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‘Racism’ Down Under
The Prehistory of a Concept in Australia

Abstract: The conceptual history of ‘racism’ is hitherto underdeveloped. One of its assertions is that the term ‘racism’ originated from a German-centric critique of völkisch and fascist ideology. A closer look at the early international usage of the categories ‘racialism’ and ‘racism’ shows that the circumstances were much more complex. Australia lends itself for validation of this complexity. It once shared a colonial border with Germany, had a substantial number of German immigrants, and, during both world wars, was amongst the opponents of Germany. Even so, the reference to Germany is only one of many elements of the early concept of ‘racism’.

Racism is older than its name. Depending on the interpretative approach, the difference ranges from decades to centuries. Moreover, the conceptual history of ‘racism’ is a desideratum. Despite the current omnipresence of the term, its etymological emergence and intellectual development are mostly unexplored. This has found widespread expression in the fact that, until today, ‘racism’ is often considered an exonerative term for a kind of racial thinking purportedly not affected by it.

This observation applies to early attempts of distinction between race theory and racism that were meant to rescue racial thinking as value-neutral scientific consideration. It also applies to later analyses that consider ‘racism’ as a reaction to the Nazis’ discrimination of parts of the white race. The background of such discursive strategies is observable in the entry “Rasse” [‘race’] in ‘Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe’ [Basic Concepts in History], a principal work of conceptual history. It was edited by three conservative historians, Otto Brunner, Werner Conze, and Reinhart Koselleck.

1 In the current discussion of the history of racism (which does not deal with the conceptual history), the following positions are, amongst others, taken: – a. Racism is a reactionary ideology that emerged in the nineteenth century (cf. Detlev Claussen, Was heißt Rassismus?); – b. Racism has its theoretical roots in Enlightenment thinking (cf. Emmanuel Chukwudi Eze, Race and the Enlightenment); – c. Racism is a white ideology that emerged in the context of colonialism and transatlantic slavery (cf., besides numerous contributions from ‘Critical Whiteness’ research, Joe Feagin, The White Racial Frame); – d. Racism dates back at least to the politics of the ‘limpieza de sangre’ in early modern Spain (cf. Max S. Hering Torres, María Elena Martinez, David Nirenberg, eds., Race and Blood in the Iberian World); – e. Racist thinking already existed in the European Middle Ages (cf. Geraldine Heng, The Invention of Race in the European Middle Ages); – f. Racism was ‘invented’ in classical antiquity (cf. Benjamin Isaac, The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity); – g. Racism was already known to the ancient Egyptians (cf. Malvern van Wyk Smith, The First Ethiopians); – h. Racism also has a long history outside Europe (cf. Ian Law, Racism and Ethnicity). Moreover, these positions are interwoven with different attitudes towards the concept of race. They range from the assertion that (i) racism did not exist before the development of modern racial thinking (cf. David Theo Goldberg, Racist Culture) on the idea that (ii) race-like concepts had existed before and (iii) ‘social race’ and ‘natural race’ are not mutually exclusive constructions (cf. Robin O. Andreasen, A New Perspective on the Race Debate) until the point of view that (iv) racism would also have used other than racial, e.g. religious points of reference (cf. George M. Fredrickson, Racism).

2 ‘Racism’ is put in single-inverted commas when we refer to the concept; in the cases we address racism as a social relation, it remains unmarked.

3 Cf. Otto Brunner, Werner Conze, Reinhart Koselleck, Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe -- the volume with the lemma ‘race’ was published in 1984. For English contributions by
and Reinhard Koselleck. The academic beginnings of the first two were influenced by National Socialism and antisemitism. The third was younger, started his studies after the war but was influenced by conservative and fascist thinkers, not least by Carl Schmitt. Later, Koselleck had the most far-reaching theoretical impact on the understanding of ‘Begriffsgeschichte’ and his work continues to serve as a central point of reference.

Koselleck emphasizes the connection between conceptual history and social history. He even suspects that “the partisanship and ideology of modern vocabulary [...] are at the same time a priori constitutive of our current politico-social language”. But no such caveats were included in the lemma ‘Race’ in the ‘Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe’. On the contrary, it provides a prime example for purposeful ideological misinformation.

This becomes dramatically obvious at the end of the entry. It culminates in an exculpatory conclusion and ends with a methodological acquittal. The conclusion claims that the word ‘racism’ had been “provoked by national socialism and denotes, in a derogatory sense, the misuse of the race term by its unjustified transmission to history and politics”. The implicit acquittal ascertains that “word and term ‘race’ [...] obviously continue to belong to the conceptual language of the natural sciences, not only that of anthropology”.

This comprehension of the term ‘race’ serves its retrospective denazification, in the sense that it was allegedly misused by the Nazis, but did not forfeit any of its importance for anthropological research. Divergent opinions and initiatives remain unmentioned. The brief conclusive reference to the category ‘racism’ attempts to contain this circumstance.

However, at least for one case (that of Apartheid in South Africa), the lexicon entry cannot avoid discussing racism’s still existing potential. Furthermore, it is suggested that the term was popularized through the critique of National Socialism. At the same time, it is conceded that it would probably lend itself as an analytical device “for the past when it was unknown”.

Koselleck, the projecting force of the lexicon, see Reinhart Koselleck, The Practice of Conceptual History.

4 For Brunner, see Hans-Henning Kortüm, Gut durch die Zeiten gekommen; for Conze, see Thomas Etzemüller, Sozialgeschichte als politische Geschichte; Jan Eike Dunkhase, Werner Conze.

5 Cf. Timo Pankakoski, Conflict, Context, Concreteness.

6 Cf. Willibald Steinmetz, Michael Freeden, Javier Fernández-Sebastián, eds., Conceptual History in the European Space.

7 Reinhart Koselleck, Begriffsgeschichten, p. 85; for the relation of conceptual and social history see Reinhart Koselleck, Begriffsgeschichte and Social History. All quotes from non-English sources are translated by the authors.

8 Werner Conze, Antje Sommer, Rasse, p. 178. The entry ‘Rasse’ was mostly authored by Conze, who, after 1945, had worked intensively on an apologetic image of German history. This mainly involved the extensive externalisation of national socialism, including the isolation of the persecution and the genocide of European Jews. This is why one seeks in vain for a reference by Conze to one of his co-editors, who had already published in the journal Rasse in 1935 (cf. Otto Brunner, Der ostmärkische Raum in der Geschichte). Likewise, the names of the two editors of this periodical, Ludwig Ferdinand Clauß and Hans F. K. Günther, are missing, as well as those of further representatives of national-socialist racial thinking. In turn, others who were able to further pursue their career after 1945, like Egon von Eickstedt and Ilse Schwidetzky or Walter Scheidt, were not only not criticized but rather even favourably mentioned.

9 Werner Conze, Antje Sommer, Rasse, p. 178.
Ample use has been made in the meantime of this possibility. Yet, this has not changed much of the negligence with which racism analysis treats the history of its own concept. This is demonstrated by an uncritical colportage that is perpetuated until today. It suggests that Magnus Hirschfeld was the first to publish a monograph with the title ‘Racism’ and that the concept of ‘racism’ only emerged after the Nazis applied racist methods against members of the “white race” (in particular Jews and Slavic peoples).10

Both assertions are inaccurate. Factually, the prehistory of the term ‘racism’ is ambiguous and was a transnational process. To emphasize this, we centre our discussion upon Australia. Its racist ‘White Australia Policy’ became state doctrine in 1901, that is roughly at a time when the new words ‘racism’ and ‘racialism’ emerged. Regarding the beginnings of a conceptual history of ‘racism’, Australia possessed some pertinent conditions.

Not only was it part of the most expanded European empire, it also sheltered a migration society consistent of different ethnic elements of the so-called ‘white race’, who considered another members of various sub-races of different value. Furthermore, this settler society had some typical characteristics of racist societalization: repression against the indigenous population including its violent and genocidal persecution; the inclusion of indentured or otherwise coerced foreign workforce in its economy; and the formation of a racially segregated and degraded social underclass subordinated to all other classes of the colonial society.

Geographically, Australia played a particular role. One the one hand, it was situated in the sphere of influence of two old Asiatic empires, China and Japan, and thus viewed itself as endangered by a ‘yellow peril’.11 The corresponding alarmism peaked at the same time as the concept of ‘racism’ emerged. On the other hand, until the First World War, Australia shared a border with Germany (in New Guinea) and accommodated a large number of settlers of German descent. This became especially important during the rise of German fascism and the corresponding applications of the concept of ‘racism’.

Moreover, Australia was by no means a society of uninformed people of parochial attitudes. There was actually a close-knit network of newspapers that acted as weekly replicators of metropolitan news for regional and rural communities. In addition, literacy was common and even in remote areas of the country people made intense use of newspapers. At the end of the nineteenth century, Australia had three times more papers per inhabitant than Great Britain. Newspapers had become real mass media.12

10 Cf. Etienne Balibar, La construction du racisme, pp. 15 f.; Robert Miles, Racism, pp. 42 f.; see Magnus Hirschfeld, Racism.
11 The yellow peril was, of course, not an anxiety specific to Australia (see, for instance, John Kuo Wei Tchen, Dylan Years, Yellow Peril); but due to the geographic proximity, the purported threat seemed a real danger and took on particularly intense extents.
12 Cf. John Arnold, Newspapers and Daily Reading; Henry Mayer, The Press in Australia. Furthermore, the readers not only used Anglophone sources but had also access to German, Swedish, French, Italian, Greek, and Chinese newspapers. In addition, there was also a press with indigenous voices. Cf. Victor Isaacs and Rod Kirkpatrick, Two Hundred Years of Sydney Newspapers. For foreign-language press, see, inter alia, Miriam Gilson and Jerzy Zubrzycki, The Foreign-Language Press in Australia 1848-1964; Mei-fen Kuo, Making Chinese Australia; for the indigenous press, see Michael Rose, For the Record.
In this context, the terms ‘racialism’ and ‘racism’ were utilized and diffused with differing contents and nuances. They make obvious that a constricted derivation of the concept of ‘racism’ falls short. We attempt to shine a light on this circumstance by tracing the far-reaching usage of ‘racialism’ and ‘racism’ in the press of the period. We precede our investigation with brief references to the early international history of both terms. Subsequently, we present two examples to demonstrate how both terms appeared early on in the Australian public discourse. They were applied, inter alia, in the context of the dispute between the Boers and the British in South Africa and aimed at German politics and settlers of German descent in Australia. Finally, we recapitulate our findings and compare them with other considerations regarding the early history of the concept of ‘racism’.

‘Heading for Racism’ – Multifarious Beginnings

In the ‘Oxford English Dictionary’, the entries for ‘racialism’ and ‘racism’ contain mutual references. The earliest pieces of evidence for the two entries stem from 1880 and 1902 respectively. Corresponding expressions can also be found early on in other languages. For instance, in 1888, the French anarchist Charles Malato relates them to transnational movements of pan-Slavism, pan-Latinism, and pan-Germanism and considers them an indication that “[p]reseeding from patriotism, today we are heading for racism”.

In the English language, the word ‘racialism’ surfaces in the outgoing nineteenth century. In 1897, the ‘Columbian Cyclopedia’ defined “nation” either as “the inhabitants of one country united under the same government” or as “a state or independent [society] united by common political institutions”. The term could also mean “an aggregate mass of persons connected by ties of blood and lineage, and sometimes of language – a race”. The latter understanding stems from “the modern dogma of nationalism”, interpreted by “extreme politicians” in a way “that a nation in the [...] race sense ought necessarily be also a nation in the [...] political sense”. Such a type of nationalism “might be properly called racialism”.

From the outset, this ethnocentric dimension of racial thinking shaped the understanding of the new terms ‘racism’ and ‘racialism’. By doing so, both could refer to a wide range of conflicts, simultaneously driving a wedge between the purportedly white and the so-called coloured races and splitting up the unity of the white race.

13 Cf. Oxford English Dictionary [online], s. v. ‘racism’ and ‘racialism’.
14 Charles Malato, Philosophie de l’anarchie, p. 9. In the early discourse, race was always used in a genealogical manner: razza in Spain, race in France, and race in England – and the relatedness to descent and class was still existential in the nineteenth century. In the debate on social conflicts, it resulted in an intermingling of the categories class and race. Along these lines, Henry Mayhew, disparaging the poor, suggested that in the course of history “every civilized tribe had its nomadic race, like parasites, living upon it”, Henry Mayhew, London Labour and the London Poor, p. 321. With regard to racism the background was usually ethnic, sometimes with a classis undertone; an example is Gaston Méry, Jean Révolte.
15 The Columbian Cyclopedia, s. v. ‘nation’.
In 1903, John Stephen Willison, long-time editor-in-chief of the Toronto ‘Globe’, discussed the “race quarrel in South Africa” and the “race quarrel in Canada” – that is between the British and the Dutch population in the one case, the British and the French population in the other case – in a book chapter captioned “Imperialism and Racialism”.\(^\text{16}\) In 1906, Rabbi Samuel Schulman, born in Russia, student in Germany, migrant to the USA, and a moderate anti-Zionist, criticized “Jewish racialism” in Palestine.\(^\text{17}\)

Three years earlier, a newspaper chronicled the appointment by Theodore Roosevelt of William Demosthenes Crum, a friend of Booker T. Washington, as a collector of customs for the port of Charleston. Crum had a medical practice and headed the local hospital for African Americans. His appointment gave rise to severe white protests in the South and resistance in the Republican-dominated Senate. But, according to the newspaper report, the president “stated that he would not allow partisanship, racialism, or sectarianism” but would instead only be guided by the “individual ability” of candidates for “responsible positions”.\(^\text{18}\)

At the same time, the veteran of the “Indian Wars” and founder of an “Indian boarding school”, lieutenant colonel Richard Henry Pratt, used the word ‘racism’ in a comparatively negative sense. Experienced in both physical and cultural genocide, his motto was “Kill the Indian in him, and save the man”.\(^\text{19}\) This expressed his radical assimilationist view of politics regarding Indigenous Americans. In view of them, he declared: “Segregating any class or race of people apart from the rest of the people kills the progress of the segregated people or makes their growth very slow. Association of races and classes is necessary in order to destroy racism and classism”.\(^\text{20}\)

The terms ‘racialism’ and ‘racism’ often had negative connotations. However, various positions could also use them in a positive sense. Already in 1897, Alexander Crummell explained that “the Negro himself is duty bound to see to the cultivation and the fostering of his own race-capacity” and in this context propagated a “devoted racialism”.\(^\text{21}\) He had lived for many years in Liberia before he returned to the United States, where he served as a pastor in Washington, taught at Howard University, and founded the American Negro Academy. Today, he is regarded as one of the founders of pan-African thinking.\(^\text{22}\)

In the same year, the antisemitic French journal ‘La Libre Parole’ claimed “that truly French – truly racist – voices oppose their eloquence to the rhetoric of internationalist boastings”.\(^\text{23}\) Already two years earlier, Charles Maurras had declared: “Et moi aussi je suis raciste”. He was a hard-core antissemit as well as a leading member of the ultra-right-wing ‘Action française’ and linked his statement to the


\(^{17}\) The Jewish Outlook (Denver), 3, 1906, 41, pp. 1 f. (Samuel Schulman, Rabbi and People), p. 2.

\(^{18}\) Sedalia Weekly Conservator, 29 August 1903, p. 2 (A New Phenomenon in American Politics).

\(^{19}\) Richard H. Pratt, The Advantages of Mingling Indians with Whites, p. 45.


\(^{21}\) Alexander Crummell, The Attitude of the American Mind Toward the Negro Intellect: First Annual Address [December 28, 1897], p. 17.

\(^{22}\) Cf. Anthony Appiah, Alexander Crummell and the Invention of Africa; see also Wilson Jeremiah Moses, Alexander Crummell (Pan-Africanism).

\(^{23}\) La Libre Parole, 18 November 1897, quoted from Pierre-André Taguieff, The Force of Prejudice, p. 85.
“civilisation latine” and the “esprit latin”. In this way, he emphasized that he did not understand ‘racialism’ in the ethnical and biological sense, like the Germans, but in its cultural meaning as an “identité d’éducation et de tradition”.24

About a decade later, in the ‘Brooklyn Daily Eagle’, an author chronicled “the development of society from patriarchalism through tribalism to racism and government in the history of Europe”.25 Another fifteen years later, the Japanese Masatarō Sawayanagi was reported to have claimed “a period of racialism (grouping of peoples of the same race)” for Asia, that is “a period of Asianism” as “a sort of Monroe Doctrine in favour of the Pacific nations”.26 Sawayanagi was a well-known pedagogue, who made a career as a bureaucrat, as a school director, as vice-minister of education, and as president of two universities. He took several overseas trips and represented Japan at numerous international conferences. In 1919, he published a book titled ‘Asianism’. In this study, he compared an Asianism led by Japan with a pan-Germanism led by Germany or a pan-Slavism led by Russia and declared that Asianism was the only way for East Asia to resist the Western menace of colonisation.27

Similar to Crummell or Sawayanagi, Alain Locke commented on these issues. His usage of ‘racialism’ and ‘racism’ over a longer time period indicates that the textual horizon of the categories was a subject to historical changes, while it nonetheless kept its ambivalent substance.

In 1925, Locke declared that “[t]he racialism of the Negro is no limitation or reservation with respect to American life; it is only a constructive effort to build the obstructions in the stream of his progress into an efficient dam of social energy and power”.28 In 1942, in the context of the discussion on the racism of the Nazis in Germany, Locke talked about “fascism and its attendant racism”. At the same time, he declared “[r]ace consciousness on the part of minorities” to be “an inevitable and pardonable reaction to majority persecution and disparagement” and added: “It is after all, however, potential minority racialism, and thus by no means exempt from the errors and extremisms of majority racialism”.29

This international diversity regarding the early usage of ‘racialism’ and ‘racism’ is also found in Australia (even though the term ‘racialism’ by far outweighs ‘racism’). In 1907, under the headline of “Eradicating Racialism”, an article tells of attempts in China to curtail traditional privileges of the Manchu to undermine the “racial jealousies between the Chinese and their former conquerors”.30

Under the keyword ‘racialism’, religious conflicts were already addressed early on. In 1898, a note about “Racialism and Religionism” referenced the fleeing of wealthy Muslims from Crete, and a piece of news about the “Racialism and Religion in Austria” dealt with the conflicts that could possibly start a war between

---

24 Quoted from Carole Reynaud Paligot, Maurras et la notion de race, p. 119.
25 The Brooklyn Daily Eagle, 19 September 1906, p. 27 (C.W. Mason, Books and Bookishness).
26 L’Ouest-Eclair, 12 October 1921, p. 1 (Les travaux de l’assemblée de Genève).
27 Cf. Tetsuya Kobayashi, Masatarō Sawayanagi (1865-1937) and the Revised Elementary School Code of 1900; Nobuo Fujikawa, Pädagogik zwischen Rassendiskriminierung und Vernichtung fremder Kultur; see Masatarō Sawayanagi, Ajiashugi (Asianism).
28 Alain Locke, Enter the New Negro, p. 633.
29 Charles Molesworth, ed., The Works of Alain Locke, pp. 334 (‘racism’), 396 (‘racialism’).
Protestants and Catholics. In 1910, a short notice was published on “Racialism in India”, which reported an increase of “[r]acial feeling” that led to a “boycott” of “Mahomedan traders” by “Hindu Nationalists”.

Additionally, the header “racialism” appeared in a wide range of contexts in 1910. One newspaper addressed “racial antagonism” in South Africa, the intra-white conflict; and the confrontation between blacks and whites under the caption “racialism”.

Further, a short notice on “Racialism in America” informed readers about a denied marriage license for the “son of a wealthy Japanese Merchant” and a “white girl”. Headed “Racialism Let Loose”, an article reported on the reactions to a boxing fight in which the black fighter defeated the white; this led to a situation in which “racial prejudice filled the lower classes of the white population with resentment” in the USA.

In the same year, ‘The Bulletin’ demonstrated the extent of the category ‘racialism’ in two articles on said boxing fight in the USA and on the conflict between the Boers and the British in South Africa. Calling the one a “savage outbreak of racism” and the other a “resource” of the Boers as well as of the British. The use of the term ‘racialism’ was highly diversified. It touched upon ‘racial’ as well as ‘cultural’ conflicts. It was biologically, religiously, or politically connoted. It comprised conflicts between whites and non-whites as well as those within certain races.

At the same time, there was no unambiguous lexical fixation of the wording. Though the use of ‘racialism’ predominated, the same incidents could be discussed by using the term ‘racism’. This was demonstrated by a 1906 South Australian newspaper article that reported on religious conflicts in India by addressing “the Hindu religious fanaticism and racism”.

‘Abolition of Racialism’ – The South African Scenario

The coverage and discussion of the war between the Boers and the British in South Africa played an important role in the Australian public discourse. The main reason for this was that the participation of Australian soldiers in an overseas war coincided with the constitution of Australia as a nation-state in 1901.

31 The Bendigo Independent, 8 December 1898, p. 2 (Racialism and Religionism); The Bendigo Independent, 23 December 1898, p. 2 (Racialism and Religion in Austria).
32 Mount Alexander Mail, 30 March 1910, p. 2 (Racialism in India).
34 The North Western Advocate and the Emu Bay Times, 30 September 1910, p. 3 (Racialism in America).
35 Kalgoorlie Western Argus, 12 July 1910, p. 28 (Racialism Let Loose); subject of the report was the fight between Jack Johnson and James Jeffries. For the reactions of the USA and the local press see, inter alia, Barak Y. Orbach, The Johnson-Jeffries Fight and Censorship of Black Supremacy.
36 The Bulletin, 14 July 1910, p. 30 (Sporting Notions); The Bulletin (Sydney), 30 June 1910, p. 10 (The Boer and the Capitalist).
Those involved went to war as soldiers and nurses of separate colonies; they returned as contingents of a new state’s army.

Their participation in the war against South Africa was by no means uncontested. Soldiers from New South Wales had already lived through a colonial war in Sudan, and their service had not at all complied with their chauvinist expectations. In fact, there was a reputable opposition against the overseas deployment of soldiers caused by the fear that Australia would need them for its own defence against foreign military incursions. The putative enemies Germany and Japan were identified as a threat. Together with China and Russia, they also appeared in fantasies that found literary expression in a wide range of popular ‘invasion novels’.

However, the imperial spirit prevailed; from the start, recruitment was accompanied by a growing patriotic euphoria. The enlistment of a separate bushmen contingent further inflamed the societal atmosphere. Many Australians linked their deployment not only with presumed colonial virtues but also with the notion that the bushmen constituted a particularly hardy variant of the white race. Based on this belief, they were also ascribed a special role in the repulsion of ‘coloured perils’ and the preservation of ‘white supremacy’. The forces sent to South Africa were associated with these objectives. But particularly, their mission was to secure control over the Boers, an enemy who was considered to belong to the same race but was nevertheless accused of a massive ‘racialism’. Depending on the respective state of conflict, this term was subject to varying trends.

In 1906, a newspaper heading asserted “Racialism Rampant”; the year after, regarding “the new trend of feeling in the Transvaal”, it was reported that, “so far as the Boers are concerned, racialism is dead”. In 1909, “the absence of any sign of racialism” at the South African Closer Union Convention was addressed; a year later, it was believed “that the little racialism still existing in South Africa was fast dying out”. In 1915, however, a revolt of powers not wanting to join England in its opposition of Germany was discussed as “an orgy of racialism”. In 1919, reports talked of a “struggle between the surviving racialism and the true South African nationalism”, and, under headlines like “Racialism in South Africa”, there were speculations about a possible disintegration of the union. In 1925, “a marked increase in racialism” was witnessed; later, the 1926 “Flag Bill” was labelled the “Torch of Racialism”. In 1929, it was simply stated that

39 Cf. Catriona Ross, Unsettling Imaginings; David Walker, Anxious Nation; Stefanie Affeldt, ‘White’ Nation –’White’ Angst.
42 The West Australian, 8 November 1906, p. 7 (The Transvaal); Darling Downs Gazette (Queensland), 6 March 1907, p. 4 (Boer Racialism Dead).
43 The Ballarat Star, 8 February 1909, p. 6 (South Africa. The Absence of Racialism).
44 The Border Morning Mail and Riverina Times, 17 February 1910, p. 2 (Racialism Dying Out).
46 The Telegraph, 22 November 1919, p. 13 (W.G. Davis, Racialism in South Africa. Will the Botha Politics Win?).
48 The Age, 3 April 1925, p. 10 (Racialism in South Africa).
49 The Daily Telegraph, 26 May 1927, p. 13 (Will There be a Civil War? South African Describes Flag Bill as ‘Torch of Racialism’).
“Racialism continues” and in 1932, a report on a regional by-election chronicled “a victory for racialism”, i.e., “Afrikaner racialism”. In 1938, a journal claimed that “[r]acialism [...] has ceased to appeal as a political creed to the average sensible South African”.

Despite the concentration on the conflict between the Boers and the British, the perception of racism did not exclude the race conflict between blacks and whites. Thus, in 1907, demands were reported to create “a gaol and a laager” for the “natives” because of the acute risk of a “general rising” under the title “Racialism”. Using the same heading, a report from 1911 dealt with “attempts to lynch natives”. At the end of the decade, entitled “Racialism in South Africa”, the conflict between the Boers and the British was discussed, involving concerns that the “Indian considers himself oppressed” and that “[t]he native question is also looming big”. Nonetheless, such media coverage was published with keeping in mind a taken-for-granted ‘white supremacy’. In 1910, it had already been explained that “(t)he racialism referred to is [...] British and Dutch, but it is inevitable that before long a bigger question of race will overshadow all these little jealousies, and drive Dutch and English together, to uphold the white supremacy against the black.”

Therefore, the addressed racism against ‘natives’ had a different significance to that amongst whites. The ideology behind it was shown in a later contribution: reporting on the differing conditions of living for blacks and whites, it claimed that “no serious racialism” existed in this context in South Africa. It was a simple fact that “natives” were “in a primitive state”, “[i]nter-marriage” was “virtually unknown” and also “forbidden by law”, the “native leaders” knew “that the natives need European guidance”, and apart from that “segregation” kept them away from the whites.

Under the ideological escort of race theory, the scope of the linguistic creations ‘racism’ and ‘racialism’ could be broadly interpreted and focussed on intra-white conflicts at the same time. Without tripping over their own logic, a Tasmanian newspaper declared in 1906 that the “constitution of the new Transvaal National Association advocates federation, abolition of racialism, co-operation with the Boers, fair treatment of natives, complete self-government, no further importation of Chinese”; this would allow “South Africans to unite and create a white nation fit to rank with Canada and Australia”.

51 The Argus, 20 August 1932, p. 9 (South Africa. A Victory for Racialism).
52 Newcastle Morning Herald and Miners’ Advocate, 21 May 1938, p. 10 (Racialism. No Longer Political Creed).
53 The Bendigo Independent, 19 March 1907, p. 3 (Racialism in Natal).
56 Evening News, 15 September 1910, p. 4 (Racialism). The addressed reciprocity of ‘racialism’ would reappear in later expositions – cf. W. Keith Hancock, Boers and Britons in South Africa, 1900-14, p. 18: “Milner, the British racialist, [...] turned Smuts [...] into a Boer racist”.
57 Cf. Effie Karageorgos, War in a ‘white man’s country’, who demonstrates that Australian soldiers were able to sympathize with the local Boers despite British ideology campaigns directed against the latter, while they considered the Indigenous Africans a lower race.
59 The Daily Telegraph, 29 September 1906, p. 7 (The Transvaal).
Using the same ideological turn of phrase, in 1911, a New South Wales newspaper appreciated that a conference in South Africa had decided “to form a strong South African Party to consolidate the white races, eradicate racialism, and make South Africa a white man’s country.” At the end of the same decade, nothing had changed in this regard. A Queensland newspaper demanded “that the two white races must work together”. This would be the only “progressive and truly national policy” in South Africa, “where the brown people outnumber the white, five to one”. It was, therefore, imperative to “gain a permanent victory over the forces of racialism, unless indeed the white man is to go down before the advancing coloured man”. For this reason, the argument ran, it was essential that “the reactionary forces of Dutch racialism” were pushed back.61

The “advancing coloured man” of this period was no mere ideological fiction. Rather, the term reflected the historical concurrence of the farthest expansion of the colonial and imperial white supremacy with alarmist warnings of their endangerment by, as a 1920 monograph called it, “The Rising Tide of Color” as “The Threat Against White World Supremacy.”62 Three decades earlier, an internationally praised publication had already emphasized Australia’s vulnerable geopolitical position as a white outpost and its lead role in the defence of the “whole civilised world” against the “swamping” by “inferior races”.63

In 1919, a newspaper got het up about Japan’s call for “a declaration of racial equality” at the Paris Peace Conference. That was not acceptable, in particular for Australia, which considered “Asiatic exclusion [...] a life and death matter”. This was explained with the assumption that the mentally further-developed white race was procreating slower than the yellow race. Like the Chinese, its members were reported to be “nearer to the animal stage” and to show “a rabbit-like rate of fecundity”.64 Even so, the Japanese were praised for their quick progress and were attested that they had been effective and dependable allies during the war. Nonetheless, the reservations about their call for ‘racial equality’ remained on the agenda. It was claimed in a perfectly circular argument that Australia’s “very life as a white man’s country depends upon inflexible adherence to the principles of a White Australia”.65

‘An arrogant Racialism’ – The German Threat

Australia and Germany were connected in several ways. There was a substantial number of German immigrants who, as one of the largest non-English speaking population groups, were from the start involved in the colonisation of the continent.66 The British Commonwealth and the German Empire (together or as

60 Daily Advertiser, 24 November 1911, p. 2 (White South Africa).
61 The Telegraph, W. G. Davis, 22 November 1919, p. 13 (Racialism in South Africa. Will the Botha Politics Win?).
63 Charles H. Pearson, National Life and Character, p. 16.
64 Chronicle, 5 April 1919, p. 31 (The Claim of Japan).
65 Daily Observer, 16 April 1919, p. 2 (Japan’s Racial Demands).
66 Jürgen Tampke, The Germans in Australia.
enemies) were involved in a number of international conflicts. Additionally, Australia and Germany had a shared imperial border that transected New Guinea.

It is not surprising, therefore, that at that time the Australians’ widespread invasion anxiety also pertained to Germany. During the First World War, the ‘State Recruiting Committee of South Australia’ illustrated such fictions with one of their posters. Here, Australia had become “New Germany”, and Sydney was renamed “Nietschburg” [sic]. In this specific context, a line of ancestors of ‘racism’ (in this case called “racialism”) had been constructed early on. This ancestry refers to “the development of the spirit of modern Germany”, to which “Fichte, Gobineau, Wagner, Nietzsche, Chamberlain, [and] Lichtenberger” had contributed: “They are the men who have so developed and applied the idea of ‘racialism’ in history as to till the modern German mind with its feelings of glory and its demands to capture a ‘place in the sun’”.68

Individual representatives of this development were strung together as agents of a united movement: “In 1809 Fichte [...] preached unity and liberty and especially racialism”. The latter referred to Fichte’s chauvinism. For him, the Germans were “the natural aristocracy of mankind”.69 Subsequently, it was stated that “Wagner became the successor of Fichte”, and added that “when Wagner retired from the succession of racialism, Gobineau took up the message”. The quintessence of this development was not so much race theory but rather the differentiation of the white race in a manner in which “the German comes out top”. Though there were attempts to claim a “prerogative of the Anglo-Saxon race”, “the true ‘racialist’ [...] puts the Teuton, the pure German, first”.

As the “next apostle in this movement”, “Nietzsche” was listed, “who represents the very spirit [...] of German racialism”. He was deemed “so wild in his thinking” that his philosophy did not become popular. The work of Wagner’s son-in-law, H. S. Chamberlain, was said to be much more effective. Regarding him, it was stated, “Chamberlain is by no means a mere repeater or imitator of Gobineau. [...] Yet their message is the same. It is an aristocratic racialism, with the ‘German’ at the top”. Added to this was that “Chamberlain’s racialism is as bitterly anti-Semitic as it is pro-Teuton”.70

67 Cf. ‘Australians arise’, poster by the State Recruiting Committee: Adelaide, c.1918.
68 The Argus, Clericus, 30 August 1913, p. 8 (Racialism); there also the following quotes.
69 Though it is indisputable (see Gudrun Hentges, Schattenseiten der Aufklärung, pp. 110 ff.), Fichte’s antisemitism remained unmentioned.
70 The sequence Gobineau-Wagner-(Nietzsche)-Chamberlain is a line of retreat for all scholars of the history of racism who, until today, want to exclude from the annals of racism the dialectics of Enlightenment as well as the role of eminent German philosophers and scientists. The discourse of the time saw similar voices – cf. The Advertiser, 7 October 1916, p. 13 (The Gospel of Super-Humanity. [Gobineau as] Nietzsche’s Predecessor). The envisioned line of tradition was later extended with Nazi ideologists – cf. Recorder, 14 May 1940, p. 2 (Myth of Nordic Germany) with a line “Gobineau-Nietzsche-Chamberlain-George-Rosenberg-Hitler”. It goes without saying that, already early on, there were Australian voices favouring Gobineau’s race mythology and even reasoning that “the interesting doctrine put forward by de Gobineau [...] provides a most powerful argument in support of the White Australia policy” – The Daily Telegraph, 1 August 1911, p. 6 (Are All the Races Equal?). During the First World War, drawing the line “Gobineau-Nietzsche-Treitschke-Chamberlain” led to the conclusion that “race heresy has been the leitmotiv of all political controversies in the [German] Empire. [...] It has culminated in the triple dogma of the superman of the super-race and of the super-State. This triple dogma of the German Real Politik has worked for the enslavement of Europe” – Maryborough Chronicle, Wide Bay
With respect to this ancestry line’s last representative, Lichtenberger, the author is not too certain and even believes that he “is more an impartial historian than any of the preceding racialists” and “seems to be a disciple of a moderate racialism”. As a Nietzschean and admirer of German culture, he nonetheless ranked as “the last of the German racialists, who began the century with Fichte”.

In the course of the First World War, ‘racialism’ was increasingly applied to Germans. Eventually, it was stated: “Germany’s patriotism has degenerated into an arrogant racialism” and is an expression of a “neurotic nationality”. This was compared with Ireland, where “a similar departure from the normal is responsible for the Sinn Fein”. Also pertaining to the discussion was the critique of the German settlers’ insistence on their cultural identity. This led to conflicts, in particular concerning religious education. The “German language”, insofar as it was used in religious schools as a teaching language, was considered “the great divisive element in our midst”, and its application was criticized as “racialism”.

However, in the further course of the debate, the category ‘racialism’ was employed not only regarding conflicts among white people. The ‘Northern Star’, for instance, reported on the deployment of coloured colonial troops in the Rhineland in 1920. “Amazing scenes occurred in the [German] National Assembly during a debate regarding the colonial troops”, it said and continued, “Frau Zeetz (Independent Socialist) asked why there was no mention of the German immorality and brutalities on women in Russia, Belgium and elsewhere” and exclaimed “This is merely racialism against the blacks”.

The newspaper misspelled the name of Louise Zietz, who had been a left-wing German social democrat until 1917 and then acted as a foundation member of the Independent Social Democratic Party (USPD). In 1919–20, she was a member of the National Assembly of Weimar (and later of the Reichstag in Berlin). In her speech, addressed by the ‘Northern Star’, Zietz engaged in the debate of an interpellation “concerning the operation of coloured troops in the occupied territories”. The session treated the occupation of the Rhineland by French colonial soldiers, which was not only in Germany scandalized as ‘black shame’ or ‘black horror’. In her speech, Zietz declared: “We Germans have indeed blemished our culture largely enough as a result of the racial hatred [Rassenhaß] prevailing


71 Henri Lichtenberger is incorporated in this line not least because he wrote two books on Wagner and Nietzsche in which he intensively and uncritically used the race term (cf. Henri Lichtenberger, Richard Wagner; id., La philosophie de Nietzsche). But, curiously enough, Lichtenberger is made a ‘racialist’ here, even though he critically wrote of “les activistes d’extrême-droite connus sous le nom de groupe ‘germaniste’ ou ‘raciste’ (deutschvölkisch)”, (Henri Lichtenberger, L’Allemagne d’aujourd’hui dans ses relations avec la France). One year later, the English translation spoke of “the agitators of the extreme Right known as ‘Germanists’ or ‘racists’ [...] (deutschvölkische)” (Henri Lichtenberger, Relations Between France and Germany, p. 53). See Pierre-André Taguieff, The Force of Prejudice, p. 88.

72 Western Mail, 21 December 1917, p. 20 (Nationality and Racialism).

73 Observer, 26 June 1915, p. 53 (Racialism and Lutheran Schools). In fact, the proportion of such schools was rather small, and the Lutheran ministers deemed themselves utterly Australian (cf. Gerhard Fischer, Immigration, Integration, Disintegration).

74 Northern Star, 24 May 1920, p. 5 (German Colonisation).

75 Verhandlungen der verfassungsgebenden Deutschen Nationalversammlung, p. 177; Sitzung vom 20. Mai 1920, p. 5690; for the following quote, see ibid., p. 5695. Cf. Iris Wigger, The “Black Horror on the Rhine”.
in our country”. Here, she referenced “racial hatred” both to antisemitism and colonial racism. But she did not use the word “Rassismus” [racism / racialism]. The ‘Northern Star’s’ translation of “Rassenhaß” as “racialism” shows the wide spectrum of the semantic field of ‘racism’ in the early stage of its usage.

Already in the course of the war, there were comparable statements in Australia. The commencement of the war had led to both the immediate mobilisation and, already in 1914, the deployment of first troops in German New Guinea. Even though the military disaster at Gallipoli in 1915 was rewritten as a heroic epic, there was a lack of volunteers during the war. The introduction of conscription in Australia was meant to remediate this circumstance and a referendum was scheduled for autumn 1916. There was extreme controversy about the preceding debates, dividing the country into two almost equally sized camps.

Labour Party and unions linked their consequent ‘No’ to conscription to the race question. This was illustrated by a poster that proclaimed “Vote No” and that depicted Australia as threatened by a mass of pigtailed Chinese. It was entitled “Keep Australia White”. This demand was underlined by a quotation of a proponent of conscription, which read: “Send every man out of Australia, even if they had to import black, brown or brindle labor to do their work”.

Although there were critical voices coming from smaller leftist organisations, the majority of the organized workers employed in their antagonism towards conscription racist arguments from the arsenal of White Australia ideology. One who saw the situation differently was John Adamson, a unionist, Labor politician, minister in the Queensland government, and a passionate supporter of conscription. He would later resign from all these memberships as a consequence of the massive disputes. In his opinion, loyalty to the Empire and the task to defend Germany had top priority.

In the course of the debate, Adamson was berated as a “traitor” and a “sectarian devil” and was faced with racist slurs: racially suspect southern Europeans would flow into the country – and “[p]erhaps you would like to see your daughter married to a Chinaman”. Moreover, Japan would threaten Australia. In this context, Adamson referred to the circumstance that he “wanted a White Australia”. This postulation, in truth, would be jeopardized by the opponents of conscription because “Japan has assisted us in this war, and saved Australia from being raided by the German cruisers”.

After the referendum, which the conscriptionists lost by a narrow margin, Adamson wrote: “Racial hatred and sectarian bitterness played a great part in the late fight [...]. There can be no doubt that selfishness, materialism, and racialism,
in one form or another, were the predominating causes which brought about the result revealed by the poll”.

The semantics of ‘racialism’ were intensified with the strengthening of the Nazis. In 1935, the antisemitic laws and incidents in Germany were subsumed as “racialism run riot”. The word did not only appear in connection with anti-semitism. ‘Nazi racialism’ was also at work when, in 1941, Germans blew up the memorial of the black French soldiers in Reims because they viewed it “as an insult to the white race”. Along the same lines, it had already been conceded in 1938 that “[t]here may be a moral case for the return of the colonies” to Germany. Though in this case, there would be “a genuine disinclination to deliver millions of natives to a Germany imbued with fanatical racist doctrines”.

At the start of 1939, a South Australian newspaper began to publish Hitler’s Mein Kampf as a serial. It had before announced this intention with the headline “Hitler’s conception of racialism”. At this time, the terms ‘racialism’ and ‘racism’ were intensively linked to German politics, German conduct, and German tradition. A quasi-definition of ‘racialism’ determined it “as the cult of Germanism for the Germans”. Already at this time, the semantic horizon of the new concept was much wider. The discourse concerning the ‘racialism’ of the Boers continued and other contexts were likewise perpetuated, reports on the racist discrimination against Indigenous Australians included. The semantic field of ‘racialism’ / ‘racism’ was not fixed to a certain content.

_calibration_

When the German historian Werner Conze claimed that the term ‘racism’ “was provoked by national socialism and denoted in a derogatory sense the misuse of the race term by its unjustified transmission to history and politics”, he was by no means alone. Already early on, Eric Voegelin spoke about “National Socialist racism”. With the help of two racist books, he had attempted in vain to pursue a career in Nazi-Germany. When this proved unsuccessful, he dedicated himself to the support of Austrofascism. After he had fled to the USA, he referred to the Nazis as racists. At the same time, he excluded American race politics from his reproach. “[T]he classification of the human races”, “the improvement of a given human population through eugenic measures”, and “the problem of political and social relations between the white and the colored races” had, in his view, nothing to do with racism.

82 The Daily News, 17 September 1935, p. 6 (Racialism run Riot).
84 The Sydney Morning Herald, 25 October 1938, p. 19 (Germany and Colonies).
85 News, 7 January 1939, p. 1 (Hitler’s Conception of Racialism).
86 Southern Cross, 8 July 1938, p. 9 (Belloch on Austria. Bismarck and Hitler).
87 Werner Conze, Antje Sommer, Rasse.
In the same year, 1940, Ruth Benedict made use of the perspective of the Boas school to distinguish between ‘race science’ and ‘racism’: “Racism is not, like race, a subject the content of which can be scientifically investigated. It is, like a religion, a belief which can be studied only historically”.89 This was a significant moment for the further development of the concept of ‘racism’. Until then, it had embodied a wide range of nuances. These included in particular: – the overlapping of nationalism and racial thinking in the construction of ‘state racisms’ or ‘pan-racisms’; – the self-racialisation that arose from various motives and found expression in the propagation of separate ‘ethnoracisms’; – and the concerns for the devaluation of the term ‘race’ due to conflicts among whites and the endangerment of ‘white supremacy’.

Furthermore, the understanding of racism was shaped by the fear of anthropologists and public intellectuals concerning an increasing delegitimisation of the race paradigm. This was intensified by the growing critique and resistance of those who were affected by imperial, colonial, and racist repression.

So far, attempts of analysis have strictly focussed their investigation of the development of the concept of ‘racism’ on this phase of its history. Pierre-André Taguieff concludes that ‘racism’ was “a name properly attributed to the enemy”. Barnor Hesse maintains “that the racism concept was formulated on grounds that objected to Nazism, but not to the history of western colonialism”.90 In fact, the contemporary witnesses of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century were already fully aware that ‘racialism’ and ‘racism’ not only existed in the case of ‘others’ and were not only committed by whites against whites.

In the USA, Ruth Benedict’s constricted use of the term was put into a broader context without any objection by ‘The Crisis’ (the magazine of the ‘National Association for the Advancement of Colored People’). In a review of her book, ‘The Crisis’ explained: “Whether we like it or not, racism today is in the ascendant and none of us can avoid its repercussions and implications, whether Negroes in America, Jews in Germany, or Nisei in California”.91 Already in the year of the Nazis’ seizure of power, Mark-Eli Ravage wrote about “Racism, American Style”: “The condition of the Negro in the United States is only the most extreme case of the shape racism assumes in this country”.

In the German-speaking discussion, Hugo Iltis (who, like Benedict, distinguished between race science and racism) decisively countered Nazi racism. In the same text, he wrote about the discrimination and oppression of the “black race” in America: “Here we encounter for the first time the racism, the fight against a

89 Ruth Benedict, Race, p. 153.
90 Pierre-André Taguieff, The Force of Prejudice, p. 93; Barnor Hesse, Racism’s Alterity, p. 145.
92 Mark-Eli Ravage, Le Racisme à l’Américaine, p. 5. Born as Marcus Eli Revici in Romania, Ravage migrated to the United States in 1900 and changed his family name. He studied at the University of Illinois and Columbia University, married a French woman, and became a successful writer. In 1920, he and his family moved to Paris, came back to the States in 1923, and went back to France in 1927. His writings against antisemitism occasionally had ironic and cynical overtones – to the point that (in the very sense of Karl Kraus) fascist readers did not understand their irony and reproduced them as purportedly unmasking documents on the Jewish undermining of the Christian world – also in Australia (see: id., The Sensational Confession of Marcus Eli Ravage (a Hebrew) Against Christianity.
human group based on their race, with all its injustices and brutality”.

For the fight against racism, he issued as a motto a variation of a class-based formulation by Marx: “The emancipation of the oppressed races can only be the work of the oppressed races themselves.” This context was also addressed, albeit less radically, in Australia. The ‘Southern Cross’ printed John LaFarge’s contribution “Racism and Social Unity”. Though he observed that “[in Europe, Racism [...] is closely associated with anti-Jewish propaganda”, he, simultaneously, discussed “American anti-Negro Racism”, the “venomous elder cousin” of German racism.

The new categories also served the concrete designation of the racist oppression of Indigenous Australians. In the same vein, ‘The Workers Star’ demanded in 1937 “Down with Racialism” and criticized an attempt to prevent the ‘cohabitation’ of a “half-caste” woman with a white man who already had four children together. He was forcibly separated from her and the children and arrested. Both went to court, where they were eventually granted the right to marry.

A year later, a newspaper article discussed fascist Italy and Nazi-Germany under the term “racialism”. In the following, however, it was self-critically noted: “Yet how many of our people, while emphatic in their condemnation of the new Germany, allow their own minds to be tainted with the same error of racialism”. This pertained to immigration policies as well as to the “conduct towards our unhappy aborigines, showing clearly that we regard them as sub-human creatures, to be preserved as curiosities or exterminated as vermin”.

Such statements remained the exception. Nonetheless, they exemplified that the narrowing of the use of ‘racialism’ and ‘racism’ was not due to a one-dimensional history of origins but drew upon an overlapping of several ideological and strategic interests. This indubitably included the externalisation of the problem in public discourse. The crimes of the settler society against the original inhabitants of the continent were subsequently redefined based on their alleged weakness. The discrimination of the White Australia policy was masqueraded as an expression of legitimate national interests in the protection of painstakingly obtained social achievements.

The early use of the categories ‘racialism’ and ‘racism’ had been comparably broad. In Australia, it could be intensively related to intraracial as well as inter-racial discriminations and applied to racial no less than to cultural issues. Focal points of the discourse were the supposed racisms of the Boers and the Germans.

93 Hugo Iltis, Der Mythos von Blut und Rasse, p. 10.
94 Hugo Iltis, Volkstümliche Rassenkunde, p. 80; see Wulf D. Hund, ‘Die Befreiung der unterdrückten Rassen kann nur das Werk der unterdrückten Rassen selbst sein’.
97 Advocate, 4 August 1938, p. 8 (The Heresy of Racialism). This context was also addressed by the indigenous press ‘The Australian Abo Call’, which, in the subtitle, called itself ‘The Voice of the Aborigines’ but did not use the words ‘racialism’ and ‘racism’. However, it did put its critique in the historical context: “The treatment of Aborigines in Australia, for 150 years, and continued today, has been a worse example of racial persecution and race prejudice than the Jews in Germany have suffered” – The Australian Abo Call, 1 September 1938, p. 1 (Conditions at Collarenebri).
But as in the multilingual European and American discourse, this did not over-
write the farther-reaching meaning of both terms. However, with its increasing
use and its simultaneous focus on the racial politics of fascist Germany as racist,
the questioning pressure of the new categories became a growing danger for all
form of discriminatory racial relations and race-thinking, in its everyday man-
ifestations and in its scientific versions. In this situation, even critical thinkers
reacted with an attempt to distinguish between scientific race research and ide-
ological racism.

This reinforced the tendency to make “racism [...] a synonym of the enemy
– Nazism”. Moreover, it prepared the ground for the subsequent resistance of
numerous scientists against a discrediting or even abolition of the race concept.
This was shown, inter alia, in the resistance against corresponding attempts
made by the UNESCO at the end of the Second World War. It also became obvi-
ous, about a quarter-century later, in the context of the “International Year for
Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination” proclaimed by the UN for
1971. In light of this, a three-volume anthology titled ‘Racism: The Australian
Experience’ was compiled. The first volume began with a text of the anthropolo-
gist William E. H. Stanner.

He used the semantic history to distinguish between ‘racism’ and ‘racialism’.
Accordingly, “racism” propagates “the dogma that some races are, and will be
perpetually, inferior to others” and directs its politics in this manner. Subse-
quently, he stipulates that such a “general racism is rare” and that it was rather
the moderate forms that were widespread, in particular “a vague but unshake-
able suspicion that there probably is something in the inferiority argument
in relation to particular races”. This concerned above all the treatment of the
“Aborigines”. “Racism”, in Stanner’s view, was “too strong a word to apply to it”.
Instead, the author suggested, “we might speak of degrees of ‘racialism’ rather
than ‘racism’”.

Subsequently, the category ‘racism’ was increasingly applied to Australian his-
tory and present. But, as a rule, the respective studies did not comprise reflec-
tions on the history of the concept of ‘racism’. This got to the point that relevant
researches intensely using the category racism did not even mention one of the
central elements of its implementation: antisemitism. Hence, the history of
‘racism’ as a concept was not at an end after its constitution in the middle of the
twentieth century. The ramifications of its subsequent development from the dis-
cussion of ‘race relations’ to the study of ‘whiteness’ need further research.

99 Cf. Michelle Brattain, Race, Racism, and Antiracism; Anthony Q. Hazard Jr., Postwar
Antiracism. For the original documents and the different comments, see Unesco, The
Race Concept.
100 Cf. Frank S. Stevens, ed., Racism.
Appreciation of Difference.
102 For instance, a widely spread introduction to the topic, David Hollinsworth, Race and
Racism in Australia, published in three editions 1988, 1998, and 2006 (the 1st ed. was writ-
ten together with Keith McConnochie and Jan Pettman), comprised an informative chap-
ter on “Racism: concepts, theories and approaches” but did not expand on the history of
the concept.
103 Cf. Alexander T. Yarwood, Michael J. Knowling, Race Relations in Australia.
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