we said we would spare if they surrendered. We guessed they were hiding in the bush, hoping that we would go away. Our commander called out again and one by one they came out of the bush, as scared as hell. The commander was smiling all the time, but when they were all out, he stopped smiling and jumped to one side. We were waiting and our machine-gun opened up. It took only a few seconds and they were soon all dead. We left them where they lay. That was one of many such incidents (TLOL, p.81).

There was no provision for arrests in General Von Trotha's Extermination Order. Once an Ovaherero or Nama was found, it was the end of life. There was no benefit in surrendering.

> At one point we came across eight or nine sick Herero women who had been left behind after a skirmish with some mixed-race Basters who were our allies then. Some of the women were blind and they had been left food and water. We heaped wood around the hut they were lying in and set fire to it (TLOL, p.82).

These local Basters had an alliance with the Germans and were also fighting against the Ovaherero. One wonders in what capacity they joined the Germans, was it because of their white like colour? It is clear again that the locals were not united, and not only that, but they were also willing to go to the extent of killing each other and siding with outside forces just to get rid of a fellow native.

Samuel, after having seen so much atrocity reasoned with David, who had now grown into ranks, whether what they did was a reasonable, the killing of innocent persons. Samuel narrates:

> A group of stragglers had been surrounded up by David and his men and among them was the most beautiful woman I had ever seen. The Ovaherero, in David's words were to be

> killed not because they had done something, but simply because of whom they were. When asked what they had done, just before their execution, he said, 'They are Herero. You heard the General's order' (TLOL, p.84).

This encounter changes Samuel's role in the war. He convinces Hartmann that Leah was not a Herero, she was a Nama, and her language would make for a good study. "I had a sense that for the first time in years, and without thinking about it, I had made a commitment and taken sides without knowing what I was getting into" (TLOL, p.86). Samuel who has carried a neutral ground all along takes the risk of exposing himself after he had fallen in love with Leah.

Women were subjects of abuse by the German armies. The natives were important only for labour, and for the sexual gratification of the army.

> The Oveherero owned little of value to European eyes except for their labour and their women. The soldiers usually contented themselves with burning down the huts and violating the women before abandoning or killing them (TLOL, p.86).

Leah also testifies the killing of her family by a white farmer who married a Herero woman. This farmer attempted to rape her, to the extent that she had to run away.

> Many whites think that the San are lower than animals. I was still young and the farmer took fancy to me, the way he would adopt an animal, having killed its parents. I became his servant, drawing water from the well, feeding the chickens, cleaning the house and doing whatever his women told me to do. He was a tall man with a black beard and a big belly; she was a bad tempered Ovaherero who did nothing but beat me. One day, while she was snoring in her room, he came to me and started to fondle me. I called for him to stop, hoping the woman would hear us but she was fast asleep. I managed to get away from him and ran into the farmyard and hid among the cattle. When he didn't find me he laughed and said he would get me later. That night I crept away from the farm (TLOL, p.102).

It is fascinating in this novel and in Leah's account here, how a person can still go ahead and live with people that had murdered that person's family. Leah confesses to have lived from a young age with people who killed her parents. It is also conflicting that a Herero woman is the one who gave her so much hardship, a woman like her, and of colour alike. Once again, the aspect of natives failing to support each other or stand for each other comes out so many times. Conflict in relationships is not only between the natives and the Germans, but between the locals as well. Can it be argued that the Germans did not cause the locals to turn at each other? Also, are the Germans correct to claim that they have been always wars before them to justify the course they are taking?

This is one of the few encounters that are recorded where the natives attack the Germans.

> They fired indiscriminately at men and beasts as the soldiers scrambled for their weapons while pulling on their boots. Mixed with the gunfire, I could hear the cries of men and screams of wounded horses (TLOL, p.90).

This ambush, the Germans blamed it upon Leah, who was with them all the time. It was said that her people had done the act, and she was called a 'whore' for that.

Thomas' encounter with Samuel indicates that the Namas joined in the war only later. "'So rumours are true,' said Thomas slowly. 'Now we fight alone. But it doesn't matter. We have no choice. We shall try to kill as many as we can before they kill us'" (TLOL, p.105). There was something fascinating about the nature of the natives after they had killed a German soldier, "there was no looting from the pockets of the dead" (TLOL, p.109). Unlike the German soldiers who searched all the pockets, the natives only took guns and left.

"Most prisoners are women and, well, soldiers will be soldiers" (TLOL, p.132). This expression suggests that the German soldiers guarding the Island raped those women the way they wanted. And when Samuel got there and looked closer, he could see "fresh weeping scars on their bony backs where a whip or sjambok had been" (TLOL, p.134). This brought to him a realisation that "they were not prisoners of war. They were slaves." So they work until the die (TLOL, p.135).

While on the Island, Samuel witnessed this gruesome murder of an old woman.

> Near one of the rickety tents, an army sergeant was pointing his smoking pistol at an old woman. The wretched creature, who was stick-thin and obviously sick, was crawling towards another woman who was holding out a broken pan of water. He fired again and this time he hit her in the thigh. She screamed and lay there writhing in agony. The sergeant grinned as some of the soldiers taking photographs applauded the shot. He holstered his pistol and strolled away leaving the groaning women to bleed into the sand. Here all the prisoners were women, many of them almost naked, all of them reduced to the status of animals in a slaughter's yard. There was no sign of sanitation and some of them were lying in their own waste (TLOL, p.136).

Even if she had not been shot at she would have died of hunger. Many were dead on the Island, there were tents and tents of dead people, and the smell was unbearable. It was a picture resembling some natural disaster that felled a state. The condition on the Island fits the description of the Island of death. It was just another way of exterminating the natives. Helpless women are

murdered cold blood in broad day light at gun point, some die because of diseases caused by deprivation, and lack of sanitation.

The doctor was just excited that his research was going well; the wellbeing of his subject was not a matter to him. He is a doctor of the dead. He saw it most fortunate that in this camp he had an almost endless supply of subjects. "We have specimens of both Herero and Hottentots here so I can determine the effect on separate races" (TLOL, p.138). This statement suggests that these people were just placed there for a purpose, and when it was done, and they were no longer needed, death was the next thing. The doctor was not even ashamed to give Samuel this account:

> We have several prisoners die each night and my experiments help with my other research. Dr Eugen Fischer has proved that the Herero are animals and that our German race is superior. I am continuing his work. There is a vast investigation there, into the physical and mental differences between ourselves and the sub-humans that live in this country. My men get the prisoners to clean the skulls of dead prisoners and they then crate them up to go to Dr Fischer in Germany (TLOL, p.139).

After witnessing all the happenings at the Island, Samuel describes it as follows:

> This island; I find it abhorrent. It's not an internment camp like the ones we built down south for the Boers but an extermination camp. The Germans are deliberately working those poor devils to death and then, even after death, they are mutilating their bodies. That shouldn't be a secret, the whole world should know about it (TLOL, p.148).

In his narration, he calls the natives sub-human. The most dehumanising thing is that women are forced to clean up the skulls of their own people. In other words, they removed the flesh from the bones. How bad could it get? Some tents brought forth a hum, which was the sound of thousands of flies humming over the dead bodies. Samuel's sympathetic attitude towards the natives is conflicting, in that he abhors the actions of the Germans, at the same time he calls the natives 'devils' because of how they look. Devil could fit the character of the Germans.

5.7. Conclusion

In this chapter, the researcher analysed the two selected texts from an ambivalence perspective. This chapter stood on the ground made firm by scholars discussed under the literature review chapter of this research. Qualitative research methods employed enabled the researcher to critique and interpret the selected texts in accordance with the tenets of ambivalence. Pertinent issues were

identified and discussed, with identity, and the shifting nature of the colonial relationship being the major themes. In addition, the significance of the genocide in the context of reparations was discussed. The researcher discovered that colonisation affects both the coloniser and the colonised and that a colonial relationship is never stable. The next chapter presents the research findings, provides recommendations and concludes the research.

CHAPTER SIX: FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

6.1. Introduction

This chapter serves to summarise and conclude the study that has been conducted with the main research objective being to explore ambivalence in Zirk van der Berg's *Parts Unknown* (2018) and Jaspar Utley's *The Lie of the Land* (2017). A qualitative, desktop approach was adopted and the ambivalence theoretical framework was employed with the aim of addressing the following specific objectives, which are to:

- explore the conflicting relationship between the colonised and the coloniser.
- investigate the cultural fault lines generated between white and black distributions in a colonial relationship.
- examine the simultaneous repulsions and desires that exist at the interface between the self and the other.

This chapter sums up the major findings presented in the previous chapter in relation to the specific research objectives mentioned above, and provides recommendations for future studies in Namibian literature in particular, and literature in general.

6.2. Findings

6.2.1. Objective 1: Explore the conflicting relationship between the colonised and the coloniser.

The colonial relationship is never stable, and in both the novels, one side was crueler than the other. The Germans did not create a relationship at all; if we say there was any, then it is that of master and slave. Acts of rape, abuse and annihilation were common from the Germans, and they acted without remorse and sympathy. The natives were also silenced or not heard at all. There were also acts of rape and violence from the natives, but meagre, compared to the Germans. Von Trotha's extermination order is proof that there is no intent to create relations from the Germans. There was also a new kind of conflict, amongst the natives, they fought against each other and even killed each other.

6.2.2. Objective 2: Investigate the cultural fault lines generated between white and black distributions in a colonial relationship.

The Germans pushed forward the Bible and missionaries to change mind sets of the natives towards anything brought before them. They threatened the existence of native languages, and speakers. In attempting to take away native languages, the Germans threatened native cultures. There was intermarriage in *Parts Unknown*, but it was looked at with distaste from the fellow Germans. The natives showed no sign of opposition to such marriages. The natives also bought clothes from Europe, which transcended in a change in culture.

6.2.3. Objective 3: Examine the simultaneous repulsions and desires that exist at the interface between the self and the other.

The Germans hated the natives, but loved the land and the native women. This was seen through the acts of rape by the German army and one incident from the Nama boys. The natives worked for the Germans for income, and to survive, to the extent that they watched their own die at the anemy's hand. Traders and Germans took advantage of the people's need for goods and swindled from them their cattle and land.

6.3. Recommendations

Recommendations by the researcher include the following:

- There is need for Namibians to consider publishing more literature and research on the genocide history.
- There is also need to introduce such Namibian literatures: *Parts Unknown* and *The Lie of the Land* in schools to be studied from a literature or historical point of view.
- There is need to revisit the handling of the whole genocide and prioritise the needs of the affected communities.

6.4. Conclusion

This chapter summarised the research through relating the research findings to the research objectives. The study demonstrated that genocidal literature is a powerful tool in transforming the lives of the oppressed and the oppressor. When both the colonised and the colonisers are informed, they become agents for change. This study addresses a knowledge gap in terms of the ambivalent nature of the colonial relationship as presented in the two selected works. Furthermore, recommendations for further research were also provided, and hence this research can guide future studies in the field of literature.

REFERENCES

Primary texts

Utley, J. (2017). *The Lie of the Land*. Windhoek: University of Namibia Press

Van Den Berg, Z. (2018). *Parts Unknown*. Cape Town: Kwela Books

Secondary texts

Adhikari, M. (2008). 'Streams of blood and streams of money': new perspectives on the annihilation of the Herero and Nama people of Namibia, 104-1908. *Kronos*, 34(1), 303-320. Retrieved August 13, 2020, from https://scholar.google.com/scholar?cluster=5343535896573159839

Amora, M. (2010). *Quantitative vs Qualitative research - When to use which.* Retrieved from http://www.surveygizmo.com/survey-blog/quantitative-qualitative-research

Anderson, R, J. (2005). Redressing colonial genocide: the Hereros' cause of action against Germany. *Scholarly Works*, 93(288), 1155-1190. Retrieved July 27, 2020, from https://scholars.law.unlv.edu/facpub/288

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. & Tiffin, H. (2000). *Post-colonial studies: the key concepts*. London: Routledge.

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. & Tiffin, H. (1989). T*he Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. London: Routledge.

Baer, E. R. (2018). *The genocidal gaze*. Windhoek, Namibia: UNAM Press

Bargueño, D. (2011). Humanitarianism in the age of empire: Deutsch-Südwestafrika & L'Ètat Indépendant du Congo. *Journal of Namibian Studies: History Politics Culture*, 9, 17-60. Retrieved August 11, 2020, from https://namibian-studies.com/index.php/JNS/article/view/37

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture.* New York: Rout ledge

Bhattacherjee, A. (2012). *Social Science Research: Principles, methods and practices* (2nd ed.). University of South Florida, CA: Scholar Commons.

Becker, H. (2020, January 26). Surviving genocide: a voice from colonial Namibia at the turn of the last century. *The Conversation*. Retrieved from https://thecoversation.com/survivinbg-genocide-a-voice-from-colonial-namibia-at -the-turn-of-the-last-century-130546

Bracht, M. (2015). Genocide in German South West Africa & the Herero reparations movement. *Senior Thesis*, 37, 1-47. Retrieved July 27, 2020, from

https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/senior_thesis37

Brehl, M. (2005). Stratagies of exclusion: the genocide of the Herero in German colonial discourse. In Kinloch, G.C. & Mohan, R.P. *Genocide: approaches, case studies, and responses.* 143-162, New York: Algora Publishing.

Burden, T. (2017). River of blood and money: the Herero genocide in German Southwest Africa. *The Student Researcher: A Phi Alpha Theta Publication*, 2(1), 1-29. Retrieved July 27, 2020, from https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/stu_researcher/vol2/iss1/2

Correa, S. M-S. (2011). History, memory, and commemorations: on genocide and colonial past in South West Africa. *Revista Brasileira de História*, 31(61), 85-103.

Cresswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

De Jong, F. (2018). Archive of darkness: William Kentridge's Black Box/Chambre Noire. *African Art*, 51(1), 10-23. Retrieved August 11, 2020, from www.academia.edu

De Wolff, K. (2016). Recognition, postcolonialism and social (in)justice. On the asymmetrical transnational memory politics of the Herero-Nama-genocide. *CULT_online. Review Journal for the Study of Culture*, 47, 1-4.

Dyck, K. (2014). Situating the Herero genocide and the holocaust among European colonial genocides. *Przeglad Zachodhi*, 350(01), 153-172. Retrieved July 24, 2020, from www.scholar.google.com

Eckl, A. (2008). The Herero genocide of 1904: Source-critical and methodological considerations. *Journal of Namibian Studies,* 3, 31–61. Retrieved August 11, 2020, from https://namibian-studies.com/index.php/JNS/article/view/37

Edwards, R., & Mauthner, M. (2002). Ethics and feminist research: Theory and practice. *Ethics in qualitative research*, 14-31.

Föster, L. (2008). From 'General Field Marshal' to 'Miss Genocide': The reworking of traumatic experiences among Herero-Speaking Namibians. *Journal of Material Culture,* 13(2), 175-194. Retrieved July 25, 2020, from https://www.sagepublications.com

Germany minister calls colonial-era killings in Namibia 'genocide'. (2019, September 2). *Reuters*. Retrieved from https://www.reuters.com/article/us-germany-namibia/german-minister-calls-colonial-era-killings-in-namibia-genocide-idUSKCN1VN1DM

Germany returns skulls of Namibian genocide victims. (2018, August 29). *British Broadcasting Corporation*. Retrieved from https://www.bbc.com/news/worldafrica-45342586

Germany sued for damages of 'forgotten genocide' in Namibia. (2017, January 5). *The Guardian*. Retrieved from http://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/jan/05/germny-sued-forgotten-

genocide-namibia-herero-nama

Germany's Herero reconciliation efforts rebuffed. (2005, December 2). *The New Humanitarian*. Retrieved from https://www.thenewhumanitarian.org/fr/node/224826

Gevers, C. (2019). The 'Africa Blue Books' at Versailles: World War I, narrative and unthinkable histories of International Criminal Law. *The New Histories of International Criminal Law*, 145-166 (Immi Tallgren & Thomas Skouteris eds.)

Gewald, J-B. (2003). Herero genocide in the twentieth century: politics and memory. In: Abbink, J, de Bruijn, M, van Walraven, K.: (Eds) *Rethinking resistance: revolt and violence in African history.* Boston: Brill.

Gewald, J-B. (2004). Imperial Germany and the Herero of Southern Africa: Genocide and the Quest for Recompense. In: Jones, A.: *Genocide, War Crimes & the West*. London & New York.

Haker, H. (2019). Towards a decolonial narrative ethics. *Humanities*, 8(120), 1-31. Doi: 10.3390/h8030120.

Hamrick, E. & Duschinski, H. (2017). Enduring injustice: Memory politics and Namibia's genocide reparations movement. *Memory Study*, 11, 1-18. Doi: 10.1177/1750698017693668

Hartmetz, A. K. (2011). *Herero Nation. Transformations of Herero society before, during, and after colonial genocide.* Bogazici University, Istanbul. Retrieved July 02, 2020, from https://www.academia.edu/9043374/

Hull, I. V. (2008). The military campaign in German Southwest Africa, 1904-1907 and the genocide of then Herero and Nama. *Journal of Namibian Studies*, 4, 7-24. Retrieved July 06, 2020, from https://namibian-studies.com

Iileka, S. (2020, June 9). Namibia snubs N$180m reparation offer. *The Namibian*. Retrieved from https://www.namibian.com.na/201514/archive-read/Namibia-snubs-N$180m--reparation-offer

Jupp, V. (2006). *The sage dictionary of social research methods.* London: Sage Publications.

Kirchner, S. (2011). State liability for the Herero genocide in German South-West Africa (Namibia). Retrieved July 17, 2020, from: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_icl=880719

Kößler, R. & Melber, H. (2004). The Colonial Genocide in Namibia: Consequences for memory culture today from German perspective. *Ufahamu: A Journal of African Studies,* 30(2-3), 17-32. Retrieved July 13, 2020, from https://namibian-studies.com

Kössler, R. (2008) Entangled history and politics: Negotiating the past between Namibia and Germany. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 26(3), 313-339, DOI: 10.1080/02589000802332531

Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research Methodology: Methods and techniques* (2nd ed.). Daryaganj: New Age

International.

Krippendorf, K. (2013). *Content analysis: An introduction to its Methodology* (3rd ed.). LA: Sage Publications.

Krishnamurthy, S. & Vale, H. (2018). *Writing Namibia: literature in transition*. Windhoek: University of Namibia Press.

Krishnamurthy, S. (2018). Resisting colonisation and colonising resistance: The writer as a historical witness in two Namibian novels: The Scattering by Lauri Kubuitsile and Mama Namibia by Maria Serebrov. *Research in African Genocide*, 1(1), 30–47.

Krishnamurthy, S. (2018). Untold Tales and Occluded Histories: Jasper Utley's The Lie of the Land as an Illustrative Nama Genocide Narrative. *Matatu 50 (2018) 396-406.*

Leistner, P. (2019). The enduring struggle for reparations: the case of the Herero and Nama genocide, 1904-1908. Retrieved July 5, 2020, from https://www.academia.edu/42679873/

Leedy, P.D. & Armrod, J. E. (2010). *Practical Research: Planning and Design* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Mack, N., Woodsong, C., MacQueen, K. M., Guest, G., & Namey, E. (2005). *Qualitative Research Methods: A Data Collector's Field Guide.* North Carolina: Family Health International.

Madley, B. (2004). Patterns of frontier genocide 1803-1910: the Aboriginal Tasmanians, the Yuki of California, and the Herero of Namibia. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 6(2), 167-192. Retrieved July 11, 2020, from https://namibian-studies.com

Marguardt, G. (March 9, 2010). Colonial genocide and reparations claims in the 21st century: the socio-legal context of claims under international law by the Herero against Germany for genocide in Namibia, 1904-1908 [Review of the book *Holocaust and genocide studies* by R. D. Breitman]. *Oxford University Press*, 24(3), 491-493.

Mbembe, A. (2001). *On the Postcolony*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Melber, H. (2013). Germany's genocide of the Herero: Kaiser Wilhelm II, His General, His Settlers, His Soldiers, review by Jeremy Sarkin. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press. *German Studies Review*, 36(1), 200-201.

Melber, H. (2017). Genocide matters – Negotiating a Namibian-German past in the present. *Stichproben. Wiener Zeitchrift für kritische Afrikastudien*, 33(17), 1-24.

Melber, H. (2017, March). Uncovering the 20th century's first genocide. *New Africa*, 26–30. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316167122

Namibia rejects Germany's reparations offer for genocide. (2020, August 12). *Deutsche Welle*. Retrieved from https://www.dw.com/en/namibia-germany-reparations/a-54535589

Nujoma, S. (1995). *The Autobiography of Sam Nujoma*. Windhoek: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Owens, J. (2008). "Blood Ties and Tongue Ties: The Role of Children in Shifting the Boundaries of Namibia's German-Speaking Community." *Journal of the History of Childhood and Youth,* 1(2), 232-249.

Paulose, R.M., & Rogo, R.D. (2018). Addressing colonial crimes through reparations: the Mau Mau, Herero and Nama. Pluto Journals, 7(2), 369-388. Retrieved August 13, 2020, from www.plutojournals.com/scj

Pelz, D. (2020, June 10). Namibia says Germany ready to apologize for genocide. *Deutsche Welle*. Retrieved from https://www.dw.com/en/namibia-says-germany-ready-to-apologize-for-genocide/a-53762187

Rosnow, R. L., & Rosenthal, R. (2008). *Beginning behavioral research: A conceptual primer* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Sarkin, J. & Fowler, C. (2008). Reparations for historical human rights violations: The international and historical dimensions of the Alien Torts claim act genocide case of Herero of Namibia. *Human Right Review*, 9, 331-360.

Sawant, S. B. (2012). Postcolonial theory: Meaning and significance. *Proceedings of National Seminar on Postmodern Literary Theory and Literature* (pp. 120-126), Nanded

Shigwedha, V. (2016). The return of Herero and Nama bones from Germany: "The victims' struggle for recognition and recurring genocide memories in Namibia." In Dreyfus J. & Anstett É (Éds.), *Human Remains in Society: Curation and exhibition in the aftermath of genocide and mass-violence* (pp. 197-219). Manchester: Machester University Press, 2016. Retrieved July 19, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt21h4xwg.14

Smith, W., D. (1991). *Politics and the Sciences of Culture in Germany, 1840–1920.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Steinmetz, G. (2005). The first genocide of the 20th century and its postcolonial alternatives: Germany and Namibian Oveherero. *The Journal of The International Institute*, 12(2), 1-7. Retrieved July 22, 2020, from https://quod.lib.umich.edu/j/jii/4750978.0012.201

Stone, D. (2001). White men with low moral standards? German anthropology and the Herero genocide. *Patterns of Prejudice*, (35)2, 33-45. doi: 10.1080/003132201128811133

Vosloo, J. J. (2014). *A sport management programme for educator training in accordance with the diverse needs of South African schools.* Doctoral dissertation.

Wa Thiong'o, N. (2012). *Globalectics: Theory and the politics of knowing*. New York: Colombia University Press

Zimmerer, J. & Zeller, J. (eds.). (2009). Genocide in German South-West Africa [Review of the book *The colonial war of 1904-1908 and its aftermath* by E. J. Neather]. *Journal of Namibian Studies*,

5, 123-133. Retrieved July 23, 2020, from https://namibian-studies.com

Zimmerer, J., & Zeller, J. (2003). *Genocide in German South-West Africa: The Colonial War (1904-1908) and its Aftermath*. Berlin: Merlin Press.

Zollmann, J. (2007). Polemics and other arguments – a German debate reviewed. *Journal of Namibian Studies*, 5, 109-130. Retrieved July 23, 2020, from https://namibian-studies.com