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Abstract:

This thesis examines the life of Dr. Augustin Friedrich Krämer (1865-1941), a key figure among early ethnologists of the Pacific. As a Marineärzt (Navy Surgeon) and naturalist and later as an ethnologist, Krämer visited the region on a number of occasions. Between the mid-1890s and 1911, he participated and engaged in five different and far-reaching expeditions to the Pacific. In doing so Krämer developed a keen interest in the peoples and cultures of Oceania. That interest found its expression not only in numerous publications and artefact collections on the region, but also in a lifelong interest in Völkerkunde (Ethnology) in general. The latter eventually saw him become Scientific Director of the Linden Museum in Stuttgart in 1911 and later lecturer for Völkerkunde and founder of the Ethnologisches Institut (Ethnological Institute) at the University of Tübingen in 1931. As such, Krämer has to be described as a pioneer ethnologist.

However, whereas Krämer’s work is still held in high regards among Pacific Islanders and scholars interested in Oceania alike, his life and presence in the Pacific has escaped any wider attention. This fate applies also to Krämer’s contribution to development of Völkerkunde in Germany.

By focusing on his travels and research in the Pacific, this thesis aims to provide a deeper understanding of the genesis and value of what he has left behind. In doing so, the thesis will also reassess the German contribution to the ethnological knowledge of Oceania. It thus provides a case study of the contribution of one German ethnologist to the wider history of the discipline, examining the intersection between the scientific endeavour and the colonial reality.
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Chapter One.

**Introduction:**

This thesis examines the life of Dr. Augustin Krämer, a key figure among the early ethnologists of the Pacific. As a *Marinearzt* (Navy Surgeon) and naturalist, Krämer visited the region on a number of occasions. Between the mid-1890s and 1911, he engaged in five different and far-reaching expeditions to the Pacific. In doing so he developed a keen interest in the peoples and cultures of Oceania. That interest found its expression not only in numerous publications and artefact collections from the region, but also in a personal and lifelong interest in *Völkerkunde* (Ethnology) in general. The latter eventually saw him become director of an ethnological museum and lecturer in *Völkerkunde* at a university in Germany. Through his work and research, he soon became recognised as an expert on Oceania. This perception would also contribute to his lasting legacy. Krämer’s writings, in particular his work on Samoa and Palau, are still held in the highest regard among scholars interested in these regions, as well as by the Pacific Islanders themselves.

![FIG. 1.1 Dr. Augustin Friedrich Krämer](image)

*(Anna Pytlík, Träume im Tropenlicht, p. 12)*
The present thesis is born of a paradox. Whereas Krämer’s work still receives much attention among scholars of the Pacific and Pacific Islanders, his life and fieldwork, as well as his contribution to the development of Völkerkunde, have largely been forgotten or overlooked. Such a fate he shares with many other early German naturalists and ethnologists active in the Pacific.¹ One reason for this neglect is based on the fact that after World War I German anthropology embarked on a so-called Sonderweg (‘special path’). This Sonderweg theory refers to German ethnologists/anthropologists becoming closely associated and finally inseparably interwoven with the National Socialist ideas and ideology of race and of race hygiene.² Their expertise was thereby instrumental in providing putatively legitimate ‘scientific’ grounds for the selection and elimination of Jews, Sinti and Roma and other Fremdvölkische (‘people of foreign races’).³ Ultimately, it is the historical investigation of this close relationship, as Hans Fischer contends, which has overshadowed other aspects of the earlier history of Völkerkunde in Germany.⁴

Another reason for this neglect is the fact that German colonialism in the Pacific itself has received little attention among historians. It was not until the late 1970s that historians such

---

¹ As examples of early German ethnologists/naturalists active in the Pacific, one has to mention the geologist and naturalist Otto Finsch; the geographer Karl Sapper, who participated on an expedition in the Bismarck Archipelago, and the many members of the various expeditions of the Deutsch Neuguinea Kompagnie which explored and researched much of the New Guinea mainland. See Markus Schindlbeck’s article ‘Deutsche wissenschaftliche Expeditionen und Forschungen in der Südsee bis 1914’, in Hermann J. Hiery ed. Die deutsche Südsee 1884-1914: Ein Handbuch, Ferdinand Schöningh, Paderborn, 2001, pp. 132-155.


³ See, in particular, Hans-Walter Schmuhl’s investigation on the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute, in which he demonstrates how the institute provided the Nazi regime with a ‘scientific basis’ for the elimination of all threats to the Aryan race. Furthermore see Gretchen E. Schafft’s study on the close relationship between German anthropologists and the Genocide.

as Peter Hempenstall, Stewart Firth, John Moses and Peter Sack began to investigate the history and the impact of German colonial rule and consequently the history of German administration in the Pacific.\(^5\) This body of historical work helped not only to make the inquiry into German colonial rule in the Pacific an accessible component for historical investigation, but it also facilitated a growing body of new work on the topic. However, despite the fact that a number of biographies of German traders, administrators and Sonderlinge (‘odd persons’) have become available,\(^6\) there is yet no detailed biography of any German naturalist or ethnologist working in the Pacific, at least not in the English language.\(^7\)

Indeed, one gets the impression, that the language barrier has to be seen as yet another reason for the disregard of early German ethnologists’ activities in historical works on the Pacific. The fact that their work was written and published in German has prevented it from receiving larger attention by the predominantly English speaking Pacific historians. Krämer’s writings are no exception. His work on Palau is at present still in the process of being translated.\(^8\)

While Krämer’s presence in the Pacific has received limited attention among Pacific historians, he is still remembered among Pacific Islanders, in particular by Samoans and Palauans. This commemoration of Krämer expresses itself in many different facets. Some Palauans can still recall the items and artefacts which were given to him during his visits.\(^9\)

---


\(^6\) As example, see Stewart Firth ‘Captain Hernsheim: Pacific Venturer, Merchant Prince’, pp. 115-130; Peter Hempenstall and Paula Tanaka Mochida’s biography on Dr. Wilhelm Solf, Germany’s governor to Samoa, *The Lost Man: Wilhelm Solf in German History*, Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden, 2005; and Sven Mönter’s biography of ‘drop out’ August Engelhardt, *Following A South Seas Dream: August Engelhardt and the Sonnenorden*, Germanica Pacific Studies No. 2, The University of Auckland, 2008.

\(^7\) For biographies of early German or German speaking ethnologists active in the Pacific in the German language, see for example Marion Melk-Koch *Auf der Suche nach der menschlichen Gesellschaft: Richard Thurwald*, Dietrich Reimer Verlag Berlin, 1989 and Andrea E. Schmidt *Paul Witz: Ein Wanderer auf der Suche nach der „wahren Natur“*, Baseler Beiträge zur Ethnologie, Basel, 1998.

\(^8\) Among Palauans and scholars interested in the region, Krämer’s five volume monograph on Palau, which he published between 1917 and 1929 (see list of Krämer’s publications in Appendix V for details), is regarded as one of the most detailed descriptions of Paluan culture and history. It is for that reason that a few years ago a joint undertaking between the Macmillan Brown Centre in New Zealand, the Belau National Museum in Palau and Hermann Hiery from the University of Bayreuth in Germany was decided to translate Krämer’s work. The translation and publication is still ongoing. I am indebted to Dr. Karen Nero and Dr. Hermann Hiery for this information.

\(^9\) In a personal conversation in November 2007 with Dr. Ingrid Heermann, curator at the Linden Museum, she recalled that on a visit from some Palauans to the Museum a few years back, they were able to recall certain
Others have adopted Krämer’s work as an essential part of their own history and culture, particularly in Samoa. Here Krämer’s work is regarded, as the Samoan Deputy Prime Minister, Misa Telefoni Retzlaff, argues, ‘as the single, greatest contribution to any in-depth study of all things Samoan’. As such, Krämer’s work is frequently used in the proceedings of the Land and Titles Court, due to its detailed genealogical information.

It is this lasting memory, as well as the steady usage of his work, which inspires a more detailed investigation of Krämer’s life. By focusing on his travels and research in the Pacific, this thesis aims to provide a deeper understanding of the genesis and the value of what he has left behind. In doing so it will also reassess the German contribution to the ethnological knowledge of Oceania. Therefore the present work provides a case study, focussing on the contribution of one German ethnologist to the wider history of the discipline, while examining the intersection between the scientific endeavour and the colonial reality.

The German Colonial Empire in the Pacific

Krämer’s expeditions to the Pacific, as well as the support for his research, were facilitated and influenced by the growing colonial interest Germany had in the Pacific, as well as by an increased interest in Völkerkunde which began to develop in the late nineteenth century. Whereas the latter found its expression in the growing number of ethnological museums and collections in Germany at the turn of the century, the former became apparent in Germany’s growing Südsee-Kolonien (Colonial Empire in the South Seas).

artefacts that had been given to Krämer on one of his visits. A similar incident was also reported by Dr. Volker Harms, the former director of the Ethnologischen Institut at the University of Tübingen and curator of the ethnological collection.

10 See Misa Telefoni Retzlaff ‘An Enduring Legacy – The German Influence in Samoan Culture and History’, Paper presented at the Conference Das Deutsche Reich in der Südsee, Berlin, September 2007, p. 6. Retzlaff’s perception of Krämer’s work is also shared by many other Samoans. I am most grateful to His Excellency Dr. Leiatua Kilifoti S. Eteuati, Samoan High Commissioner in Australia, for providing me with his view, during a personal conversation in January 2006, on Krämer’s work and its relation to present day Samoa.

The German colonies in the Pacific included parts of Melanesia, namely Kaiser Wilhelmland in New Guinea; the Bismarck Archipelago; and the islands of Buka and Bougainville in the Solomon Islands, all of which became a German protectorate in November 1884. Alongside these areas the German colonial empire included parts of Micronesia, namely Nauru; the Marianas; Palau; the Caroline and Marshall Islands, which were mostly acquired by the German Empire from Spain in 1898. The Polynesian islands of Savai‘i and Upolu in Samoa also became a part of this Empire on 1 March 1900, when they were declared a German protectorate.\textsuperscript{12}

The colonial reality of the German presence in the Pacific went hand in hand with a growing interest among German naturalists and scientists. This interest was initiated by the colonial expansion, which allowed natural scientific and ethnological research to be carried out in this far-flung posts of the Empire. Research of this nature was seen as an important contribution to promote and help Germany’s economic and political expansion in the region. It is not surprising that German firms active in the Pacific, such as Godeffroy & Son (which later was succeeded by the Deutsche Handels- und Plantagengesellschaft or D.H.P.G.) and the Deutsch Neuguinea-Kompanie (German New Guinea Company), as well as the Navy and even the German colonial administration supported and encouraged natural scientific and ethnological research in the colonies.13

Early ethnologists, the development of Völkerkunde

When Krämer set out for the Pacific in the late 1890s, Völkerkunde (Ethnology) was still in its infancy. It was only in the decades prior, that ethnological societies and museums in Germany had began to evolve. Prominent examples were the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte (German Society for Anthropology, Ethnology and Prehistory), which was established in 1870, as well as the Völkerkunde museums in Berlin and Munich, which had opened in 1868.14 These societies and museums had their origins in the increasing contact with indigenous people and the in-flow of ethnographical artefacts in the early nineteenth century, which were brought by traders, merchants and travellers and later by colonial administrators and Navy personnel.

13 For an overview of German ethnological and natural scientific expeditions in the Pacific and the influence of German firms, Navy and administration, see Schindlbeck, pp. 132-155.
The term Völkerkunde (literally translated ‘science of people’ or Ethnology), as the ethnologist Hans Fischer points out, ‘was probably first coined in 1770 at the University of Göttingen’, where it lay at the crossroads between the ideas of the French Enlightenment and the British ideas of Empiricism and Scepticism. The name Völkerkunde itself, as he explains, was set up as a conscious analogy to the term of Erdkunde (Geography), aiming to include a people or peoples into the focus of enquiry. Despite the different focus of Völkerkunde, it nevertheless, remained closely attached to the disciplines of Geography and Natural Science, at least in the realms of academia. This close attachment stemmed from a number of reasons. One was certainly the fact that it was geologists, geographers and naturalists, who were among the first persons to visit and explore the newly opened territories. The second reason, without doubt, was based on the accessibility of resources. By the mid-nineteenth century, geography was a well established discipline in German universities, with its own space allocations and resources. Indeed, this relationship is once more illustrated in Krämer’s career. The Ethnologisches Institut (Ethnological Institute) which he founded in 1931, remained part of the Geography Department at the University of Tübingen for financial and organisational reasons.

The close connection of Geography and Ethnology was further entrenched by the fact that it was geographers and natural scientists who, alongside their collection of natural specimens, were keen collectors of ethnological artefacts. These artefacts, in turn, ended up as exhibits in museums and collections of Natural History. A similar connection is although evident in

16 Fischer ‘Was ist Ethnologie?’, p. 7.
17 For example, the geologist and naturalist Otto Finsch (1839-1917) visited the Pacific and, in particular, German New Guinea in the late nineteenth century on a number of occasions. Apart from natural observations, Finsch was also employed by the Deutsch Neuguinea Kompagnie (German New Guinea Company) to survey and explore the newly acquired protectorate. However, he is just one example of a number of German scientists who explored and surveyed Germany’s new South Sea territories in the mid nineteenth century. See Markus Schindlbeck, pp. 132-155. For more information on Finsch and his ornithological work, see also Oliver Harrison ‘The Paradise of the Southern Hemisphere’. German and Austrian Visitors to New Zealand 1876-1889, Germanica Pacific Studies No. 3, The University of Auckland, 2008, pp. 62-89.
18 Fischer ‘Was ist Ethnologie?’, pp. 6-7. See also ‘Introduction’, by Glenn Penny and Matti Bunzl in Glenn H. Penny and Matti Bunzl eds Worldly Provincialism, pp. 10-16.
19 See letter from the Dean of the Philosophical Faculty to the Minister of Culture from 9 November 1931, held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, Sig. 117C/505. For more information on the foundation of the Institute, see Chapter Seven.
20 A good example can be found in the German geologist Ferdinand von Hochstetter, who visited New Zealand as part of the Austrian scientific expedition on board the Novara in the late 1850s. Apart from collecting geological and natural specimens, Hochstetter also collected ethnographical artefacts, which subsequently became exhibits in the Natural History Museum in Vienna. A few of these later ended up in Krämer’s collection at the Hohenschloss Museum in Tübingen. They were given to him by Hochstetters’s daughter, who was
Krämer’s own career, as he started out collecting natural specimens along with some ethnographic artefacts for the *Naturalien Cabinett* (the predecessor of the Natural History Museum) in Stuttgart. Some of these ethnographic artefacts became later part of the original collection of the Linden Museum, an ethnological museum which opened its doors in 1911. Krämer became the Museum’s first *Wissenschaftlicher Director* (Scientific Director).

The increased interest during the late nineteenth century in these ethnographic artefacts, as well as the interest in their underlying histories, was fuelled by the commonly held belief that indigenous cultures and people were doomed to extinction. It was of primary importance to collect and ‘save’ as much data and as many artefacts of these cultures as possible, a concept that became known as ‘salvage anthropology’. For Krämer this concept indeed proved to be an important motivation. He conceived it his duty to collect as much information and artefacts during his travels through the Pacific as he could before the inhabitants would fade away. It seems that his interest in collecting of information eventually succeeded his interest in collecting of ethnographic artefacts. Although Krämer remained a keen collector of ethnographic artefacts throughout his travels, the collection of myths, stories, songs and dances, genealogies and other ethnological information became the predominate object of his fieldwork. In his quest he developed his own methods, as it has been stressed by the sociologist George Steinmetz, who notes that “like almost all ethnological field workers and collectors in this era before the creation of university anthropology departments, Krämer was an autodidact who invented his own methodology as he went along’. Krämer has to be seen as a pioneer ethnologist. His research and fieldwork preceded the fieldwork of famous anthropologists married to the ethnologist and director of the Völkerkunde Museum in Berlin, Felix von Luschan. For information on Luschan, see Appendix II. I am grateful to the participants of the Hochstetter Symposium, held in Auckland on 1-2 September 2008, in particular to Dr. Sascha Nolden, and Dr. Volker Harms, for providing me with this information.

21 The belief in ‘salvage anthropology’ stood at the beginning of anthropology and anthropological museums, see for example Glenn Penny *Objects of Culture: Ethnology and Ethnographic Museums in Imperial Germany*, pp. 31-34, 51-52, who argues that the idea was a main motivation for the development of anthropology and ethnographical collections in Germany.

22 Krämer’s focus on ethnological data is certainly reflected in his publications. See ‘Publications by Augustin Krämer’ in Appendix V.
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ethnologists of the Pacific, such as Margaret Mead in Samoa in 1924 and Bronislaw Malinowski in the Trobriand Islands between 1915 and 1918.

Despite the fact that Krämer’s fieldwork methodology had similarities to the ones used by Malinowski, like the notion of ‘participant observation’, it did not receive the same fame as did Malinowski’s work, which is regarded as the genesis of modern ethnological fieldwork. Nevertheless, Krämer’s work remains an important contribution to the ethnological knowledge of the Pacific and it is the quality and quantity of this work which has led to Krämer’s lasting recognition as an ethnological expert of Oceania. Such is its value, that his work on Palau is currently being translated into English, joining his two-volume monograph on Samoa, *Die Samoa-Inseln*, which was published in translation in 1994 and 1995.

A Biography

The writing of a historical biography, as most historians agree, is not easy, but remains nevertheless a rewarding task. In his fittingly titled article ‘Sniffing the Person’, Peter

---


27 Krämer’s five volume monograph on Palau, which he published between 1917 and 1929, is presently in the process of being translated. See Donald R. Shuster’s article ‘Palau’, in *The Contemporary Pacific*, Volume 16, Nr. 1 (Spring 2004), p. 143, where he states that translation is being awaited of Krämer’s work. This publication, however, is still in progress. I am indebted to Dr. Karen Nero for this information. A sideline that needs to be mentioned is that a similar situation also applies to Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow’s book *Bei kunstssinnigen Kannibalen der Südsee: Wanderungen auf Neu Mecklenburg, 1908-1916*, Berlin: D. Reimer, 1916, to which Krämer provided some scientific remarks. The translation of this book is forthcoming, see Crawford House Publishing ‘Among Art-Loving Cannibals of the South Seas (English translation of the 1916 German edition)’, online, nd, available at: [http://www.crawfordhouse.com.au/catalogue.php?isbn=1863332995](http://www.crawfordhouse.com.au/catalogue.php?isbn=1863332995), visited 13 September 2009. In regard to Krämer’s work on Samoa, his monograph was translated and published by Dr. Theodor Verhaaren under the title *The Samoa Islands: An Outline of a Monograph with Particular Consideration of German Samoa*; Auckland: Polynesian Press, in 1994 and 1995. For more information on this translation and the subsequent reaction among scholars of the Pacific, see Chapter Three.

28 Indeed most historians and scholars agree that biographies are hard work. See, for example, Gavin Daws’s article “All the horrors of a half known life”: some notes on writing of biography in the Pacific’, in Niel Gunson, ed. *The Changing Pacific: Essays in honour of H. E. Maude*, Melbourne, Oxford University Press, 1978, pp. 297-307. At the same time, biographies provide a fertile ground for historical investigation, and it is
Hempenstall investigates the importance of biographical work in regard to Pacific History. By discussing the different approaches that historians have used while investigating the lives of others, Hempenstall demonstrates the many difficulties imbedded in biographical writings. One example he describes is the approach of ‘ethnographic history’. On one hand this approach is able to provide a deeper understanding by using ‘life stories as framework for reflective cultural history’. On the other hand, this approach ‘may dampen the biographical impulse by subordinating the force of the individual to the rules of structure’. This problem is also identified by other historians engaging in the investigation of German colonists in the Pacific. In the biography of Dr. Wilhelm Solf, Germany’s former governor in Samoa, Hempenstall and Mochida stress the point even more emphatically, arguing that ‘structural history confines the individual in a straitjacket of cultural and material forces that do not acknowledge the power of self-consciousness in human action’. It is the individual which stays at the heart of the biography. That point is illustrated by the historian Peter Sack who, in his ‘Editors’ Introduction’ to a translation of Albert Hahl’s memories as Governor and Imperial Judge on New Guinea, remarks:

History is made in small drops and the drop which makes the bucket run over is often uncommonly small, but all drops are made by men and women and not by ideologies or institutions.

This remark is of great importance in regard to the biographical investigation of Augustin Krämer. As a pioneer ethnologist he was less influenced by institutions, but instead rather engaged in their formations, notably the Ethnologisches Institut at the University of Tübingen and the Linden Museum in Stuttgart. In his profession and personality he thereby displayed

the latter which is motivation for engaging in this form of enquiry, as illustrated in the introduction of Peter Hempenstall and Paula Tanaka Mochida’s biography The Lost Man; Wilhelm Solf in German History, Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden, 2005, when they argue that their work is based on their ‘conviction of the rewarding ways biography can complicate history’, p. 2.


30 Hempenstall ‘Sniffing the Person’, p. 36

31 See Hempenstall and Mochida The Lost Man; Wilhelm Solf in German History, p. 2.

32 See Peter Sack’s ‘Editor’s Introduction’ in Albert Hahl Governor of New Guinea, ed. and translated by Peter G. Sack and Dymphna Clark, Canberra, Australian National University Press, 1980, p. x.

33 For more details, see Chapter Seven.
‘a peculiar blend between a great organiser and scientist and a less pleasing person’.  
Although Krämer’s career, his methods and interests have close similarities with those of many other early ethnologists, his life and experiences were in various respects different. It is this difference which makes it important to look closer at Krämer’s life, and to provide a clearer picture of the person, his work and his legacy.

**Krämer’s Life**

Augustin Friedrich Krämer was born on the 25\(^{th}\) of August 1865, as the second of three children to a German colonist family in Los Angeles de Chile.\(^{35}\) His brother, Carlos, was born in 1864 and his younger sister, Martha, in 1868.\(^{36}\) Krämer’s father, August Krämer, had been 18 years old, when he emigrated to Chile in 1850.\(^{37}\) In his obituary for Augustin Krämer in 1951, Oscar Paret argues that this step was ‘partly motivated by political reasons’\(^{38}\).

However, neither Paret nor Augustin Krämer himself, who also mentions the *politischen Wirren jener Zeit* (‘political turmoil of the time’) in regard to his father’s emigration, provide

\(^{34}\) See Hans Fischer *Die Hamburg-Südsee Expedition: über Ethnographie und Kolonialismus*, p. 66, translation by the author.


\(^{36}\) The dates of Krämer’s siblings are displayed on the family grave in the Uff-Friedhof (cemetery) in Cannstatt: Dr. Carlos Krämer (*7 May 1864 - +19 April 1924) and Martha Tscherning, néé Krämer (*1868 - +1921), where they are buried along with their spouses: Maria Krämer, néé Hildt (*8 June 1869 - +19 October 1945) and Vizepräsident (Vize-President) Dr. Otto Tscherning (*[not decipherable] – +1943).

\(^{37}\) See Augustin Krämer *Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa*, p. 4. The age of his father at the point of his emigration, however, does not match with Krämer’s later provided information in a questionnaire, when he states that his father was born in Münchzell near Baden on 5 April 1829 and died in Cannstatt on 26 April 1893. Questionnaire held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, Sig. 126/347.

\(^{38}\) See Oscar Paret’s obituary ‘Augustin Krämer’, p. 10, translation by the author.
any further detail. Apart from this potential “political reason”, there was certainly also economic motivation for his emigration: Creating a new home abroad allowed for new business opportunities. Coming from an old Müllerfamilie (miller’s family), it is not surprising that shortly after arrival in Chile August opened a grain mill in San Miquel. Eventually he expanded, establishing a business enterprise which consisted of ‘extensive saw-mills and grain mills’, the plans for which, as Augustin Krämer later proudly noted, his father ‘had drawn up himself, and the machine parts he had ordered from Germany’. After establishing the business, Krämer’s father moved to the little township of Los Angeles, half an hour’s ride from San Miquel, where he settled in a larger house. It was here, in late 1862, that he brought his wife, Wilhelmine (née Nifssel), whom he had married during a visit in Cannstatt in October of that year. In 1867, when Augustin was only 2 years old, the family returned to Germany. Having, as Krämer later stated, ‘decided to make the Schwäbische Heimat (Swabian home country) their place of residence’, the family settled in Berg, a little township between Cannstatt and Stuttgart. There, it is reported, the family lived in comfortable middle-class circumstances, partly due to the revenue made from the selling of the family’s business enterprise in Chile. Although the family was Protestant, it seems there was no great religious engagement.

Augustin attended the Karlsgymnasium (‘Karl’s Grammar School’) in Stuttgart, attaining his School Certificate in spring 1883. Without further delay; he enrolled to study medicine at the University of Tübingen. The exact reasons for his decision to embark on this course of study

39 Similarly to Paret, Krämer hints in his book Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, p. 4, that his father’s emigration had to do with the political situation at the time. However, neither provide any further information regarding August Krämer’s involvement in the political revolution which took place in Germany and Europe in 1848, nor do they implicitly say that this was the reason for his emigration to Chile.
40 See Krämer Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, p. 13. Indeed, both of Augustin Krämer’s grandfathers had been millers. See the questionnaire held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, Sign. 126/347.
41 Ibid., p. 13, translation by the author.
42 Ibid., pp. 13-14. On his later visit Krämer provides some details of the township as well as of the house which, by then, as Krämer acknowledges ‘was in a stage of decay’.
43 Information about Krämer’s mother is sparse. Nevertheless, in the questionnaire, Krämer states that his mother, Wilhelmina Krämer was born on 31 October 1843 and died in Cannstatt on 3 February 1893. He also provides the date of marriage of his parents, which was said to have taken place in Berg, on 7 October 1862. Questionnaire held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, Sig. 126/347.
44 See Krämer Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, p. xi, translation by the author. For the Krämers’ move to Germany in 1867, see also Paret, p. 10.
45 See Schleip, ‘Ozeanische Ethnographie und Koloniale Praxis, Das Beispiel Augustin Krämer’, p. 10, who argues that the Krämer family lived in comfortable middle class circumstances. This fact was, as Krämer suggested, made possible by his father’s selling his business in Chile. See Krämer Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, pp. 13-14.
46 In the Questionnaire held at the University of Tübingen, Sig. 126/347, Krämer stated his religious affiliation was evangelisch (Protestant). Despite this indication of his religious belief there is no hint in Krämer’s work or diaries that he was in any way a religious man.
remains unknown. He certainly did not display a great interest in medicine throughout his career. Of his more than 150 publications only six have medical content, including his medical dissertation.\textsuperscript{47} Thus, one has to presume that his decision may have been influenced by his brother’s decision, who had begun to study medicine a year earlier.\textsuperscript{48} Krämer further followed his brother’s example and became a member of the local student fraternity \textit{Rhenania}.\textsuperscript{49}

After the first semester Augustin suspended his studies for a year, serving a voluntary year in the military. That was certainly not an uncommon step at the time, as military training was seen as an essential part of one’s education.\textsuperscript{50} Following that experience, he studied for two semesters at the University of Berlin.\textsuperscript{51} In 1886 he returned to the University of Tübingen where, in March 1889, he passed his \textit{Staatsexam} (State Examination).\textsuperscript{52} Immediately after his graduation, instead of setting up medical practice like his brother, Krämer joined the \textit{Sanitäts-Corps der Kaiserlichen Marine} (Medical Corps of the Imperial Navy).\textsuperscript{53} Indeed, his association with the Navy was to have an important impact on Krämer’s life and work. This


\textsuperscript{48} See \textit{Verzeichnis der Kandidaten der Medizin} (‘Register of the Candidates of Medicine’), held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, Sig. 470/2, which reveals that Carlos Krämer had the ID number 213, and completed his studies in 1887/1888, whereas Augustin had the ID number 240 and completed his studies in 1888/1889.


\textsuperscript{50} See questionnaire held at the University of Tübingen, Sig. 126/347. Indeed, it seems that the \textit{Freiwillige Militärdienst} (Voluntary Military Service) was only voluntary by name. Most of Krämer’s contemporaries, like his later friends and colleagues Georg Thilenius and Felix von Luschan, had also finished their voluntary year with the military, as had Dr. Albert Hahl, the late Governor of German New Guinea.

\textsuperscript{51} See questionnaire held at the University of Tübingen, Sig. 126/347, in which he states that between 1885 and 1886 he studied for two semesters in Berlin. See also \textit{Verzeichnis der Kandidaten der Medizin}, held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, Sig. 470/2.

\textsuperscript{52} In the \textit{Verzeichnis der Kandidaten der Medizin}, held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, Sig. 470/2, it is noted that Augustin Krämer completed his study with an overall mark of ‘gut’ (‘good’), whereas his brother finished his studies a year prior with an overall mark of ‘sehr gut’ (‘very good’).

\textsuperscript{53} While Augustin Krämer had joined the Navy in late 1889, his brother, Dr. Carlos Krämer, set up practice in Bopfingen, a town near Stuttgart. See Krämer’s diaries and correspondence with Count Linden and Dr. Kurt Lampert, in which he mentions his brother. Krämer’s correspondence with the former is held at the Linden Museum, whereas his correspondence with the latter is held at the Naturkundemuseum in Stuttgart. In his work ‘Ozeanische Ethnographie und Koloniale Praxis, Das Beispiel Augustin Krämer’, Schleip reports that Carlos Krämer became a renowned Tuberculosis expert, p. 11.
professional relationship not only contributed to his first travel aboard, but it also facilitated and supported much of his later research in the Pacific.

His decision to join the Navy, as Chapter Two will illustrate, was based on his wanderlust, but also by his keen interest in natural science, which he certainly thought to satisfy while travelling aboard. With his travels to Samoa and the wider Pacific, which he conducted between 1893 to 1895 and from 1898 to 1899, Krämer’s curiosity developed a new focus. Eventually, the preference for natural science was replaced by an interest in *Völkerkunde*.

Krämer’s change of interest, presented in Chapter Three, found its expression in the publication of his two-volume monograph *Die Samoa-Inseln* in 1901 and 1902. This particular publication not only demonstrated Krämer’s entry into the field of ethnology, but it also contributed to his later legacy as an expert on Oceania to a great degree.

In 1906, as Chapter Four will examine, Krämer commenced his third Expedition to the Pacific, which consisted of two parts. The first saw him travelling to the Pacific onboard the SMS *Planet*, a Navy surveying ship. The second, after having left the ship, took him to the islands of Micronesia. It was on the second part of his Expedition that he was accompanied by his wife, Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, whom he had married a few years earlier. This trip was the beginning of a working partnership and cooperation with his wife which was to characterise Krämer’s following fieldwork in the Pacific.

Shortly after his return home, which will be illustrated in Chapter Five, Krämer was again called out to the Pacific. He was asked to take over the leadership of the *Deutsche Marine-Expedition* (German Naval Expedition), which between 1907 and 1909 was researching parts of German New Guinea. The chapter provides a recount of the history of the Expedition, as well as an examination on Krämer’s ethnological work in which he was again supported by his wife.

The Krämers participation in the *Deutsche Marine-Expedition*, as Chapter Six will point out, was followed by their participation in the *Hamburg Südsee-Expedition* (Hamburg South Seas Expedition) in 1910. This Expedition was and remains Germany’s largest ethnological and ethnographical endeavour in the region. The chapter presents a report of this ship-based expedition, visiting large parts of Melanesia and Micronesia. It will illustrate that the second year of the Expedition was characterized by Krämer’s strict working ethos and his notion of *Tiefen-Arbeit* (‘in-depth research’). Both of these factors contributed to the fact that the
publications and collections of the second year of the Expedition far outnumbered those of the previous year.

Although this Expedition, as discussed in Chapter Seven, was Krämer’s last expedition to the Pacific, it nevertheless marked the beginning of his continued interest in the wider field of Ethnology. In 1911 Krämer became Scientific Director at the Linden Museum in Stuttgart. After the First World War, he became a lecturer at the University of Tübingen, where he eventually established the *Ethnologische Institut* (Ethnological Institute) in 1931.

Chapter Eight will show that this development marked the highpoint of Krämer’s career in Ethnology. Shortly afterwards, in October 1933, he was then forced into taking his pension and consequently withdrew into retirement. He died on 11 November 1941. Although news of his death was accorded no greater attention at the time, his legacy as an ethnological expert on Oceania is an enduring one.
Chapter Two.

Krämer in Samoa

During the last decade of the nineteenth century Dr. Augustin Krämer visited Samoa on two occasions. The first trip, spanning the period from 1893-1895, saw him there as a *Marinestabsarzt* (Navy Surgeon) and as a member of the *Reichsmarine* (German Navy). The second journey, from 1897 to 1899, was more in a private capacity, motivated by his interest in natural science. His time in Samoa had a profound influence on Krämer’s professional career, as his focus on natural science was gradually replaced by a growing interest in *Völkerkunde* (Ethnology). This growing interest is reflected in Krämer’s deep interest in Samoan culture. At this point it needs to be stressed, that Krämer’s shift of interest, as well as his presence in Samoa, did not take place within a social or political vacuum. His travels to Samoa coincided with an important part of Samoan history, which saw Samoans not only involved in civil war(s), but also at the heart of a colonial-political struggle between Germany, Britain and the USA. By investigating the colonial context as well as by examining Krämer’s journeys to Samoa, this chapter aims to explore and explain Krämer’s shift of interest to ethnology and motivation in his research. In doing so, it will demonstrate that Krämer’s personal development was as much shaped by his own experiences, contacts and working methods, as it was by the underlying colonial situation in Samoa.

First travels to the Pacific

Augustin Krämer first arrived in Samoa on 31 August 1893. As a Navy Surgeon, he was a crew member onboard the light cruiser SMS *Bussard*, which was making its way to Apia harbour. For Krämer it marked the official beginning of a two year deployment onboard the *Bussard*, which lasted until his departure from Samoa in July 1895. Krämer, along with the 165 crew, had taken over the *Bussard* in Sydney just a few days earlier. The navy relief team
of which he was part had left Bremerhaven in July that year to travel by liner via Aden to Sydney.\textsuperscript{54}

![Image](www.kaiserliche.marine.de)

\textbf{FIG. 2.1} \textit{The SMS Bussard}

(Website: \url{www.kaiserliche-marine.de})

The \textit{Bussard} had been stationed in Apia since 1891 and remained there until 1898.\textsuperscript{55} From its base in Apia the \textit{Bussard} frequently travelled to its logistic ports in Sydney, Australia and Auckland, New Zealand, usually on a 3 to 4 month turn around.\textsuperscript{56} These regular tours were

\textsuperscript{54} See Krämer’s diary, held at the Linden-Museum, in which he states that he left Bremerhaven in July. He also noted down all stopovers on his travel towards Australia. On 26 August Krämer noted ‘Arrival in Sydney’.

\textsuperscript{55} The SMS \textit{Bussard} was a small (unprotected) cruiser, with a water displacement of 1570t, armed with 8 canons of a 10.5 cm calibre and 5 x 3.7 revolver-canons. It had a maximum high speed of 15 knots and was launched in Wilhelmshaven on 23 January 1890. It had a crew of around 165 men. In 1913 the \textit{Bussard} was dismantled. More details on \url{http://www.deutsche-schutzgebiete.de/sms_bussard.htm}, 24 November 2007.

\textsuperscript{56} According to Krämer’s notes on his plankton catches in his publication \textit{Über den Bau der Korallenriffe}, Verlag von Lipsius & Tischer in Kiel und Leipzig, 1897, pp. 127-139, as well as according to his diary entries, the following overview on the travels of the \textit{Bussard} emerges:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sep. – end of Dec. 1893</th>
<th>Samoa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1894 – end of Mar. 1894</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. – May 1894</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May – early Dec. 1894</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.1894 – mid March 1895</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late March – Apr. 1895</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 1895</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Apr. – Jul. 1895</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[28\]
not only ordered to secure and protect Germany’s military and economic interests in the Pacific, but also ‘to show the presence of the German flag’.57 In this sense the Bussard can be regarded as an example of Germany’s increasing political and colonial aspirations in the region at the end of the nineteenth century.

Germany’s original interest in the region had been mainly economic, and hence of a private nature. However, from the late 1870s onwards the German empire began to pursue a more aggressive colonial policy, supporting existing undertakings, as well as encouraging further German colonial and economic endeavours.58 True to the motto ‘the flag follows trade’, German warships were frequently despatched to the Pacific in order to provide support and protection for the growing commercial empire.59 Samoa, which was generally referred to as ‘the pearl of the South Seas’, played an important role within this development.

The three islands Savai‘i, Upolu and Tutuila are the most important of the fourteen islands which form the Samoa group. Savai‘i in the west, although sparsely populated, is the biggest island in the group. The second largest island Upolu, in contrast, is densely populated, with the port town of Apia lying on its north coast. The smaller islands of Manu‘a and Tutuila, which contains the deep harbour of Pago Pago, lie just a few miles to the east. From the mid-nineteenth century these islands had become the focal point of German, British and American colonial and economic interests.


58 See Hermann Hiery ‘Zur Einführung: Die Deutschen und die Südsee’, in Hermann Hiery, ed., Die Deutsche Südsee 1884-1914, p. 2. See also Hermann Hiery Das Deutsche Reich in der Südsee (1900-1921), Göttingen, 1995, pp. 19-26. Hiery argues that, despite already existing German economic interests in the region, the German empire further supported economic growth in the region. For example, the Neuguinea-Kompanie (New Guinea Company) was given the exclusive right to regulate the administration in New Guinea, which included levying taxes and the right to take possession of all unknown land. See also Hempenstall Pacific Islanders Under German Rule, p. 19; and Achim Schyboll and Michael Trimborn’s article ‘Zur Geschichte der deutschen Kolonien in der Südsee’, in Volker Harms, ed. “Südseebilder”: Materialien zu einer Ausstellung, Völkerkundliches Institute Tübingen, Tübingen, 1992, pp. 38-40.

The involvement of these three nations provided ground for a variety of diplomatic issues, and made the question of hegemony (and control) in Samoa unavoidable. Subsequently this important issue was passionately argued over in Washington, London and Berlin. But it was not until late 1899, due to ‘back-door politics’ between British diplomats and their German counterparts, that the issue was finally resolved. It was agreed by the Western nations that all of Samoa lying west of longitude 171º would become German, whereas the islands of Tutuila and Manu’a would be considered American territory.

Map. 2.1 Samoa

(H. B. Gardner Gathering for God, p. 10)

---


61 For details and information on the implication of the 1899 agreement between Germany and Great Britain, see Paul Kennedy The Samoan Tangle, Irish University Press, Dublin, 1974, pp. 240-254; R. P. Gilson Samoa 1830-1900 the Politics of a Multi-Cultural Community, with an introduction and conclusion by J. W. Davidson, Oxford University Press, 1970, p. 432; Horst Gründer, p. 46; Peter Hempenstall, pp. 29-32; and Peter Hempenstall ‘Samoanische Geschichte in der Zeit der Deutschen Herrschaft’, in Hermann Hiery, ed., Die Deutsche Südsee 1884-1914, pp. 698-702. Furthermore see Otto Riedel Kampf um Deutsch Samoa: Erinnerungen eines Hamburger Kaufmannes, Berlin, 1938, pp. 150-156; The Cyclopedia of Samoa, Tonga, Tahiti and the Cook Islands, published under the patronage of his Excellency Dr. Solf (the Governor of German Samoa), his Majesty King George II of Tonga, his Majesty’s Consul at Tonga (Hamilton Hunter, Esq. CMG.) etc., printed by McCaron, Stewart & Co, Sydney, 1907, reprint by R. McMillan, Papakura, 1983. In the agreement it was stated that, for receiving control of Savai’i and Upolu, Germany was to transfer its treaty rights in Tonga to Great Britain.
Germany’s regional interest in Samoa had been kindled in the late 1850s, when Samoa became the headquarters of the Hamburg trading company Godeffroy & Son. The company was predominantly engaged in island trade, mainly trading copra. By establishing trading posts and plantations the company’s agent August Unshelm, and later his successor Theodor Weber who was also the German consul in Apia, managed to establish a monopoly trading position for Godeffroy & Son in Polynesia. However, in 1879, despite extending business prospects in Samoa, the trading firm was unable to escape bankruptcy. Eventually the company was succeeded by the newly founded firm Deutsche Handels- und Plantagen-Gesellschaft (DHPG), which took over the existing trading stations and plantations in Samoa. The DHPG later extended its influence throughout the region by establishing trading stations and plantations in Melanesia and Micronesia, and further through an increase in trade with Tonga. Melanesia became the main source from which plantation-labourers were recruited, and Melanesians, who were disparagingly called ‘black boys’ (the Samoans called them ‘tama uli’), eventually dominated the workforce on the DHPG plantations in Samoa. The DHPG plantations in Samoa suffered not only from increased competition from other enterprises, but also from ‘the constant civil wars among Samoans over the paramountcy question’. The civil wars and the question of ‘paramountcy’ among Samoans had their origins predominantly in land and title disputes. Although these disputes had been an integrated part of Samoan life for generations, they were amplified with the growing European influence and its accompanying demand for land at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The

---


63 For the employment of Melanesian workers in Samoa, see Hiery Das Deutsche Reich in der Südsee, pp. 20-22, 187-195; Hempenstall, pp. 63-66; Dr. Franz Reinecke Samoa, Band 3-4 in Süssepotts Kolonialbibliothek, Wilhelm Süsserot Verlagsbuchhandlung Berlin, 1902, pp. 208-212.

64 Hempenstall, p. 17; Hempenstall in Hiery, p. 692.

65 Meleisea Making of Modern Samoa, p. 21.
dispute was not only a Samoan affair. The question of land ownership became the focal point of dispute between Samoans and the colonial representatives of Great Britain, Germany and the USA. War, as Meleisea argues, ‘was the instrument of settlement of these disputes, and offered foreigners the opportunity of gaining an increasing hold over Samoan affairs’.  

By the 1880s the increasing dominance of Samoan affairs by the colonial powers resulted in a political climate that saw each nation supporting different factions within Samoan society. The British and Americans supported chief Mata’afa, whereas the Germans were in favour of Tamasese. This involvement contributed to the fact that the civil wars among Samoans not only continued, but that the colonial forces themselves engaged more and more in direct military confrontation.

Eventually, the situation escalated to the point that an open military confrontation between the colonial powers seemed inevitable. However, this confrontation was circumvented by a hurricane that hit Apia in March 1889, sinking three German and three American warships. As a result of these events, the colonial powers began to re-evaluate their position and interests in Samoa and a conference in Berlin was organised. Eventually, with the signing of the Berlin Act in 1889, it was decided to implement a power sharing agreement, and Malietoa Laupepa was declared ‘King of Samoa’. This decision, as Meleisea reminds us, was ‘a compromising choice for the three powers but not for the Samoans’. Indeed the Samoans, first under the leadership of Mata’afa and later under the leadership of Tupua Tamasese,

66 Ibid., p. 21.
67 For a background on the development within Samoa at the time and the political alliances, see P. Kennedy, pp. 76-86; Gilson, pp. 382-395; Meleisea Making of Modern Samoa, pp. 32-40; Hempenstall in Hiery, pp. 694-695; Balme, pp. 334-335; and Peter J. Hempenstall, and Noel Rutherford Protest and Dissent in the Colonial Pacific, University of the South Pacific, Apia, 1984, pp. 20-24.
68 See Malama Meleisea and Penelope Schoeffel Meleisea, eds., Lagaga: A Short History of Western Samoa, University of the South Pacific, 1987, pp. 89-93, for the involvement of the colonial powers and their military reactions, which consisted mainly of shelling Samoan villages with ship artillery or sending marine commandos. Also see Hiery Das Deutsche Reich in der Südsee, pp. 1-27; Gilson, pp. 358-424; Hempenstall in Hiery, p. 693; and I. C. Cambell, pp. 115-116.
69 When the great hurricane hit Samoa on the 15/16 March 1889, seven warships in Apia Bay were taken by surprise: three German, the Eber, Adler and Olga; three American, Trenton, Nipsic and Vandalia and one British, Calliope. All of them, except the Calliope which managed to leave the Bay for the open sea, sank in the storm. There are variations in the reports of the date and the number of lives lost at sea during the hurricane. The estimated number of victims ranges from 130 people drowned (Cylopedia) to 93 German and 117 American sailors drowned (Hempenstall in Hiery, p. 696). In addition, there were also a number of Samoans who lost their lives while helping to rescue German and American sailors. For information on the hurricane see The Cyclopaedia of Samoa, Tonga, Tahiti and the Cook Islands, pp. 19-20; Adolph Thamm, Samoa-eine Reise in den Tod; Briefe des Obermatrosen Adolph Thamm, S.M. Kanonenboot Eber, 1887-1889, Berlin, 1889, reprinted and commented by Karl-Theo Beer, Hamburg, 1889; Meleisea Making of Modern Samoa, p. 40; Hempenstall in Hiery, pp. 696-697; and S. R. Fischer, p. 145.
70 For details of the Berlin conference and its agreements, see Gilson, 396-424, Meleisea Making of Modern Samoa, pp. 40-42; S.R. Fischer, pp. 144-146; and Hempenstall in Hiery, pp. 696-697.
71 Meleisea Making of Modern Samoa, p. 40.
continued to contest Malietoa’s position, as well as the rightfulness of his appointment. Occasionally this resulted in open hostility, which in turn was more than once dealt with by military force by the three colonial powers.\footnote{For the Samoan reaction to Malietoa’s appointment, as well as for the reaction of the colonial powers towards the Samoan position, see Gilson, pp. 366 396; Meleisea \textit{Making of Modern Samoa}, p. 38-40; and Meleisea and Schoeffel, pp. 89-93.}

During 1893 and 1894 the \textit{Bussard}, as Krämer’s diary illustrates, participated in military actions against Samoans. On the 11 of August 1894 Krämer noted: ‘9 o’clock \textit{Bussard}, 16 shells fired on Lufilufi’.\footnote{See Krämer’s diary, Linden-Museum, translation by the author. Krämer recalled his participation in the military actions in the following publications: Augustin Krämer \textit{Über den Bau der Korallenriffe und die Planktonverteilung an den samoanischen Küsten}, p. 59; Augustin Krämer ‘Samo in der Geschichte und als wissenschaftliche und kommerzielle Station in der Südsee’, paper presented at the geographical society to Hamburg (Geographische Gesellschaft zu Hamburg), 2 May 1901, transcribed by Dietrich Schleip, p. 21, held at the Linden-Museum in Stuttgart.} The small village of Lufilufi, at the north-east coast of Upolu, had played an important role in resisting Malietoa.\footnote{For more details, see Tamasailau Suailii-Sauni, I’uogafa Tuagalu, Tofilau Nina Kirifi-Alai, Naomi Fuamatua \textit{eds. Su’esu’e Manogi: In Search of Fragrance}, The Centre for Samoan Studies, National University of Samoa, Lepapagaalagala, Samoa, 2008, p. 26ff.} The village had been a camp of the opposition, headed by Tamasese. It was the British who had put forward a plan to attack Tamasese and, together with a British cruiser, the \textit{Bussard} attacked Lufilufi, shelling the village and hinterland and wounding a number of Samoans. They were later brought to the hospital at the London Mission Society (LMS) in Apia, as Otto Riedel recalls, ‘where our doctor Funk and doctor Krämer bandaged and looked after them’.\footnote{See Riedel, p. 78, translation by the author. See further Reinecke, p.71, who also mentions Krämer and Funk’s cooperation in attending to the wounded Samoans during the fighting in the 1890s.}

A few months earlier, in his position as a member of the crew onboard the \textit{Bussard}, Krämer witnessed how Mata’aфа, also an opponent to Malietoa’s rule, was sent into exile. Since 1888, due to his attack on German forces which left sixteen marines dead and many more wounded, Mata’aфа had been regarded as an arch enemy of Germany. In 1893, after having led a rebellion against Malietoa’s appointment as King of Samoa, the colonial powers finally decided to send him to exile on the island of Djalut (Jaluit) in Micronesia.\footnote{See Gilson, pp. 415-424; Meleisea \textit{Making of Modern Samoa}, p. 39-40; Hempenstall, pp. 28-29; and Hempenstall in Hiery, p. 696-698. For further details on Mata’aфа’s resistance against Maliteoa, the colonial powers and his subsequent exile, see Augustin Krämer \textit{Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa; meine Zweite Südsee reise (1897-1899) zum Studium der Atolle und ihrer Bewohner}, Stuttgart: Strecker & Schröder, 1906, p. 206, as well as Riedel, pp. 56-61.} The task of deporting Mata’aфа and his entourage was appointed to the German cruiser \textit{SMS Sperber},...
while the *Bussard* remained on standby.\(^{77}\) However in October 1898, it was the *Bussard* which, ‘under the cheers of the Samoan people’ brought Mata‘afa back to Samoa.\(^{78}\)

These military involvements of the *Bussard* were surely the exception rather than the rule. The reality of the *Bussard*’s travels, as Krämer’s diaries express, was much more peaceful. His time on board was characterised by the ship shuttling back and forth within the triangle of Samoa, New Zealand and Australia. The visits to these places were dominated by social events rather than by warfare.\(^{79}\) As a member of the officer corps Krämer participated in numerous social occasions and official receptions. He conducted sight-seeing trips and visited cultural performances.

Indeed Krämer’s diaries provide a useful insight on the activities he engaged in during the various stays. In New Zealand for example, he was a guest on a number of official occasions, meeting the majors of Auckland, Christchurch and Wellington, as well as the German acting-consul in Auckland, Mr. Kerr V. Laugguth. He also attended a variety of cultural performances and concerts and visited a number of New Zealand’s natural attractions, such as Rotorua’s thermal lakes.\(^{80}\)

Krämer’s visits to Australia were also dominated by the social duties normal for an officer of the German Navy. Visiting the cities of Melbourne, Sydney and Adelaide, he met with consuls, politicians and city officials. While in Australia, Krämer also engaged in sight-seeing tours, visiting places such as the Blue Mountains and the Katoomba Falls in late March 1895.\(^{81}\)

A similar pattern of activity also applied to Krämer’s stays in Samoa, which, as historians have pointed out, remained a safe place for Europeans even during the on-going fighting of

\(^{77}\) For details on the events surrounding Mata‘afa’s deportation, see Krämer *Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa*, p. 206, who also mentions that Mata‘afa was accompanied by a number of chiefs and relatives. See also Harry Liebersohn ‘Coming of Age in the Pacific: German Ethnography from Chamisso to Krämer’, in H. Glenn Penny and Matti Bunzl, eds., *Worldly Provincialism, German Anthropology in the Age of Empire*, University of Michigan, 2003, p. 42.

\(^{78}\) Krämer *Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa*, p. 206. Translation by the author.

\(^{79}\) See Ian McGibbon’s chapter, in which he acknowledges that, until early 1900, the visits of German ships-of-war in New Zealand were generally seen as ‘asocial and economic events for the young colony’, pp. 26-27.

\(^{80}\) Krämer’s diaries contain a number of flyers and programmes for concerts and performances he visited, such as a concert of the Auckland Orchestral Union held at the Auckland City Hall on 30 November 1893. Krämer’s diaries are held at Linden-Museum.

\(^{81}\) Krämer’s diaries illustrate that he visited numerous concerts and theatre performances in Sydney and Melbourne, as well as undertaking a number of sight-seeing tours.
the civil wars. Krämer and other members of the crew were frequent visitors to social and cultural events in Apia, which consisted either of traditional Samoan performances or more European influenced events, such as picnics and theatre performances. These were organised by the Europeans living in Samoa or even by the crews of the visiting warships. The crew of the Bussard, for example, had set up its own ‘Theatergesellschaft’ (‘theatre group’), which organised entertainment nights in Apia.

![Figure 2.2: Theatre Group of the SMS Bussard, Autumn 1894](Jutta B. Engelhard and Peter Mesenhöller, eds Bilder aus dem Paradies, p. 43)

The German Consul to Samoa, Max Biermann, whose task it was, among others, to entertain and greet the officers of visiting German warships, mentions in his memoirs that ‘Dr.

---

82 See Gilson, p. 394; Meleisea Making of Modern Samoa, p. 40-41; and Leilani Burgoyne ‘Re-defining “the beach”: the municipality of Apia, 1879–1900’, MA Thesis, University of Auckland, 2006. See also contemporary reports by Max Biermann and Otto Riedle, who both stress that the situation of the Europeans living in Samoa, especially around Apia, was rather safe, as fighting normally occurred further in the hinterlands or along the coast.


84 In May 1895, for example, the crew of the Bussard organised a Bierabend (Beer Evening). In his diaries Krämer listed some of the guests: “Dr. Funk, Riedel, Hufnagel, Heydlen, Ahrens, Dr. Reinecke [and others]”, Krämer diaries at the Linden-Museum.

85 See Krämer’s diaries, Linden-Museum. See also Peter Mesenhöller, pp. 38-50. Krämer might well have been a member, since he had participated in theatrical performances during his stationing in Kiel. However, other ships, like the HMS Curacoa, also had their own ‘Variety Company’. See Krämer’s diaries, Linden-Museum.
Augustin Crämer … was a welcomed guest on our musical nights’.

Krämer, as his diaries illustrate, was also a guest on numerous parties and Bierabende (‘Beer Evenings’) organised by Dr. Bernhard Funk (1844-1911).

Dr. Funk, who was known as ‘the Apia Doctor’, was with certainty a figure of great importance in the social life in Apia. He was the German medical doctor in Apia, serving from 1880 to 1911. Apart from his official function as a medical doctor to the German colonialists and the workers of the DHPG, he had established a private practice with a small hospital at Sogi. Here he treated both, Europeans and Samoans, who frequently called upon his help. It seems that Funk often received support in his medical duties from the surgeons of the ships in port, regardless of their nationality. For example, in August 1894, Funk’s duties were taken over by Dr. Donald Hoskyn, surgeon on board the British warship HMS Curaccao, as Funk had received an injury earlier that month. According to Krämer’s diaries entries, he also stood in for Funk on a number of occasions.

Krämer certainly enjoyed the company of Dr. Funk and his Samoan wife Senitima, whom he described as ‘liebenswürdig’ (‘charming’). It was certainly through his friendship with Dr. Funk and his wife that Krämer made contact with a variety of Samoans and Europeans alike. Among them was Apia’s most famous European inhabitant, the Scottish author Robert Louis Stevenson, who was a close friend of Funk.

86 Max Biermann Erinnerungen, Kapitel 2: Reise nach Samoa, p. 37, held in private collection, translation by the author. Although Biermann’s description of having met Krämer sounds rather positive, he does not paint a very positive picture of the German Navy. Instead, he states that ‘our Navy was really demanding’, arguing that the Prussian system of status and the excessive self-perception of the naval officers stood in contrast to the administrators, and thus contributed to many difficulties.

87 For a good description on the life of Dr. Bernhard Funk, see Leilani L. C. Burgoyne “Going “Troppo” in the South Pacific: Dr. Bernard Funk of Samoa 1844-1920”, Hons. Diss., University of Auckland, 2004, as well as her 2007 published article ‘Going ‘Troppo’ in the South Pacific: Dr Bernhard Funk of Samoa 1844-1911’, Working Papers of The Research Centre for Germanic Connections with New Zealand and the Pacific No. 6, University of Auckland, Department of German and Slavonic Studies. In her works, Burgoyne also illustrates Funk’s contacts with other Europeans in Samoa at the time, such as Robert Louis Stevenson, Max Biermann, Otto Riedel and Augustin Krämer.

88 Ibid., p. 5, see also Reinecke, p. 209ff.

89 Ibid., p. 12.

90 On 7 October 1893, Krämer noted in his diaries ‘Vertretung für Dr Funk übernommen’ (‘stood in for Dr. Funk’). See Krämer diaries, Linden-Museum.

91 Augustin Krämer Die Samoa-Inseln: Entwurf einer Monographie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Deutsch-Samosas, Herg. Mit Unterstützung der Kolonialabteilung des Auswärtigen Amts, Stuttgart: E. Schweizerbart, 1902, Vol. I, p. 7. See also Krämer’s diaries, which reveal that he was indeed a frequent visitor to the Funk’s house. He also accompanied Dr. Funk on a number of trips around the island, see Krämer’s diaries held at the Linden-Museum.

92 See Booth & Mehew, eds. The Letters of Robert Louis Stevenson: Volume Seven: September 1890 – December 1892, p. 408, where it is stated that Stevenson remarked in relation to Dr. Funk: ‘it would never do [good] to quarrel with the doctor – and the doctor, though he tipples a little and gabbles much, is a good man.
Apart from taking part in these social activities, Krämer also used his stays in Samoa to engage in natural scientific research. While there, he undertook tours around the island, such as a two day tour to the Lanuto’o Mountain on which he embarked on 14 October 1893. During this tour, as well as on numerous others which were to follow, Krämer entrusted himself to his Samoan companions and guides. He seemed to have enjoyed their company. His writings reveal that on these tours he developed a deep affection for the Samoans, whom he praised and admired for their ‘kind character and (their) cleanliness’ and ‘noble-mindedness’. As his time in Samoa lengthened, so Krämer’s interest in Samoan culture and society began to grow.

Krämer, the naturalist

Although the exact reasons for Krämer’s commission onboard the Bussard remain unknown, there is evidence to suggest that he actively applied for the position. In a letter from 12 March 1893 a fellow officer congratulates Krämer for ‘receiving the position onboard the Bussard’. Wanderlust and a thirst for adventure were almost certainly motivating factors for Krämer. However, as a letter from Professor Brandt from the Königliche Marine-Akademie (Royal Marine-Academy) in Kiel to the Commanding Admiral von der Goltz suggests, Krämer’s motives for participating in this travels were also strongly influenced by his interests in natural science. During his stationing and training as a Navy Surgeon in Kiel whom I respect’. See also Burgoyne’s article ‘Going ‘Troppo’ in the South Pacific: Dr Bernhard Funk of Samoa 1844–1911’, pp. 11-13. Krämer’s diaries and writings illustrate that Krämer, at least, had contact with Stevenson’s relatives, Mrs. Strong and Llyod Osborne, see Krämer Hawaii, Ostmitronesien und Samoa, p. 56; as well as his diaries, held at the Linden-Museum.

93 In his diaries Krämer described that on 14 October 1893 at 7.00 am he started his tour from Apia, returning one day later, on 15 October. See Krämer’s diaries, held at the Linden-Museum.

94 See Krämer Über den Bau der Korallenrüfe und die Planktonverteilung an den samoanischen Küsten p.19, translation by the author. Krämer describes Samoa as the “paradise on earth”. However Krämer’s perception of the Samoans is criticized by Heinrich Neffgen, a German resident and interpreter to the New Zealand administration states that: ‘Those who (for instance Dr. A. Kraemer) put up the Samoans as “high-souled”, or praise them up to the skies for their liberality and hospitality, understands the Samoans just as little as those who call them without further ado: “liars”’. See Neffgen, ‘Papers relating to Samoa, 1907-1916’, Canberra, A.C.T.: Pacific Manuscripts Bureau, A.N.U.

95 This letter from a fellow officer, whose name is unfortunately illegible, is to be found in Krämer’s diaries, Linden-Museum, translation by the author. The letter lists other names of Krämer’s comrades and their places of commission.

96 See letter, Professor Brandt from the Royal Marine-Academy in Kiel to the Commanding Admiral von der Goltz, from 6 May 1893, Bundesarchiv/Militärarchive, Freiburg RM3/4362. In the letter, Brandt highlights Krämer’s interest in marine zoology and his wish to continue his studies. See also Dietrich Schleip ‘Ozeanische Ethnographie und Koloniale Praxis, Das Beispiel Augustin Krämer’, MA Thesis, Eberhard-Karls-Universität.
between 1889 and 1893, Krämer had developed a deep interest in natural science, studying zoology and geology at the local marine-academy as well as at the University of Kiel.  

Throughout his earlier deployments in the North Sea and the Baltic Sea he had engaged in marine zoological research. He used his brief deployment on board the training ship SMS *Nautilus* between May and July 1892, to take and analyse water samples in order to investigate its plankton content. In this light, a position on board the *Bussard* was certainly a chance for Krämer to pursue his interest and expand his field of research.

However, Krämer’s interest in natural science should not be seen in isolation from the times in which he lived, but rather as a reflection of them. The early nineteenth century has been characterised by historians, as an era when the ideas and ideals of the Enlightenment finally reached their full momentum, and in which rationalism celebrated its victory. Scientific education and scientific knowledge became not only accepted and admired social values, but were also important aspects of the colonising process. Natural science, in particular, was seen as a way to help explain and understand not only the natural world in general, but also specifically. In the eighteenth and early nineteenth century expeditions to the Pacific were usually accompanied by naturalists. Their task was primarily to collect and compile data and specimens, which then formed the base for the creation of new scientific knowledge and hence contributed to the development of scientific institutions in the metropolises of Europe and the United States of America. Eventually, at least in regards to the Pacific region, the collection of data and specimens became a valued hobby among navy officers, traders and colonial administrators.

---

97 Although Krämer did not gain a degree in natural science, he nevertheless developed a deep interest. See Krämer’s book *Über den Bau der Korallenriffe*, which he dedicated to ‘his teachers in natural science Mr. Prof. Dr. Karl Brandt and Mr. Prof. Dr. Hippolyt Haas. For further details of Krämer’s studies, refer to his book *Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa*, p. XI-XIII. See also Schleip ‘Ozeanische Ethnographie und Koloniale Praxis, Das Beispiel Augustin Krämer’, p. 12, who argues that Krämer studied zoology and geology in his spare time and without achieving a degree, a fact which is also mentioned in the obituary of Krämer in the *Tübinger Chronik* from 17 November 1941.

98 See Krämer’s diaries, Linden-Museum; over the course of over a week he noted to have taken water samples on different locations during his position on board the SMS *Nautilus*.


100 The most famous naturalists in the Pacific, at least from a German point of view, were Johann Reinhold and Georg Forster. They were father and son, who accompanied James Cook on his second travel to the Pacific. Another famous naturalist was Adelbert von Chamisso, who accompanied a Russian expedition under the command of Captain Kotzebue from 1818-1819.

101 There are countless examples of administrators, traders and officers engaging in data collection and purchasing ethnographical artefacts and/or conducting scientific research. Funk might be used as an example in Samoa. After his arrival he continued to observe and notice the weather patterns in Apia and kept metrological
It is, therefore, not surprising that, in addition to his medical duties, Krämer used the travels aboard the *Bussard* to continue his studies on plankton, and for the collection of marine zoological data and specimens. The necessary equipment which, as Dietrich Schleip reports, consisted of ‘simple instruments’ Krämer had organised before he left Germany.\(^{102}\) In his plankton research, Krämer enjoyed the support from his superior, Captain Schedler. He also received the help of an *Oberlazarettgehilfe* (Hospital Assistant in the Navy), a fellow crew member on board the *Bussard*, who analysed water samples.\(^{103}\)

During his travels Krämer also established contacts with other naturalists and zoologists around the Pacific region, which at times proved to be influential for his further development as a naturalist. One of these contacts was the German botanist Dr. Franz Reinecke who, between 1893 and 1895, conducted a two year botanical and ethnological research trip through Samoa, eventually publishing a number of books and articles.\(^{104}\) Reinecke, as Krämer noted in his diaries, had been allowed to accompany the *Bussard* on its journey. He was also a cousin of Consul Biermann, who mentioned that Reinecke was called ‘*Fomai á le vao*’ (‘Grass Doctor’) among the Samoans due to his collection of plant samples.\(^{105}\) The contact between Krämer and Reinecke almost certainly had mutual influence, as shown by the fact that both men later referred to each other’s work in their own publications.\(^{106}\)

A further acquaintance Krämer made during his travels was Baron Ferdinand von Müller (1825-1896), a fellow naturalist from Stuttgart, whom he met in Australia. Von Müller had emigrated to Australia in the 1840s, where he became director of the zoological-botanical gardens in Melbourne.\(^ {107}\) In New Zealand Krämer made contact with Thomas Frederic…

---


\(^{103}\) Schleip ‘Ozeanische Ethnographie und Koloniale Praxis, Das Beispiel Augustin Krämer’, p. 15-16.

\(^{104}\) Reinecke’s publications included the following: *Das Pflanzenreich* (zus. mit Prof. Dr. Migula), 2. Aufl., 1896; *Flora der Samoainseln*, 1900; *Samoa*, Berlin. 1902; *Die wirtschaftliche Entwicklung der Samoainseln*, 1899. For more information on Reinecke, see *Deutsches Kolonial Lexikon*, 1920. As Krämer noted in his diary, Reinecke ‘later worked as editor at the Schlesischen Zeitung’, Linden-Museum.

\(^{105}\) Biermann, p. 38.

\(^{106}\) In *Die Samoa-Inseln* Vol. I and Vol. II (p. 29), his article ‘Die wirtschaftliche Lage auf Samoa und in der umgebenden Südsee’, in *Geographische Zeitschrift*, Wiesbaden, 1899, 5, (pp. 489-508), pp. 494, 498, 503 and in his book *Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa*, p. 480, Krämer refers to Reineck’s work. Reinecke, on the other hand, mentions not only Krämer’s article “Einige ornithologischen Notizen aus Samoa” (p. 287), but also refers to him in his chapter on animal life. In his book *Samoa*, Reinecke further highlights Krämer’s contribution and role during the political upheavals in Samoa in 1898.

\(^{107}\) Krämer, as his diaries illustrate, met von Müller on a number of occasions, Linden-Museum. One such occasion was the celebration of von Müller’s 70th birthday. Krämer seems to have held von Müller in high
Cheeseman (1846-1923), the co-founder and director of the Auckland Museum, and with Malcolm George Thomson (1848-1933), a self-taught naturalist and founder of the technical school in Dunedin. It was probably due to the acquaintance with Cheeseman that Krämer’s paper ‘On the Most Frequent Pelagic Copepods Cladoceres of the Hauraki Gulf’, which was based on his plankton research among the New Zealand coast, was read before the Royal Society of New Zealand at the Auckland Institute on 1 October 1894.

However, it was the coral reefs and the zoological life on and around Samoa which became the focal point of Krämer’s natural scientific interests:

I had been far off, when I came to Samoa, to engage in coral reef research; … but since I found the whole animal life of the sea strongly linked with the coral reefs, [I decided] to allow some room for my observations of the coral reefs of Samoa.

Krämer was fortunate in that his superiors onboard the Bussard, as well as the Navy in general, showed great support for his research. They granted him plenty of shore leave and, as will be demonstrated later, allowed him time to work on his manuscripts and publications.

During the course of his research Krämer often closely engaged with Samoans, whom he employed as guides, porters or coxswains. His closeness with Samoans helped to improve and extend his knowledge and command of the Samoan language, which he had set out to learn since his arrival in Samoa on 1 September 1893. The ongoing contact with Samoans...
also made Krämer aware of the growing European influence on island life as it was changing, and even destroying, indigenous customs and culture. He later noted:

"It just needs a few more years and the South Sea is no longer a strange area, cut off from the world and civilisation … the natives are all Christians and the originality is more and more diminishing." 113

In realising the decline of Samoan culture Krämer’s developing interest in ethnology and Völkerkunde (Ethnology) was triggered. This was commonly known as ‘salvage anthropology’ and Krämer, as Liebersohn argues, soon ‘proved to be an able practitioner’. 114 His newly found interest expressed itself in the inclusion of ethnological themes in his work. In his work on the formation of Samoa’s coral reefs, for example, he included a chapter titled ‘Die Rifffauna von Samoa, insbesondere in ethnologischer Beziehung’ (‘The Reef Fauna of Samoa, in Particular Relation to Ethnology’), in which he provided a brief description of Samoan culture and customs. 115 He further began to add the collection of ethnographic artefacts to his collections, which resulted in the accumulation of ‘a nearly complete collection of Samoan commodities’. 116

**A brief return: Krämer’s plans for a new expedition to Samoa**

In June 1895 Krämer’s deployment on board the *Bussard* came to an end. On 8 June, as his diaries reveal, he and the rest of the crew celebrated their farewell in Apia, before eventually sailing for Australia. As with the circumstances of his arrival, the crew had their change of guard in Sydney. Krämer and the other crew members continued their travel to Adelaide, where, in mid-July, they boarded the post steamer *Preussen*, bound for Germany. They arrived in Bremerhaven on 22 August 1895. 117

---

114 Liebersohn, p. 42.
115 See Krämer Über den Bau der Korallenriffe und die Planktonverteilung an den samoanischen Küsten., pp. 103-113. See also Schleip ‘Ozeanische Ethnographie und Koloniale Praxis, Das Beispiel Augustin Krämer’, who highlights that Krämer does not distinguish between ethnology and ethnography as he later does. Schleip also argues that the chapter title “is exaggerated”, p. 19.
116 Letter Lampert to Sprösser, 6 January 1897, held at the Naturkundemuseum, translation by the author.
117 For details of his home travels, see Krämer diary, Linden-Museum.
On his homebound journey Krämer was accompanied by Dr. Reinecke who also had reached the end of his two year research stay in Samoa. During this journey home, Krämer and Reinecke presumably not only discussed their research and their experiences, but also developed the idea of a new expedition to Samoa in order to continue their studies. Although the aims of these studies were mainly focussed on natural science, they certainly also included ethnological topics. In early 1896 they filed an application with the Royal Academy of Science in Berlin to support their plan. Although their application was rejected, which, as Krämer admitted ‘was probably due to the asked for 60.000 Marks (US$ 15.000) of financial support [Reinecke had demanded]’; it nevertheless illustrates Krämer’s deep passion to organise his return to Samoa.

One gets the impression that Krämer devoted much time and effort advocating, lobbying and preparing for another expedition to the Pacific. Drawing on the lessons learned during his first trip, he aimed to conduct this new trip without the limiting effect of his official duties. Studies on the formation of coral reefs, as well as the collection of further zoological specimens and ethnographical artefacts, were again the main focus of interest for Krämer.

In his plans, as well as in the analysis of his studies so far, Krämer received much support from the Navy. The interest of the Navy was in particular based on his work on the formation of coral reefs and atolls, due to their practical and important implications for sailing. This support expressed itself in many different ways. In spring 1896, for example, Krämer was commissioned on board the SMS Gefion. This commission which, as Schleip argues, was ‘just as honourable as it was idle, since the solemn task of the Gefion was to escort the emperor’s yacht Hohenzollern on a long cruise through the North and Baltic Sea’, left

---

118 For first hints on Krämer’s and Reinecke’s planned cooperation and their planned trip, see Krämer’s letters to Lampert of May 1896 and of 15 June 1896. Letters held at the Naturkundemuseum in Stuttgart.
119 This assumption is based on the fact that both Reinecke and Krämer addressed ethnological aspects in their early works on Samoa. See Krämer Über den Bau der Korallenriffe und die Planktonverteilung an den samoanischen Küsten, p. 102ff and Reinecke Samoa, p. 130-132, as well as Reinecke’s article ‘Zur Kennzeichnung der Verhältnisse auf den Samoa-Inseln’, in Globus, 76 (1899), pp. 4-13.
120 See letter from Krämer to Lampert dated 15 June 1896, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.
121 See Krämer’s Preface Die Samoa-Inseln, Vol. I, pp. 1-6, where he argues that the continuation of his studies undertaken during his first trip, ‘were close to his heart’.
122 Information on Krämer’s daily life during this time, especially in 1896, is limited, since his diary of this time is not part of the collection held at the Linden-Museum. However, part of his correspondence with the Naturalien-Cabinet, especially with Kurt Lampert, provides an insight into Krämer’s plans and activities during this time as well as on his preparations and organisation for a return trip to Samoa.
123 See Schleip ‘Ozeanische Ethnographie und Koloniale Praxis, Das Beispiel Augustin Krämer’, p. 20. See also Krämer’s letters to Lampert from May 1896 and 15 June 1896, as well as Krämer’s letter to Sprösser, dated 3 June 1896, all held at the Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.
Krämer with ample time to work on the manuscript of his first book. In late 1897 this book, titled Über den Bau der Korallenriffe und die Planktonverteilung an den Samoanischen Küsten, was published with financial support from the Navy. The Navy was also generous in granting Krämer leave, which allowed him to pursue his interests in natural science. In October 1896, he was granted three months leave to study at the zoological station in Naples.

The Statione Zoologica di Napoli, which had been founded and directed by the German zoologist Felix Anton Dohrn (1840-1909) in 1870, was a well known institution among Europe’s leading zoologists and marine biologists. It became an important training ground for a number of zoologists. During his time in Naples, Krämer focused especially on preservation techniques of marine biological specimens.

Krämer’s studies at the zoological station took place on direction of the state government of Württemberg and his placement was arranged on Krämer’s explicit wish. It was facilitated and supported by Dr. Kurt Lampert. Lampert was not only the director of the Naturalien-Cabinet in Stuttgart, but also a board member and secretary of the Württembergische Verein für Handelsgeographie (Württemberger Society for Trade Geography), which had been established in February 1882. In both his functions, as well as a colleague and friend of

---

125 Krämer’s book, Über den Bau der Korallenriffe und die Planktonverteilung an den Samoanischen Küsten, was published in 1897, with the financial support of the Navy being acknowledged in its preface.
126 In a letter to Lampert dated 31 August 1896, Krämer acknowledges that his leave has been granted. In a further letter to Lampert dated 3 February 1897, Krämer reports that 'he] received note from the high command of the German Navy (Reichsmarine) that they take a supporting view towards my studies’, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart, translation by the author.
127 For information on the zoological station in Naples see website on Dr. Felix Anton Dohrn; Uni-Protokolle, online, available at: http://www.uni-protokolle.de/Lexikon/Anton_Dohrn.html, visited 16 July 2007.
128 Among the naturalists trained at Naples was also Dr. Reinecke, who had been a visiting member there, before he left for Samoa in 1893.
129 In his diary, Krämer acknowledges that on their homebound travels, Reinecke left the Preussen in Naples on 8 August 1895, Linden-Museum.
130 See Krämer’s correspondence with Lampert at the Naturkundemuseum, Stuttgart. In a letter of 7 August 1896, Krämer enquires for example if ‘the place for Württemberg [at the zoological station in Naples] is still vacant’, thereby creating the assumption that the station had certain places reserved for participants from the different German kingdoms and countries.
131 See Friederich Kussmaul’s article ‘Linden-Museum Stuttgart, Staatliches Museum für Völkerkunde. Rückblick, Umschau, Ausblick’, in TRIBUS (Sonderdruck), Nr. 24 (November 1975), p. 18, for information on Kurt Lampert see p. 24. For further information on the Naturalien-Cabinet and on Dr. Kurt Lampert, see also ‘Chronologie’, by B. Ziegler in Stuttgarter Beiträge zur Naturkunde, pp. 2-4.
Krämer, Lampert proved to be of great importance for Krämer’s planned expedition and, to an extent even Krämer’s further career.\textsuperscript{132}

\textbf{FIG. 2.3} Dr. Kurt Lampert


In late 1896, Lampert facilitated the contact between Krämer and Theodor Sprösser. It was this contact, as it will be shown, that brought Krämer’s planned expedition closer to reality. Sprösser, a wealthy industrial director from Stuttgart, intended to provide the 
\textit{Württembergische Verein für Handelsgeographie} with a donation of over 15 000 Marks (US$ 3750) for the purchase and collection of ethnographical artefacts.\textsuperscript{133} It was agreed that Krämer would be most qualified for this task, based not only on Lampert’s recommendation but also due to the fact that Krämer already had experience in collecting.\textsuperscript{134}

During the first few months of 1897 Krämer, Lampert and Sprösser finalised the arrangements for his next journey and his collecting activity. During this time Krämer frequently raised the point that, although he was able to pay for parts of his own travel due to

\textsuperscript{132} See Krämer \textit{Die Samoa-Inseln}, Vol. I, p. 1. There he acknowledges Lampert’s contribution and help in his work. The correspondence between Krämer and Lampert, which is held at Naturkundemuseum in Stuttgart, further illustrates the close and friendly relationship Krämer developed with Lampert, as well as providing insights into the organisational, financial or scientific matters they discussed. However, the letters are also characterised by their friendly tone, containing private matters and greetings.


\textsuperscript{134} In a letter to Sprösser dated 27 January 1897, Lampert briefly mentions Krämer’s abilities and experiences. Furthermore see letter from Krämer to Sprösser, dated 1 January 1897, in which Krämer presents Sprösser with a provisional plan for his further travels; Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.
some money he had inherited from his parents, he would be unable to finance trips to other island groups, ‘whose visit would be worthwhile from a collector point of view’. Finally it seems that Krämer’s proposal, which saw him being granted free disposal of over 25% of the available funds for travel expenses, was accepted by Sprösser and Lampert. In addition Krämer was also given a camera, which after his return became part of the *Naturalien-Cabinet*.136

With the finances secured, Krämer’s next step was to convince the Navy to support his planned expedition. Already in late December 1896, as Dietrich Schleip reports, Krämer had applied for 1½ years leave to continue his studies.137 He was given provisional approval on 25 January 1897. Finally, on 15 March 1897, Krämer was placed *a là suite* by the Navy, which granted him leave without pay, but with all his military and official rights upheld.138 The Commanding Admiral not only allowed Krämer to use the services of the Navy while in the Pacific, but even allowed ‘small deviations of route depending on place and time [in relation to the plans of travel of the ship]’, if they were necessary for his research.139 As will be shown below, Krämer certainly made extensive use of this window of opportunity.

Thus, with his leave granted, the support of the Navy secured, and the financial framework in place, he was finally able to return to Samoa to continue his studies.

### Return to the Pacific: Krämer’s second trip

On 17 April 1897 Krämer finally embarked on his second trip to the Pacific, leaving Antwerp aboard the cosmos liner *Memphis*. The *Memphis* was bound for Chile. Krämer had decided to

---

135 See Krämer’s letters to Lampert, dated 11 March 1897, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart. Translation by the author. In this letter Krämer further acknowledges that he was able to pay his travel to Samoa but not anywhere further. See also Krämer’s letter to Sprösser dated 21 February 1897, which is of similar content; as well as Schleip ‘Ozeanische Ethnographie und Koloniale Praxis, Das Beispiel Augustin Krämer’, p. 20-22.
136 See Krämer’s letters to Lampert dated 11 March 1897, in which he proposes to be granted 25% of the funds to pay for travel and other expenses: ‘I ask you to place all your confidence in me, that I will put the money to good use, as discussed in our contract’, translation by the author. Letter held at the Naturkundemuseum, Stuttgart.
137 See Krämer’s diary. Although the diary starts with his departure for his second trip, he included a summary on the previous developments leading to his expedition, Linden-Museum. See also Schleip ‘Ozeanische Ethnographie und Koloniale Praxis, Das Beispiel Augustin Krämer’, pp. 22-24.
138 See letter of commanding Admiral to the Surgeon-General of the Reichsmarine from 25 January 1897 and letter from the Commanding Admiral to the State-Secretary of the Reichs-Marine-Amt from 26 April 1898, Bundesarchiv/Militärarchive Freiburg RM/4362. This fact proved quite important for Krämer, as the methods of transport were rather limited. See Margarete Brüll ‘Die deutschen Kolonien in der Südsee’, in freiburg-postkolonial.de-Reithe, p. 12.
take the western route, travelling via South America, as he planned to get a connection to the
Pacific from a harbour in Chile or Peru. Naturally he also aimed to use his travel to
investigate ‘the oceanographic situation on the West coast of central America’, as well as ‘to
collect a few ethnographic objects along the way’.  

Indeed this two-fold approach became a characteristic feature not only for Krämer’s stay in
South America, but also for his second travel in general. On the one hand, Krämer’s travel
was undoubtedly inspired and motivated by his interest in natural science and zoology,
especially in regards to the investigation of the formation of reefs on Samoa and on other
islands of the Pacific. On the other hand, Krämer, in accordance with his contract with
Sprösser and Lampert, intended to use his travels to collect ethnographic artefacts. An
approach which was not uncommon for naturalists of the time. The ethnologist Michael
O’Hanlon argues that early naturalists ‘saw natural history and ethnography as part of a
continuum’, and that ‘it is important to recall that their collections of the former were often
larger, than those of the latter’. In Krämer’s case, however, the ratio changed. In the course
of his travels, as it will be demonstrated later, Krämer’s interest in the collection of
ethnographic artefacts, as well as ethnological data, eventually superseded his interest in
natural science.

Still, during his month-long sea travel onboard the Memphis, his interest in natural scientific
studies was still paramount. He frequently took and analysed water samples for their content
of plankton. Crossing the mouth of the La Plata river on 12 May, he noted the water to be
‘19.3 C°, whereas the colour is dark green. … Over the afternoon the colour becomes greener,
whereas there remains a bit of blue. The next water examination was 8 C° at a quarter to 9
o’clock’. But on arrival at port, Krämer’s focus changed and the collection of
ethnographical objects became of increasing importance. This becomes obvious as, during a
brief stop over of just a few hours at Puntas Arenas, Krämer bought not only bows, arrows,

---

140 See Krämer Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, p. 1. Also see Die Samoa-Inseln, Vol. I, p. 1, translation by
the author.
141 Michael O’Hanlon ‘Introduction’, in Michael O’Hanlon and Robert L. Welsch, eds. Hunting the Gatherers,
New York, 2000, pp. 9-10
142 Krämer Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, pp. 1-3.
143 For quote see Krämer’s diary entry from 12 May 1897, held at the Linden-Museum, translation by the author.
jewellery and weavings, but also left 30 Marks (US$ 7.50) to the ship surgeon with the task to continuing his collection efforts.\textsuperscript{144}

On 24 May Krämer finally arrived in Chile, when the \textit{Memphis} made port in Coronel. From there, he travelled by train to Concepcion, before eventually making his way to Los Angeles de Chile. There he was ‘to fulfil a long held dream – a visit to his place of birth’.\textsuperscript{145} Indeed, one gets the impression that this visit was the main reason for choosing to travel via the western route in the first place. After having spent some time in Los Angeles de Chile and Santiago de Chile, Krämer made his way across the South American continent. Since he was not able to find a direct connection to the Pacific, he decided to travel north to try his luck in San Francisco.\textsuperscript{146}

Travelling by boat, train and donkey, he crossed from Chile to Peru and on to Columbia, before heading through El Salvador and Honduras. Thus Krämer used his travels to do some sight-seeing, such as visiting ruins of the Mayan empire in Quirigá/Honduras on 17 July 1897.\textsuperscript{147} During his travels through South America, Krämer continued his collecting endeavours. As his stays were often very brief and did not permit any larger and thorough collections, Krämer often asked others to help out. One of these persons was Dr. Karl Sapper, a geologist and fellow countryman from Württemberg, whom Krämer met in Guatemala.\textsuperscript{148} On his departure he acknowledges that he gave Sapper 400 Marks (US$ 100) for the purpose of ‘collecting ethnographical artefacts’.\textsuperscript{149}

\textsuperscript{144} See Krämer’s letter to Sprösser, dated 3 June 1897, in the letter Krämer also acknowledged that he had given 30 Marks to the ship surgeon in order to buy more artefacts, since his stay proved not as successful as he had hoped. The letter is held at the Naturkundemuseum, Stuttgart.
\textsuperscript{145} See Krämer \textit{Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa}, p. 1, translation by the author. On his arrival in Concepcion Krämer met with Mrs. Aichel, an old friend of his mother. In Los Angeles de Chile Krämer spent a few days visiting his god-mother and Mr. Carlos Heck, a fellow countryman from Stuttgart who knew his father from his time in Chile (pp. 12-15).
\textsuperscript{146} See Krämer’s letter to Sprösser from 3 June 1897, in which Krämer reports on his further plans, stating that he hoped to be in San Francisco by 20 July, from where he aimed to continue his travels to the Pacific via Hawaii. Naturkundemuseum, Stuttgart.
\textsuperscript{147} For a detailed report on Krämer’s travels through South America, see his book \textit{Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa}, pp. 12-40.
\textsuperscript{148} Ibid., pp. 23-24. In 1908 Sapper, together with Dr. Friederici, conducted his own expedition to the Pacific. Sapper also became a close friend of Count von Linden and he frequently visited the ethnographical collection in Stuttgart with his students, as his correspondence with Count Linden reveals. See File ‘Sapper’, Linden-Museum.
\textsuperscript{149} In a letter to Lampert dated 5 October 1897, Krämer acknowledges that he gave the money to Sapper for the purpose of collecting ethnographical artefacts. He also mentions this in a letter to Sprösser dated 25 August 1897. In regard to the outcome of this deal, however, Lampert later reports in a letter to Krämer dated 11 April 1900, that ‘in private, Sapper has not made a special effort [in his collection activity]’, Naturkundemuseum, Stuttgart.
Krämer was aware of the marginality of his collections during his trip through South America, he states that ‘I don’t want to spend too much time on the places I touched on while globetrotting and where I purchased some things for my collection’. Indeed, this marginality not only refers to his collection activity but also to his time spend in South America in general which, apart from a brief description in his later published travel account Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, received no further mention.

In late July 1897 Krämer arrived in New Orleans aboard the American steamer Stillwater. Convinced he had taken too much time by travelling through South America, Krämer decided to take the train and travel non-stop from New Orleans to San Francisco, ‘the heaven’s gate to the Pacific’. On 5 August 1897, bound for Honolulu, Krämer left San Francisco aboard the steamer China. The trip took six days. Krämer mentions the kind assistance he received in Honolulu from the local German Consul, Herr Hackfeld, who not only helped him to find a room but also provided him with a local servant, a Hawaiian named Mahelone. During his stay in Hawai‘i Krämer made numerous scientific observations on the formation of the reefs and dunes. He also visited the Bishop Museum and other historical places. However, in regards to his collecting activity, his stay at Hawai‘i proved disappointing:

He who thinks that [ethnographical collection] means trading things with the natives in Honolulu, still has no idea of the true situation of things. ... Two main sources had I discovered on my first day, a missionary store “Woman’s exchange” and a cake-shop. Here did I find not only a good selection, namely of beautiful carved Tapa-sticks, bamboo stencils, ornamented pumpkins a.s.o., but also numerous pieces from other South sea islands, especially from Micronesia. The later pieces were unloaded at the cake shop by the returning American missionary ship Morning Star. Certainly the prices were according to it, but nevertheless they were good things and [they] served the purpose. With many other things it was coincidence. So I saw a modern carved club at a barbers shop, its normal value would have been 2 Marks, here it cost me 8 Marks.

---

150 Krämer Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, p. 18, translation by the author.
151 Also Krämer acknowledges his visit to Chile and Peru in the preface of Die Samoa-Inseln Vol. I, p. 2. A detailed description of his travels through South America is only to be found in his book Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, pp. 1-40, which is even more astonishing since Krämer generally published a number of articles on his travels.
152 Krämer Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, pp. 40-50.
153 Ibid., p. 62. Krämer reports that the room was in a small cottage owned by Mrs. Lewey and cost him US$ 5 per week.
154 Ibid., chapter 2, pp. 62-142, in which he describes in great detail his stay in the Hawaiian Islands.
… From the natives in Honolulu themselves I received nothing, despite sending my comrade Mahelone on the look out. 156

In mid August 1897 Krämer decided to extend his stay beyond the 14 days he first had planned. He did so in order to see ‘if, after all, he was perhaps able to squeeze something out of this robbed land’. 157 His action therefore provides yet another indication that the collection of ethnographical artefacts was becoming more and more an important part of Krämer’s travels.

A few days later he met Dr. Georg Thilenius (1868 – 1937), a medical doctor and lecturer for anatomy from Strasbourg, who soon became a ‘travel companion, who shared pain and joy on the coming travels’. 158 Indeed the contact with Thilenius proved not only important on this travel, but was also quite influential for Krämer’s further career as an ethnologist. 159 Together with Thilenius, Krämer conducted numerous trips and expeditions on foot, ship and horseback. In late August 1897, for example, they climbed the volcano Mauna Loa. During this trip Krämer learned the hard way that ‘one can live for three days solely on coffee and crackers’. 160 The climb also featured in the Hawaiian Star, the local paper under the heading ‘Dr. Guppy descends from Mauna Loa’s summit’; mentioning Dr. Guppy’s companions as: ‘Professor A. Kramer, a German naturalist of wide experience [and] Dr. Thilenius, a Strasburg anatomist’. 161 On an excursion to the island of Molokai and its local leper

156 Ibid., p. 82, translation by the author.
157 Ibid., p. 101, translation by the author.
158 Ibid., p. 104. For details on Thilenius’s life, see Jürgen Zwernemann ‘Jahre des Glanzes: Die erste Hälfte der Amtszeit von Georg Thilenius’, in Wulf Köpke, ed. Die ersten 112 Jahre – Das Museum für Völkerkunde Hamburg, pp. 63–65; Hans Fischer Die Hamburg-Südsee Expedition: über Ethnographie und Kolonialismus, Frankfurt am Main, 1981; and Hans Nevermann’s obituary on Thilenius in Dr. Augustin Krämer and Dr. Hans Nevermann Revik-Ratok (Marshall-Inseln) Bd. 11, Ergebnisse der Hamburger Südsee-Expedition 1908-1910, edited by Dr. G. Thilenius, Hamburg, 1938. 159 Dr. Georg Thilenius became director of the Völkerkunde Museum in Hamburg on 1 October 1904. He also remained in close contact with Krämer over the years (see Chapter Four). He also helped raise financial support for Krämer’s third expedition to the Pacific in 1906 to 1907 and recommended him to take over the Hamburg Südsee-Expedition in 1908 to 1910, see Chapter Six. 160 Krämer Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, p. 120, translation by the author.
161 See The Hawaiian Star, Saturday 4 September 1897. Dr. Henry Brougham Guppy (1854-1926) was a British botanist who specialized in the distribution of plants on oceanic islands. His first contact with the Pacific occurred in the 1880s, when he was a Navy surgeon on board the HMS Lark. Thereby Guppy also developed a strong focus on geology, zoology and anthropology. He published a number of books and articles and had a long standing correspondence with Charles Darwin. For publications of H. B. Guppy, see his article ‘On the physical characters of the Solomon Islanders’, in The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, Vol. 15 (1886), pp. 266–285; and his book The Solomon Islands: Their Geology, General features, and Suitability for Colonization, London, 1887. For further information on H.B. Guppy see Peter J. Bowler The Eclipse of Darwinism: anti-Darwinian Evolution Theories in the Decades around 1900, John Hopkins
settlement on its western side, Krämer and Thilenius actively engaged in the so-called ‘bone hunting’, eventually securing ‘five skulls and two to three complete skeletons’.\textsuperscript{162} This ‘Bone hunting’, as the historian Andrew Zimmerman acknowledges, was a common activity among early German scientist and had an important impact on the development of German ethnology.\textsuperscript{163}

During his travels it seems the relationship between Krämer and the Hawaiians remained distant. There is, however, mention of contacts with white settlers and missionaries. The reason for this imbalance might have it origins in the historical context during which Krämer’s visit to Hawai‘i took place. In 1891, just three years before Krämer set foot on Hawai‘i, American planters had initiated a revolution, thereby deposing the Hawaiian queen and opening the way for annexation by the USA.\textsuperscript{164} Hawaiians thereby reacted by withdrawing and a general de-population set in. Thus it seems not surprising, that Krämer does not mention any names of Hawaiians, apart from his servant, whom he later made responsible for the poor quantity and quality of his collected artefacts and zoological specimens:

How much of the success of such a scientific expedition depends on the servant, every traveller is able to sing a song of this. It is for sure that the rather small success of my stay on the Hawaiian Islands is to a large degree Mahelone’s fault.\textsuperscript{165}

In late September Krämer and Thilenius left the Hawaiian Islands for Samoa, ‘where the true work was about to begin’.\textsuperscript{166} They arrived in Apia onboard the post-steamer \textit{Mariposa} at midday, 30 September. On his arrival, as Krämer later reports, he was greeted by the words:

---

\textsuperscript{162} Krämer \textit{Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa}, p. 30, translation by the author. ‘Bone-hunting’ was an important aspect among early twentieth century European naturalists. Some, like Dr Hugo Schauinsland, the later director of the Übersee-Museum in Bremen, used to exhume bodies and bones on the Chatman Islands in 1897 under the cover of darkness. See James Braund ‘The German Anthropological Interest in New Zealand circa 1900 and its Subsequent Connection with the German Race Hygiene Movement’, Paper presented at the New Zealand Historical Association Biennial Conference “Conversations Across Time and Place”, Auckland, 24-27 November 2005.


\textsuperscript{165} Krämer \textit{Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa}, p. 83, translation by the author.

\textsuperscript{166} Ibid., p. 142, translation by the author. See also \textit{Die Samoa-Inseln}, Vol. I, pp. 2-3.
The next day, on 1 October 1897, with the support of Dr. Funk, Krämer and Thilenius rented a small house at Sogi.

The little house became their home base. There they created a storage place for their equipment and their collections. Also with some help from Otto Riedel, the director of the DHPG, and some improvising they made themselves a comfortable home, where ‘the bed was replaced by the floor and the suitcases functioned as wardrobe’.

The following months were dominated by excursions that Krämer and Thilenius conducted around Apia, such as visiting the crater lake Lanuto’o in early October 1897 and engaging in palolo research among the reefs. The investigation of the palolo was one of Krämer’s stated aims for visiting Samoa. During November, after full moon, the palolo worm generally

FIG. 2.4 Thilenius and Krämer in front of their house in Sogi
(Augustin Krämer, Hawai, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, p. 147)
appeared along the reefs, where it was harvested by Samoans as a delicacy.\textsuperscript{169} It was due to Krämer’s research, as the American biologist W. M. Woodworth later reports, that it was discovered ‘that this 40 cm long worm actually lived among the reefs’, just coming out for reproduction purposes at a certain time.\textsuperscript{170}

Although Krämer spent much time on the research of the \textit{palolo}, he later abandoned this topic, arguing that, if he had known that ‘the so neglected \textit{palolo} worm … was suddenly tracked down from all sides [including] two English expeditions and two American ones directed by Agassiz, [he] would have laid [his] focus somewhere else’.\textsuperscript{171} Eventually he left his material and collected specimens at the disposal of Mr. M. Woodworth, who was an assistant to the American biologist Alexander Agassiz, whom Krämer had met and befriended during his travels in South America. In his letters to the \textit{Naturalien-Cabinett} Krämer later asked for his materials to be forwarded to Woodworth, whom he described as ‘as a good friend, […] who is able to speak German quite well’.\textsuperscript{172} In return, Woodworth later contributed an article to the second volume of Krämer’s \textit{Die Samoa-Inseln}.\textsuperscript{173}

Abandoning his research seemed a rather unusual step for Krämer. It can be presumed that this action was triggered by his discovery of \textit{fa’alupega}, a constitutional set of greeting phrases which establishes the order of rank within Samoan villages. During a trip to Falelatai, on the western side of Upolu, Krämer was introduced to the chief Le Kuka, in whose possession he discovered a \textit{fa’alupega}. By mentioning ‘the word Dollar quite frequently’ Krämer eventually convinced Le Kuka’s brother Saula to allow him to borrow the book for a few days.\textsuperscript{174} Since Krämer was not able to buy the book, he just copied it. Therein he was supported by the half-caste Charles Taylor, whom the Samoans called Sale. But it seems that even Taylor’s understanding of the \textit{fa’alupega} was limited; ‘asking him for the meaning of words and sentences’ Krämer soon discovered, ‘that he understood as much of it as I did’.\textsuperscript{175}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{169} Ibid., pp. 186-189.
\textsuperscript{170} Krämer \textit{Die Samoa-Inseln}, Vol. II, p. 399ff; see also article ‘Notes on the Palolo’, by Benedict Friedländer, published in \textit{The Journal of the Polynesian Society}, Vol. 7, No. 1 (March 1898). Although this article acknowledges Krämer’s contribution to the research of the \textit{palolo}, the author also stresses Thilenius’ contribution to these observations.
\textsuperscript{171} Krämer \textit{Die Samoa-Inseln} Vol. I, p. 2. Here Krämer forgets to mention the research by Benedict Friedländer, whom he met in Samoa and who was also researching the palolo worm.
\textsuperscript{172} See Krämer’s letters to Lampert dated 4 April 1899 and dated 27 April 1899, in which he asks to have his material sent to ‘the Museum of Comparative Zoology in Cambridge Massachusetts, USA’, Naturkundemuseum, Stuttgart.
\textsuperscript{174} Krämer \textit{Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa}, p. 181, translation by the author.
\textsuperscript{175} Ibid., p. 180ff, translation by the author.
\end{flushright}
Although Krämer had continued to collect artefacts and conduct natural scientific observations during his activities and excursions, it was the discovery of a record like this that spurred his interest in the social-cultural organisation of Samoan society. In the fa’alupega Krämer saw an ‘excellent aid … to establish the political organisation of Samoa’. It was ultimately this finding which intensified his interest in Samoan customs and culture, which gradually overshadowed his interest in zoological studies.

**Travelling the Pacific, Krämer’s visits in Micronesia**

In mid-November 1897 Krämer and Thilenius departed from Samoa on their own different journeys. They promised to meet again in Apia in a few months time, and extended the rent of their little house in Sogi for another ten months, till October 1898. Thilenius continued his travels to New Zealand, the original aim of his expedition to the Pacific. There he wanted to investigate the Tuatara and their reproductive behaviour. Krämer, on the other hand, decided to accompany the Bussard on a trip around the German protectorates in the Pacific. The captain of the Bussard at the time, Captain Winkler, delayed the departure of the ship for two days to allow Krämer to finish his palolo research. This fact is again proof of the support Krämer was granted by the Navy. Winkler further made numerous stops during the voyage to Jaluit in order to allow Krämer to conduct his plankton catches.

On arrival in Jaluit (Djalut), Krämer decided to stay on the island, following an invitation from Herr Hütter and Herr Wolfhagen, directors of the Jaluit Company (Jaluitgesellschaft), in order to continue his studies on the formation of reefs. The Jaluit Company was one of the first German trading firms to be active in the Marshall Islands, the Caroline Islands and

---

177 Ibid., p.186. The price of renting the house for these ten months, as Krämer acknowledged, was 300 Marks ($75).
178 For information on Thilenius’ travels and aims, see Krämer Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, p. 104, where he states that Thilenius’ original aim was travel to New Zealand to conduct zoological-biological investigations, among them an investigation on the tuatara. See Jürgen Zwernemann, p. 64.
179 For Captain Winkler’s support, see Krämer Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, pp.185-187, 194.
180 Ibid., p. 205.
Gilbert Islands (now known as Kiribati).\textsuperscript{181} Krämer was given the governor’s house (	extit{Landeshauptmann Haus}), which was vacant, as was the position of governor at the time. After having made the necessary arrangements, he paid visits to the commandant of the island and to Mata’afa, the Samoan chief who had been exiled to the Marshall Islands by the German administration in Samoa.\textsuperscript{182}

Krämer had been present during the deportation of Mata’afa and a number of his fellow chiefs and relatives to Jaluit in 1893. On their meeting Krämer presented Josefo Mata’afa with a kava root, which had been given to him in Samoa, together with letters and news from Samoa. Krämer does not fail to mention that, in 1889, Mata’afa ‘fought among the helm of his troops against us Germans on Samoa, and that the losses the German Navy had faced during the battle by Vailele in December 1888 remain in sad memory’. Still, he stressed the noble character of Mata’afa, who had ‘surrendered himself in order to avoid further bloodshed’.\textsuperscript{183} It was probably at this meeting that Krämer and Mata’afa’s friendship began, preparing a path of trust and cooperation with Mata’afa, which proved not only important in the political events that followed just a year later in Samoa, but which also caused Krämer to dedicate his later published work 	extit{Die Samoa-Inseln} to Mata’afa.\textsuperscript{184}

\textsuperscript{181} The Jaluit Company had been founded in 1888 by the DHPG and Robertson & Hernsheim. Similar to the New Guinea Company, the Jaluit Company was given an Imperial Charter in January 1888, allowing it to take possession of all unused land, thereby creating a monopoly position. However, in contrast to the New Guinea Company, the Jaluit Company, as Peter Hempenstall argues, proved to be ‘the longest lived and the most successful’ of the German Companies in the Pacific, see p. 19. For further information on the Jaluit Company, as well as one of its founders, Eduard Hernsheim, see I. C. Campbell, p. 219; Margarete Brüll ‘Die deutschen Kolonien in der Südsee’, pp. 8-9; and Peter Sack and Dymphna Clark’s Introduction in Eduard Hernsheim 	extit{South Sea Merchant}, ed. and transl. by Peter G. Sack and Dymphna Clark, Institute of Papua New Guinea Studies, 1983, pp. iv - viii.

\textsuperscript{182} Krämer 	extit{Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa}, pp. 195-208.

\textsuperscript{183} Ibid., pp. 193-206, translation by the author.

\textsuperscript{184} See Krämer’s dedication to Mata’afa in 	extit{Die Samoa-Inseln}, Vol. I, p. V.
FIG. 2.5 ‘Mata’afa with his chiefs and Talala in Exile on Djaluit’
(Augustin Krämer, *Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa*, p. 209)

Krämer spent two months on Jaluit, conducting medical inquiries and engaging in zoological research on the reefs. ‘On this small corner of earth it was easy to make spontaneous arrangements due to place and time’, as he later described, however, stressing that no matter ‘how small the place is, so inexhaustibly seemed the research of the reefs’.

Following careful consideration, Krämer decided to embark on a trip to the Gilbert Islands on board the *Neptun*, a copra schooner under the command of Captain Kessler. On 12 December 1897, after having organized his material and equipment to remain in Jaluit, as he expected to return in a few months time ‘to finish the current works and to bring them to some kind of closure’, Krämer went to sea. Krämer’s trip on board the *Neptun* lasted over a month, during which time he visited the following nine islands of the Tuvalu Island group: Maraki, Onoatoo, Tapiuēa, Nonuti, Apamama, Maiana, Tārava, Apaiang, and Butaritari.

---

185 Krämer *Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa*, pp. 227-241, translation by the author. During his investigation of the reefs, Krämer was helped by the Marshall Islander Lovelāg, a brother of the local queen. For Krämer’s quote, see p. 230.
186 Ibid., p. 250.
187 Ibid. See also Krämer’s diaries, Linden-Museum.
Although the visits to these islands were dominated by the copra trade Captain Kessler was conducting, Krämer nevertheless used the time to gain an overview of each individual island. In doing so he developed a method he perfected during his later career in the field: he first visited the reefs, made drawings and collected data, before engaging in ethnological observations and collecting information. These he collected mainly from local beachcombers, missionaries and traders. He proudly states, that he gathered ‘around 70 objects while just

---

188 See Chapter 5, pp. 253-329, and Chapter 6, pp. 330-361, in Krämer’s book *Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa* for his experiences, observations and travels among the Gilbert Islands (Kiribati), as well as for short descriptions of the islands he visited (pp. 253-329).
189 Ibid., p. 272.
spending] a little tobacco and money, [among them] a large shield, on which a man works for at least a year cost me 2 – 4 Marks’. 190

Apart from collecting artefacts by trading and exchanging goods, Krämer also used his medical knowledge to extract ethnographical artefacts and information. This becomes evident when he stated that ‘for a few medical services [provided to] Mr. Corrie [an English trader on Maiana] and his family, I received some beautiful things, for example a necklace made from 100 dolphin teeth’. 191 Eventually, this trade of services in exchange for information and/or artefacts became an often repeated feature of his ethnological fieldwork. In his work he admitted that ‘later I frequently employed this practical and radical measure to secure from Samoans help which otherwise could not have been available’. 192

On his arrival on Buaritari in mid January 1898, Krämer left the Neptun, which by then was loaded with copra. Due to a lack of transport he had to remain 15 days on the island. There he stayed as a guest of the local director of the Jaluit Company, Mr. Klimann, and later as a guest to the German planter couple, Mr. and Mrs. Dolch. Together with Mr. Dolch, Krämer visited the small neighbouring island of Makin, before returning to Jaluit to board the post steamer Merkur on 3 February 1898. 193 After his return to Jaluit, Krämer was offered a trip through the Marshall Islands by ‘King’ Kabua, travelling on board the schooner Benak. This ship was generally known as ‘Kabua’s yacht’, which he had named after his daughter. 194 The main reason for this cruise, as Krämer later reports, was to spread Kabua’s word among the islands to commence with the copra harvest. The command of the cruise had been given to the Micronesian chief Nelu, a son-in-law of Kabua, who also functioned as Krämer’s translator during the travels. After having agreed to accompany this cruise Krämer felt like ‘swimming in a sea of ethnological heaven’. 195

However, Krämer’s high hopes were not fulfilled. Although Krämer visited four islands, Ailinglaplay, Likiep, Gwadjelin and Wodja, he failed to visit the ‘pagan islands’ in the east: Medjit, Ailuk and Udjirik, which he was looking forward to. 196 Although his travels onboard the Benak were again marked by brief stopovers, he was not able to collect as many artefacts

---

190 Ibid., p. 280, translation by the author. The price for the shield, as he states, was between 50c to US$ 1.
191 Ibid., pp. 303-304, translation by the author.
192 During his travels there are many instances where Krämer used his medical knowledge to extract artefacts and information. For quote see Krämer Die Samoa-Inseln, Vol. I, p. 5.
193 Krämer Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, pp. 316-329.
194 Ibid., p. 366. Here Krämer reports that the Benak had been built in America. It was purchased by Kabua with the help of the Jaluit Company and paid for by Kabua’s copra money.
195 Ibid., pp. 361-370 for a description on Krämer’s travel on board the Benak. For quote, see p. 363, translation by the author.
196 For a description of his visit to these islands, see Krämer Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, Chapter 7, pp. 362-397.
as he had apparently hoped for. Still, in a letter to Lampert, Krämer states he was able to bring together ‘a nearly complete, and quite valuable Marshall Islands collection’.  

On his return to Jaluit, Krämer again spent his time as guest of the Jaluit Company, which provided him with free lodging. He used the following weeks to go through his notes, pack his equipment and to wrap the collected materials for posting. He also continued to collect and buy ethnographical artefacts. His efforts proved successful, by trading glass pearls and necklaces to local women in exchange for indigenous necklaces and hair ties. In his later published memoirs Krämer recalls that he even had to ‘turn down [some necklaces], an event rarely experienced by people visiting the Marshall Islands’, as he was offered more and more necklaces.  

Krämer’s preparation soon paid off, as he had to leave the island in a hurry. His transport, the cutter Arthur, arrived on midday 29 March, ‘unexpectedly early’. After having said his farewell to the members of the Jaluit Company and Mata’afa, Krämer quickly began boarding the ship and storing his equipment and material on board. Bound for Sydney, the Arthur made a brief stop-over in Nauru, where it arrived in the afternoon of 31 March. Although Krämer claims to have just spent 24 hours on Nauru, his visit nevertheless contributed to a number of later written articles on the geological and ethnological situation of the island. This was almost certainly only possible due to Krämer’s contact with Mr. Jung, the former German administrator of Nauru, whom he had met onboard the Arthur and whom he described as ‘the best and only true expert on Nauru’.  

On 2 April, after having bought and collected a number of artefacts, mainly jewellery and necklaces, as well as a number of marine-zoological specimens, Krämer left Nauru. His collection was, as he mentioned in a letter to his friend and patron Lampert, travelling with him, ‘stored in four boxes in the belly of the Arthur’. In this letter Krämer also explained more about the content of these four boxes, his previous experience and his further travel plans:  

The four boxes, No. 20, 21, 23 and 24 for the royal Naturalien Kabinet, contain a complete, and relatively extensive Marshall collection, for whose completion I took

---

197 Letter from Krämer to Lampert, dated 10 April 1898, translation by the author. Letter held at the Naturkundemuseum, Stuttgart.  
198 See Krämer’s book Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa AK 1906, pp. 395-397, translation by the author. See also Krämer’s letter to Lampert dated 10 April 1898, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.  
199 Krämer Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, pp. 396-397.  
200 In his book Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, Krämer dedicates a whole chapter on his visit to Nauru, pp. 441-457. He also published an article, ‘Nauru’, in Globus Band 74 (1898), in which he also described his findings on the geological, ethnological and economic situation of this island.  
201 Krämer Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, pp. 441-442, translation by the author.  
202 Ibid., pp. 448-457.
great trouble in the face of the degenerating local circumstances. … Among the ethnographic artefacts there is a zoological collection, which includes a collection of corals from Jaluit which might be of great interest to you. … With my zoological collecting in Jaluit I came to an abrupt end, as I was running out of formalin. I will now try to get a larger batch in Sydney, to be able to complete my Samoa collection. There I will pay special attention to the fishes and try to make sure to conserve their colours. … The Marshall boxes also contain a few fans and small mats to satisfy Mr. Sprösser. They are not part of the collection, but meant as presents. I am convinced the ladies will be delighted by these cute Marshall-fans.

In all there are 300 pieces from the Marshall [Islands] and 40 from Nauru (not counting the zoological specimens) … On Jaluit I was able to work and live quite cheaply, thanks to the friendly help from the Jaluitgesellschaft, who offered me free boarding. I could have easily continued my reef research, but in regards to my collection it became quite difficult. Therefore, in the interest of the collection, I left Jaluit for Sydney, from where I will travel via New Caledonia, New Hebrides, Viti [Fiji] to Samoa, where I plan to arrive in July at the latest.  

On 13 April 1898, after 11 days at sea, Krämer arrived at Port Jackson, Sydney, where he again met the Bussard and its crew. There he arranged to have a number of instruments transferred to the Bussard, as he thought them ‘to be safer on a warship than on a merchant ship’. In the end, however, he had to learn that the sea was unpredictable, as his instruments were washed over board when the cruiser left the harbour a few days later. Krämer further used his brief stay in Sydney to take care of his correspondence, sending out a number of letters, as well as his collected artefacts and zoological specimens to the Naturalien-Cabinett in Stuttgart. He further used his stay to stock up his supplies, buying preservatives and 7 rolls of Kodak film. In the late morning of 15 April, Krämer left Sydney for Newcastle on a coal ship. From there he had the chance to get a transport to the island of Noumea in New Caledonia. Krämer decided to take this chance, because otherwise it would have meant ‘to wait for another 10 days and I would have lost more precious time’. This meant travelling onboard a Viehdampfer (‘livestock steamer’). As he later describes, he had ‘to share the deck on the six days travel with a herd of sheep’. Nevertheless he saw a positive side to this, when he mentioned that:

---

203 Letter from Krämer to Lampert dated 10 April 1897, Naturkundemuseum, Stuttgart, translation by the author.
204 Krämer Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, p. 458, translation by the author.
205 Ibid., p. 458.
206 Among the letters Krämer sent from Sydney was a letter to Sprösser, which he sent from the ‘German Club, 89 Philip Street [Sydney]’, dated 14 April 1898. He also must have sent a letter and parcel to his brother Carlos Krämer in Cannstatt, which he acknowledges in a letter to Lampert dated Apia, 10 August 1898, Naturkundemuseum, Stuttgart.
207 See Krämer’s diary, in which he gives details on his purchase of material, including prices, Linden-Museum.
208 See Krämer’s letter to Lampert dated 10 May 1898 sent from Viti (Fiji), Naturkundemuseum, Stuttgart, translation by the author.

---
The food was much better than on the Arthur, which by far had provided the worst [food] that an English steamer is able to provide.\footnote{Krämer \textit{Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa}, p. 458, translation by the author.}

On 21 April Krämer arrived in New Caledonia, where his exploration ‘would have been most interesting, due to its plant and animal life and also in regards to the inhabitants’.\footnote{Ibid., p. 459, translation by the author.} Instead, his 14 days’ stay was characterized by disappointments. First of all the ‘alleged fresh’ Kodak rolls which he had bought in Sydney, did not work, which meant that he had to buy pictures. Apart from this, Krämer was shocked about the high level of assimilation of the indigenous population and the unfriendly behaviour of the French administration, which kept him ‘waiting for hours’.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 459-460.} But it was due to the failure of a French administrator, who failed to pick him up after a long excursion at an agreed location, that he finally had the chance to discover a nearly ‘untouched village’ and to wander through the ‘beautiful jungle’.\footnote{See Krämer’s letter to Lampert from Viti (Fiji), dated 10 May 1898, Naturkundemuseum, Stuttgart.} Despite the largely disappointing stay in New Caledonia, Krämer was able to acquire a number of artefacts and zoological specimens, among them a \textit{nagonda}-greenstone club, carved faces and masks, as well as some freshwater crabs and a number of bird hides.\footnote{Ibid.}

Krämer left Noumea on 5 May onboard the \textit{Birksgate} (under Captain Saunders), arriving in Suva, Fiji three days later. The first few days in Suva Krämer spent again on his \textit{palolo} observations on the local reefs as well as on buying ethnographical artefacts. He eventually sent home a larger package to the \textit{Naturalien-Cabintett} in Stuttgart, which, among the ethnographical artefacts he just had collected in Fiji, like two canoe models, fans and jewellery, also contained the artefacts and specimens he had collected in New Caledonia.\footnote{Ibid.}

Krämer’s fieldwork in Samoa

In the early afternoon of Tuesday, 17 May 1898, Krämer reached Apia. Shortly after his arrival he reunited with Thilenius, who had arrived in Samoa a few days earlier. Their reunion though was short lived, as Dr. Thilenius had decided to accept an invitation from the
commandant of the SMS Falke to accompany the ship on its travel to Melanesia.\textsuperscript{215} Krämer thought about accompanying the Falke as well, but than decided to remain in Samoa, as ‘having two scientists accompanying a small cruiser like this was a little bit much’.\textsuperscript{216} Eventually this decision proved a stroke of luck, as he later remarked: ‘I could concentrate myself fully on Samoa’.\textsuperscript{217} On 27 May, Krämer left Apia again, following an invitation by Captain Fischer of the cutter Waratah. On board the Waratah he travelled to the eastern island group of Manu’a, where he arrived a few days later, on 2 June 1898.\textsuperscript{218}

On this trip Krämer spend some days on the small island of Taū, where he made an important ethnological discovery.\textsuperscript{219} It was here that he met the English-Samoan half-cast Arthur Young, ‘the father of the deceased Manu’a virgin queen Matelita (Margaret) who had the Manu’a traditions dictated to her a few years prior to her death’.\textsuperscript{220} This written account of Manu’a’s traditions proved to be of great interest to Krämer. Although he would have preferred to take the manuscript back to Apia, Young declined. Nevertheless, he allowed Krämer to copy the manuscript, which he did although ‘it missed any translation’.\textsuperscript{221} Krämer later invited a number of chiefs and speakers from Manu’a, who were visiting Apia, to his house in order to help him with the translation of the manuscript. But to his dismay they refused, as he later explained, since they ‘were naturally not much in the mood to spend the days of their travels in my house searching their brains’.\textsuperscript{222} Krämer tried to ask chiefs from Upolu for help with the translation, but they had problems translating the old dialects, as Krämer states, ‘even the old Samoans of Upolu, however, were not able to translate the traditions’.\textsuperscript{223}

Krämer had returned to his house in Apia in early June 1898, where he spent ‘the following three months of June, July and August …, the peaceful life only being disturbed by short

\textsuperscript{215} Krämer Hawaiii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, p. 463.
\textsuperscript{216} Ibid., p. 463, translation by the author.
\textsuperscript{217} Ibid., p. 463
\textsuperscript{218} Ibid., p. 463. Krämer states that Capt. Fischer just wanted a crate of beer for the travel expenses, ‘which I was happy to pay’.
\textsuperscript{219} ‘Here Krämer is inconsistent with his spelling of the island. In his book Hawaiii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, p. 465 he also calls it Taū, whereas in Die Samoa-Inseln, Vol. I, he writes it Taū. Taū was later made famous by the anthropologist Margaret Mead in her book Coming of Age in Samoa, New York, 1928.
\textsuperscript{220} Krämer Die Samoa-Inseln Vol. I, p. 5. For translation, see Krämer The Samoa Islands: An Outline of a Monograph with Particular Consideration of German Samoa, translated by Theodor Verhaaren, p. 5. Furthermore see Krämer Hawaiii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, pp. 466-468.
\textsuperscript{221} Krämer Hawaiii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, p. 468. In his Samoa monograph, Die Samoa-Inseln Vol. I, p. 4-6, Krämer claimed that this copying took him six days, whereas his diaries show that he remained only five days on Taū. See Krämer’s diaries, Naturkundemuseum, Stuttgart.
\textsuperscript{222} Krämer Die Samoa-Inseln Vol. I, p. 5. For translation, see Krämer The Samoa Islands: An Outline of a Monograph with Particular Consideration of German Samoa, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{223} For quote, see Krämer The Samoa Islands: An Outline of a Monograph with Particular Consideration of German Samoa, p. 5. Furthermore see Krämer Hawaiii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, p. 469.
excursions to the surrounding area’. To help him with his work, as well as with the chores of daily life, Krämer had hired two half-castes, arguing that ‘[he] had to completely refrain from looking for full-blood Samoans, although they are most capable in domestic tasks, they are not settled, usable for written work and, in the long run, do not remain with the house’. Fred Pace, whom the Samoans called Feleki, became his translator, and a half-caste named Sione (John) was responsible for domestic duties, as well as for gathering zoological specimens, which included hunting birds. By now Krämer’s interest was predominantly focused on the ethnological research, sparked by the discovery of fa’alupega earlier.

Sitting on the veranda of Krämer’s house in Sogi, Krämer and Feleki spent much time transcribing, translating and interviewing visiting chiefs from Apia and the wider area. Krämer hoped to gain more information and an insight into the fa’alupega and gafa (genealogies) which he had collected during his trip to Manu’a and Tutuila. At times, when his sources had new stories to tell, Krämer reports that he and Feleki had to split up. Feleki usually went inside, whereas Krämer remained on the veranda, eagerly writing down the new information. Krämer later notes that: ‘the old chiefs dictated their myths in their original text, whereas we young ones wrote as fast as we could’. Krämer reports that, despite his ability to speak and understand Samoan quite well, he always checked his translations and notes with Feleki in order to ‘avoid all misunderstandings’. He later proudly recalled that during ‘this midsummer 1898 we [Krämer and Feleki] managed to get all the legends from Manu’a and Tutuila, including the fa’alupega, the administration and the order of titles on the islands … together’.

The quality of his working method however was naturally influenced by the quality of the information he received. At times it was a social and cultural gamble, because people needed to be motivated and information, which was normally safeguarded, had to be extracted. This was even more important in relation to the gafa, which, as Krämer acknowledges, were regarded as containing secret and sacred information. Telling these, he states, was

[224] Krämer Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, p. 476, translation by the author. See also Steinmetz, who highlights the fact that, although Krämer spent much time at Sogi, “he also spent long periods of time in the districts and villages where he lived in Samoans’ homes”, p. 263.
‘punishable by death’. This, however, did not refer to himself. In the name of science, he felt obliged to publish them regardless of any ethical issues which would be an important aspect in present day research. Nevertheless, Krämer had to be very careful in order to get the information he needed, as not everybody was allowed to hear what his informants were telling him. In his book Die Samoa-Inseln he states that ‘by joint agreement we then spoke in the presence of such unpleasant intruders about fishing etc. and when the spies had sat some time on my veranda with us I would ask them what they wanted and bade them farewell as soon as possible’. One of his main Samoan informants was a tulafale (orator) named Sauni from Tufuele, whom Krämer described as his ‘best teacher’ and as an ‘unshakable friend’, who ‘devoted himself completely to [Krämer’s] studies’. Born before 1830, at the beginning of the Christian era, Sauni was ‘generally looked upon by other Samoans as one of the wisest men among them’, and proved to be one of the most comprehensive sources of information for Krämer.

FIG. 2.6 Sauni von Tufulele
(Augustin Krämer, Hawaii, Osttimorien und Samoa, p. 514)

232 Ibid., p. 5.
233 Ibid., p. 513. See also Steinmetz, p. 263.
Other important informants Krämer acknowledges include the old chief Le’iato from Aoa, ‘who overflowed with old stories’, and his orator Talauenga, both of whom helped Krämer to understand and translate the information he had gathered earlier on Manu’a.\textsuperscript{235} He also mentions ‘the highly respected orator Tautolo from Aunu’u’, who also proved an important informant.\textsuperscript{236} Furthermore, Krämer highlights the help from Salaia, a fisher from Siumu, who taught Krämer ‘in fishing matters and was a constant companion on all reef excursions’.\textsuperscript{237} Although Krämer had all these contacts, he did not limit himself to working just from the house. Instead Krämer, Feleki and Sione conducted extensive trips into the surrounding area. They went on malaga, or visits, to other districts and villages. In late August, Krämer, Feleki and Sione visited Robert Louis Stevenson’s grave and his former residence in Vailima, before climbing up Maugafiamoe mountain and hunting in the woods behind Vaiusu.\textsuperscript{238} In early September 1898, they embarked on a longer tour to Savai’i, thereby ‘proving that one could easily circle Savai’i in 8 days’.\textsuperscript{239}

### Political upheaval in Samoa and Krämer’s farewell

In the later half of 1898 Krämer’s work, as well as the life in Samoa in general, was disturbed and permanently influenced by the death of King Malietoa Laupepa on 22 August 1898. Malietoa’s death brought about the unavoidable question of his succession and plunged Samoa into a deep political crisis, pushing Samoans to the brink of a renewed civil war.\textsuperscript{240} The majority of Samoans supported Mata’afa who, after having signed a pledge of loyalty to Malietoa, had been allowed to return to Samoa in September that year.\textsuperscript{241} Others supported the candidature of Malietoa’s son Tanumafili and others still wanted Tupua Tamasese Lealofi

\textsuperscript{235} Ibid., pp. 5-6. See also Krämer \textit{Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa}, pp. 477- 513. On page 478 Krämer has even included a photo of chief Le’iato.
\textsuperscript{237} Ibid., p. 5-6. See also Krämer \textit{Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa}, pp. 479-480. On page 478 Krämer has also included a photo of Salaia.
\textsuperscript{238} Krämer \textit{Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa}, p. 479-488, translation by the author.
\textsuperscript{239} For an overview on the political and social development in Samoa after the death of Malietoa, see Gilson, pp. 424- 433; Meleisea \textit{Making of Modern Samoa}, pp. 40-42; Hempenstall in Hiery, pp. 698-699; Hempenstall and Rutherford, pp. 24-25; and Meleisea and Schoeffel \textit{Lagaga}, pp. 98-102. For contemporary reports, see Reinecke, p.73 ff; Krämer \textit{Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa}, pp. 514-552; and Riedel, p. 123-144.
\textsuperscript{240} For the surrounding circumstances of Mata’afa’s return, see Gilson, p. 424; Meleisea \textit{Making of Modern Samoa}, pp. 40-41. Krämer \textit{Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa}, reports that Mata’afa was returned to Samoa on board the SMS \textit{Bussard}, where he arrived on 19 September 1898. See p. 526.
to be the successor of the title. However, the question of succession divided not only Samoans, but also the colonial powers of Great Britain, Germany and the USA, whom all had their own interests in Samoa. Samoan interests and customs, as it has been argued, ‘therefore had to take a back stand in the face of this international situation’. The Berlin Act of 1889, which built the basis for the municipality rule in Samoa in the first place, stated explicitly that Malietoa Laupepa’s successor was to ‘be duly elected according to the laws and customs of Samoa’. Nevertheless, the three nations interfered in order to support their favoured candidates. Great Britain and the USA supported the joint rule of Tanumafili and Tamasese Lealofi. In November 1898, Tamasese Lealofi had proposed that he would prefer to become vice-king under Tanumafili than to challenge him for the title. Germany endorsed the candidature of Mata’afa, a decision which was, as the Pacific Historian Richard Gilson argues, ‘probably not uninfluenced by the ethnologist, Augustin Krämer’. Indeed, within this sensitive political situation and probably due to his personal relationship with Mata’afa, Krämer became involved in the ongoing dispute. Due to his knowledge of the Samoan language, Samoan customs and social-political structure, he was consulted frequently by German, British and American colonial authorities. But it was exactly this involvement which eventually led to his departure from Samoa a few month later. Krämer’s first noticed involvement within the divided political situation in Samoa occurred on 19 September 1898, when he and Dr. Bernhard Funk boarded the Bussard, which had just arrived from Jaluit, to carry out the medical inspection. On board Krämer met Mata’afa, who had just returned from his exile. The British Consul, Maxse, witnessed Krämer greeting Mata’afa and regarded it as an affront against the rule agreed upon and discussed among the colonial administrators that Mata’afa’s return was to be kept secret. In a note to the German Consul M. Rose, Maxse argued:

242 See Gilson, pp. 424-433; Meleisea Making of Modern Samoa, pp. 40-42; Meleisea and Schoeffel Lagaga, pp. 98-102.
244 See Gilson, p. 425. It has to be added that the involvement of the three colonial powers within the question of succession in Samoa and the threatening civil war eventually contributed to the three powers themselves nearly engaging in direct military actions. See Riedel, pp. 123-143 and Reinecke, p. 87 for more details.
245 Gilson, p. 426. See also Riedel, pp. 124-126; Reinecke, pp. 87-89; and Krämer Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, p. 529ff. Krämer states that Tamasese, ‘in rage against the Germans, and in blind hate against Mata’afa decided to merge with the Malitoa side’, after having lost any chance of gaining the title himself.
246 Gilson, p. 427.
247 In November 1898, for example, as he reports in his book Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, p. 534, Krämer received an invitation by the acting Chief Justice, the American William Lea Chambers, to discuss details of the Samoan constitution. Krämer’s diaries further reveal that during this time he was also a frequent guest to Raffel, the president of the municipality, Linden-Museum.
248 Krämer Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, p. 526.
We must also take the opportunity of stating that in our opinion this gentleman’s conduct towards the chiefs on board was such as to leave any person not knowing the arrangements agreed upon under the impression that he was charged with the mission of receiving him [Mata’afa].

The news of Mata’afa’s return soon spread among the Samoan community and, despite the fact that Mata’afa had been placed under virtual ‘house arrest’ in Mulinu’u, he was celebrated by the Samoans. As expected, during the *fono* (great gathering of chiefs) which took place in Mulinu’u between 16 October and 12 November 1898, the chiefs present declared Mata’afa to be king.

During this time Krämer, ‘thanks to his exceptional familiarity with the Samoan language, as well as with the traditions and perceptions of the Samoan people, [became] a valuable adviser

---

249 For the wording of Maxse’s note see Krämer’s diary, Linden-Museum. A similar perception of Krämer’s behaviour is also shared by Paul Kennedy, who writes that ‘the anthropologist and general intriguer, Dr. Krämer rushed aboard to consult the exiles, causing much annoyance to the British and American consuls’, p. 149. For Krämer’s view on the incident and his reaction, see *Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa*, pp. 526-527.
250 See Krämer *Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa*, pp. 528-531; Riedel, p. 125.
251 See Reinecke, p. 74; Krämer *Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa*, pp. 528-531; Riedel, p. 126; *The Cyclopaedia of Samoa, Tonga, Tahiti and the Cook Islands*, pp. 25-27.
for the German [administration], as well as a sound observer of the events in those days.’ 252
Focusing on ‘Samoan rites and customs’ (‘samoanische Gebräuche und Sitten’), Krämer
aimed to demonstrate that Mata’aafa’s election as well as his claim of the title was
legitimate. 253 On 21 November 1898, Krämer’s knowledge on the social-political structure of
Samoan society was consulted by the acting Chief Justice, the American William Lea
Chambers. Ahead of the court case which was to determine the question of succession,
Chambers invited Krämer to visit him for a discussion on the matter. Krämer accepted this
invitation, ‘despite the fact’, as he later stated, ‘that his way to me was as long as the other
way around and although I should have been the giving-one, I did so without hesitation, in
favour of a good course’. 254

On 19 December, in accordance with the protocols of the Berlin Treaty and after the formal
nomination of Tanumafili as successor for the title, the court began to sit and hear the case of
the two contenders, Tanumafili and Mata’aafa. 255 Krämer reports that two days before the
opening of the court the Mata’aafa party had made a renewed written attempt to ‘the Chief
Justice, to protest against the use of lawyers, as their counterpart possessed two whereas their
side possessed none. On the first day of court, however, when all correspondence was read,
this letter had strangely enough been forgotten’. 256

On the next day of court, the long-time resident and planter, retired second lieutenant Werner
von Bülow appeared as adviser for Mata’aafa in order to balance the injustice and in order to
‘help against the clever tricks of the whites’. 257 Von Bülow was supported by Krämer, who

252 Reinecke, p. 76. For an assessment of Krämer’s involvement within Samoan politics at the time, see Harry
Liebersohn, p. 31-46.
253 See Krämer’s article ‘Die samoanische Königsfrage im Hinblick auf die letzteren Ereignisse zu Apia’,
Globus, Band 75, p. 185-189. See also Schleip ‘Ozeanische Ethnographie und Koloniale Praxis, Das Beispiel
254 Krämer Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, p. 534, translation by the author.
255 For details and background of the events, see Gilson, pp. 427-428; Meleisea Making of Modern Samoa, pp.
40-42.
256 Krämer argues that the Tamasese and Tanumafili side had two British lawyers, Carruthers and Gurr,
‘provided by the English Mission’, p. 538. The British missionaries, as Krämer and others suggested, feared that
they would lose influence in case of Mata’aafa’s election since he was a Catholic and therefore outside their
direct influence in contrast to the young Tanumafili, who was educated in a British mission school. See Krämer
Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, pp. 536-541 and his paper ‘Samoa in der Geschichte und als
wissenschaftliche und kommerzielle Station in der Südsee’, pp. 21-22. Krämer’s assessment is also supported by
Riedel, pp. 124-129.
257 Krämer Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, p. 542.
also spoke in defence of Mata’aafa’s legitimate claim. As a result both men were regarded as ‘Mata’aafa’s lawyers’.  

Their involvement, however, was in vain. In late December 1898 the Chief Justice Chambers dismissed Mata’aafa’s claim, thereby laying the foundation for growing resentment among the Samoan people towards the condominium of the colonial powers. This resentment found its expression in increasing armed conflict between the two Samoan sides that lasted throughout January 1899. The conflicts were mirrored on the European side by a number of diplomatic incidents. Although the tensions were eventually eased with the provisional acceptance of Mata’aafa by the colonial powers, it was impossible to resolve the situation before the signing of the Samoan Treaty on 2 December 1899.  

On 25 January 1899, Krämer, who had extended his stay for more than a month at the request of the German consul, finally left Samoa on board the steamer Moana. Krämer’s involvement in the recent political events in Apia had made his presence undesirable for certain circles in Samoa. In relation to his departure, Krämer later recalled:

Hardly a dear friend accompanied me on board, let alone one of the official personages, who fearfully seemed to avoid me in order not to arouse suspicion of having collaborated with me. Only the German warship did insisted on to accompanying me on board with one of their boats, in order to make sure that I was well received.

Krämer had decided to return to Germany via Hawai’i, where he ‘had been promised a number of artefacts and specimens (among other things: birds), the United States and Mexico’. Again he was hoping to be able to add to his ethnological collection.

Unfortunately Krämer never went to Mexico. After a brief stopover in Honolulu, he arrived

---

258 Lieutenant Werner Albert von Bülow was a planter and naturalist, as well as the author of numerous articles on Samoa, its culture and flora and fauna. For information on von Bülow, who was not related to the German Chancellor Bernhard von Bülow, see The Cyclopedia of Samoa, Tonga, Tahiti and the Cook Islands, p. 106; Kieran Schmidt ‘The Gift of the Gods’, in Phyllis Herda, Michael Reilly and David Hillard eds. Vision and Reality in the Pacific Region, Australian National University, Canberra, 2005, p. 45; and Riedel, p. 121. In regard to von Bülow’s and Krämer’s position as representative/adviser of the Mata’aafa party, see Reinecke, p. 77, who described von Bülow and Krämer as ‘Mata’aafa’s lawyers’, an assessment which is also shared by Riedel, p. 128. It seems that Krämer, in contrast, downplayed his involvement since he mentions von Bülow’s involvement but withholds his own. See Krämer Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, p. 542.

259 For a description and evaluation on the events in Samoa, see Gilson, p. 424-433; Meleisea Making of Modern Samoa, p. 40-42; Hempenstall in Hiery, pp. 698-699; and Meleisea and Schoeffel Lagaga, p. 98-102. For contemporary reports, see Reinecke, p.73 ff; Krämer Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, pp. 514-552; and Riedel, pp. 123-144.

260 Krämer Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, p. 551.

261 Ibid., p. 551, translation by the author.

262 See Krämer’s letter to Lampert dated 10 January 1899, Naturkundemuseum, Stuttgart.
in San Francisco, where he was confronted by a local journalist of *The Examiner*. After interviewing Krämer, he published an article on 8 February 1899 describing Krämer as a German agent:

Though Dr. Kramer may be a physician or a student of botany, as he professed to be in Apia, the impression he left in Samoa and on board the *Moana* among the officers was that his duties were those of an agent for the German Government, or, in plain English, a spy for Emperor William. He held himself aloof from all on board the steamer and recognized his own importance to such an extent that he was less than civil to those who ventured to accost him.

He spent several months in Samoa making notes of all that went on, and it was very evident that botany was a side issue entirely with him.

By some he was thought to be Raffel, the cause of all recent trouble in Samoa; but this is evidently a mistake, though how close he was to Raffel is well known and has given rise to the impression that possibly both men only sought an opportunity to make trouble in Apia.\(^\text{263}\)

Despite these accusations and the fact that he was pursued by American reporters who followed him until his departure, Krämer was able to continue his travels towards the east coast undisturbed.\(^\text{264}\) There he boarded a cruiser and returned to Germany where he arrived in Bremerhaven on Friday 3 March 1899, Krämer’s second journey to the Pacific had finally come to an end.

\(^{263}\) For quote, see *The Examiner*, 8 February 1899. The author of the article, however, was subsequently criticized by a German-speaking article in the *Californ. Zeitung*, which describes the accusation of *The Examiner* as “*Den Gipfel der Lächerlichkeit*” (“the height of ridiculousness”). In regard to the reference to Raffel, it has to be said that Munizipalrat Dr. Raffel was seen among contemporaries as “a daredevil” in contrast to the diplomatic consul Dr. Rose, “who work carefully and thoughtfully”. See Riedel, p. 127. Furthermore see Reinecke, p. 78.

\(^{264}\) Krämer *Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa*, pp. 550-551.
On returning to Germany, Krämer began arranging the materials he collected. He paid increasing attention to the completion of his ethnographical collection, eventually even proclaiming himself ‘passed over to the ethnographers, perhaps even the ethnologist’.²⁶⁵ That shift of focus away from natural science was based on his experiences he had made during his journeys to the Pacific. Krämer’s new focus found its expression in the publication in 1902 and 1903 of his two-volume monograph Die Samoa-Inseln. Entwurf einer Monographie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Deutsch-Samoas (The Samoa Islands. An Outline of a Monograph with Particular Consideration of German Samoa). By investigating Krämer’s preparation and publication of that work, this chapter will illustrate the history behind his enduring ethnological achievement.²⁶⁶ Special consideration will be placed on demonstrating that Die Samoa-Inseln not only marked Krämer’s entrance into the academic world of Völkerkunde (Ethnology), but contributed to his enduring legacy as an Oceanic ethnological expert.

²⁶⁵ See Krämer’s letter to Kurt Lampert dated 9 March 1901, in which he further argues that: ‘I don’t regret having dedicated myself to zoology for so long, but apart from the fact that I just earned misery, I noticed that anthropology as a whole is more suitable for me and my purposes’, translation by the author, Naturkundemuseum, Stuttgart. Krämer’s change of interest is also reflected in his publications. Although he published a number of articles related to his natural scientific research, which are listed in the literature list, he increasingly focused on ethnological and ethnographical topics. See also Dietrich Schleip ‘Ozeanische Ethnographie und Koloniale Praxis, Das Beispiel Augustin Krämer’, Master Thesis, Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen, 1989, pp. 44-51.

²⁶⁶ Since its publication, Krämer’s work has become widely known as a classic ethnological and ethnographical text which, as the American anthropologist Paul Shankman states in his article ‘Virginity and Veracity: Rereading Historical Sources in the Mead-Freeman Controversy’, in Ethnohistory, 53, 3 (Summer 2006), pp. 479-492, ‘is still held in the highest regard by virtually all scholars interested in the Pacific’, p. 487.
Krämer’s return

From Bremerhaven in March 1899, Krämer made his way to Bremen, where he visited Dr. Hugo Schauinsland and his Überseemuseum, then took the express train to Stuttgart. On his arrival in Cannstatt, a wealthy suburb of Stuttgart, on Sunday, 5 March, he was greeted by his brother, Dr. Carlos Krämer, who had set up a clinic there. During the following days Krämer spent much of his time in Stuttgart. On this occasion he got to know Karl Graf (Count) von Linden (1838-1911), president of the Württembergischen Vereins für Handelsgeographie und Förderung deutscher Interessen im Auslande. (Society for Trade Geography in Württemberg and Promotion of German Interests Aboard), who became a close supporter and friend.

FIG. 3.1 Karl Graf von Linden (1838-1911)

268 See Krämer’s diary 1898-1899, Linden-Museum.
269 The contact between Krämer and Count Linden was probably facilitated by Kurt Lampert who, apart from his function as director of the Naturalien Cabinet, was also involved with the society for trade geography. Count Linden later became the driving force behind the foundation of the ethnological museum in Stuttgart, the Linden Museum. For more information on Linden and the Württembergischen Vereins für Handelsgeographie, see Appendix I, as well as Linden-Museum ed. Museum, Linden-Museum Stuttgart, Staatliches Museum für Völkerkunde, Magazin Presse, 1987, p. 14; Friedrich Kussmaul ‘Linden-Museum Stuttgart, Staatliches Museum für Völkerkunde. Rückblick, Umschau, Ausblick’, in TRIBUS (Sonderdruck), Nr. 24 (November 1975), pp. 19-21 and 24-28.
On the one hand, Krämer’s stay in Stuttgart can be seen as a holiday after his long time overseas. On the other, Krämer used the time in Stuttgart to take care of the ethnological and zoological artefacts and specimens he had collected during his previous voyage. Together with his friend and patron Dr. Lampert and the curator of the Naturalien-Cabinett Heinrich Fischer, he began to work through the contents of the many boxes he had sent from across the Pacific. Some of the boxes still had to be opened; artefacts and specimens had to be named, catalogued and stored. In some instances the contents of the boxes had to be divided between himself, Sprösser and the Naturalien-Cabinett, as a few objects had been collected for private use. In a box sent from the Marshall Islands, for example, Krämer had included fans and a few small mats to be used by Sprösser as presents. Other objects and specimens, however, were part of Krämer’s private collection.

During the course of his journeys Krämer had not only collected approximately up to 1802 ethnographical objects for the Naturalien-Cabinett, but also established an exclusive private collection of biological, geological and zoological specimens. This natural scientific collection, as Kurt Lampert noted in a report to the Royal Direction (königliche Direktion) of the Naturalien-Cabinett, consisted of a number of specimens:

- Mammals: 2 species 2 exemplars; birds: 52 species 118 exemplars; reptilians: 12 species 24 exemplars; Fishes: 250 species approx. 400 exemplars; mollusks: 185 species approx. 400 exemplars; insects: 10 species approx. 40 exemplars; spiders: 9 species approx. 30 exemplars; crabs: 60 species approx. 120 exemplars; worms: 23 species approx. 100 exemplars; echinodermen: 46 species 64 exemplars; Coelenteraten: 57 species 100 exemplars; plants: 45 species.

---

270 Heinrich Fischer (1868-1953) was a trained precision mechanic and amateur-zoologist. In the latter function he was called upon by Dr. Kurt Lampert to become curator at the Naturalien-Cabinett. It was also under Lampert’s leadership that Fischer eventually became involved with the ethnological collection, which eventually formed the basis for the Linden-Museum. From 1932 to 1945 Fischer became the director of the ethnological museum in Stuttgart. For information and a picture of Heinrich Fischer see Linden-Museum ed. Museum, Linden-Museum Stuttgart, p. 14; Friedrich Kussmaul, p. 30; and Garry Barton’s article ‘A Century of Stewardship, the Paruai Malagan in the Linden-Museum, Stuttgart, Germany’, in Pacific Arts, The Journal of the Pacific Arts Association, Honolulu, No 21 & 22, July 2000, p. 87.

271 See Krämer’s letter to Lampert, dated 10 April 1898, in which he notes that in one of the boxes from the Marshall Islands ‘I have added a few fans and small mats to satisfy Mr. Sprösser [who] wanted to have them as presents; they do not belong to the collection’, translated by the author, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.

272 Although Krämer had sent most these objects separately directly to his brother, at times he had included them in his packets to the Naturalien-Cabinett, as his letter to Lampert from 10 May 1898 illustrates. In this letter he asks Lampert to ‘please forward these objects to my brother Carlos in Cannstatt’, translation by the author.

Letter held at the Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.

273 See Kurt Lampert’s report of the royal direction of the Naturalien-Cabinett from 5 January 1900, translation by the author, held at the Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.
In his report Lampert further estimates the value of Krämer’s private collection to be in the excess of 4000 Marks (US$ 1000).  

Eventually, in early 1900, Krämer donated his private natural scientific collection to the *Naturalien-Cabinett*. With his donation it seems Krämer followed a two way approach. First, he had recognized that his collection required ample space, which he did not have; it was also in need of constant maintenance, preparation and, most important, of taxonomy. By presenting his collection to the *Naturalien-Cabinett* Krämer made sure that it was looked after, while at the same time he was still able to access it for his own scientific and research purposes. The second reason was that he hoped to increase his chances for funding the publication of the findings of his expeditions to Samoa. Indeed, this donation, as well as his activity as a collector for the *Naturalien-Cabinett*, became a frequently mentioned point in connection to Krämer’s applications for financial support for his planned publication.  

### A planned publication  

Even before Krämer had embarked on his second trip to the Pacific he had envisioned a scientific publication of his findings. As early as autumn 1896 he had made contact with Erwin Nägele, owner of the *Schweizerbartsche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, a publishing-house in Stuttgart. Nägele, who was the son-in-law of Sprösser, was also actively engaged in financing Krämer’s trip and showed great interest in a possible natural scientific publication.  

---

274 Ibid. In relation to the ethnographical collection Krämer had accumulated during his travels, Lampert mentions 1802 artefacts with an estimated value of 26.743 Marks (US$ 5.936). In regard to the quality of Krämer’s natural scientific collection, Lampert remarks that “[this collection] is very extensive and provides a very useful inside into the fauna of the South Seas islands, especially of Samoa”, translation by the author. Letter held at the Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.

275 See correspondence between the royal directory of the *Naturalien-Cabinett* and the *kö nigliche württembergerische Ministerium des Kirchen- und Schul- Wesen* (Royal Württemberger Ministry for Church and School Matters) of 13 March and 19 March 1900, Naturkundemuseum, Stuttgart.

276 See, for example, Krämer’s letter to the Royal Württemberg Ministry for Church and School Matters, dated 22 March 1900, in which he stresses his contribution as a collector and his donation to the Naturalien-Cabinett while asking for financial contribution to his planned publication. Also see Lampert’s letters to the Ministry dated 27 March, as well as to the *kö nigliche Direktion der wissenschaftlichen Sammlungen des Staates* (Royal Direction of the Scientific Collection of the State) of 13 May 1900, in which Lampert supports Krämer’s application. The correspondence is held at the Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.

277 Ibid. In relation to the ethnographical collection Krämer had accumulated during his travels, Lampert mentions 1802 artefacts with an estimated value of 26.743 Marks (US$ 5.936). In regard to the quality of Krämer’s natural scientific collection, Lampert remarks that “[this collection] is very extensive and provides a very useful inside into the fauna of the South Seas islands, especially of Samoa”, translation by the author. Letter held at the Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.

278 See, for example, Krämer’s letter to the Royal Württemberg Ministry for Church and School Matters, dated 22 March 1900, in which he stresses his contribution as a collector and his donation to the Naturalien-Cabinett while asking for financial contribution to his planned publication. Also see Lampert’s letters to the Ministry dated 27 March, as well as to the *kö nigliche Direktion der wissenschaftlichen Sammlungen des Staates* (Royal Direction of the Scientific Collection of the State) of 13 May 1900, in which Lampert supports Krämer’s application. The correspondence is held at the Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.

279 See Krämer’s letter to Lampert, dated 11 March 1897, in which he mentions a planned scientific publication of his travels, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.

280 See Krämer’s correspondence with Lampert, held at the Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart, in which he frequently asks to have his regard forwarded to Nägele. Although Krämer mentions in this regard to have written to Nägele on a number of occasions, these letters could not be found.
publication. However, it was not until his return that Krämer’s idea of a publication became more concrete.

Realising that the social and cultural structures of Samoa were subject to increasing change, Krämer saw it as his duty as a scientist to preserve an insight into the Samoan culture as he had found it. This belief in ‘salvage anthropology’ stood not only at the heart of the development and foundation of ethnological collections and museums in late nineteenth century Germany and throughout the Western world, but also influenced Krämer to pay increasing attention to the ethnological situation in Samoa. This becomes obvious, when he argued:

After all, the spiritual property of those primitive peoples is far richer than one is frequently inclined to believe. To define it more accurately, in so many cases no one has hitherto hardly made an effort. And yet it is disappearing before our very eyes! Every year zoological expeditions are equipped to do research on animals which will be in existence hundreds and thousand of years from now, yet we fail to consider that in the Pacific Ocean people dwindle before the might onslaught of civilisation. We are about to let spiritual treasure fade away as did the Spanish conquistadors 400 years ago in the West Indies. Will we some day reap the same accusations? Or is man less interesting than a tadpole? What formerly fire and the sword brought about – and this extends right into our days if we think of the bloody Maori wars and the depopulation of Tasmania – is wrought today in a most humane manner by civilisation so that solely

---

279 See Krämer’s letter to Lampert, dated 25 January 1897, in which he reports that Nägele had shown great interest and promised support ‘to discuss the publication of a larger work on the corals on my return’, translated by the author. Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart. This interest in a natural scientific publication on behalf of Nägele seems not surprising, as the 1826 founded publishing house had and still is specialised in the publication of scientific literature. See the publisher’s web-page: [http://www.schweizerbart.de/](http://www.schweizerbart.de/), visited on 20 January 2008. For Nägele’s financial support of Krämer’s trip, see Krämer’s letter to Lampert of 11 March 1897, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.

280 See Chapter Two.

281 The strong relationship between the idea of ‘salvage anthropology’ and the foundation and development of ethnographical collections and museums becomes illustrated in a review by Dr. Kurt Lampert regarding the activities of the Württembergische Verein für Handelsgeographie during the last 25 years. He argues that ‘the morning hours of Völkerkunde in acquiring fundamental material was soon over. Collecting what was there to collect became the motto; scientific work could follow later, once the material is preserved within our museums. Now it is getting what can still be saved from the flood of the white race; before everything has been destroyed by the levelling culture [and] the reminiscence of all characteristically features of these cultures and their products disappear like snow in the sun’, translated by the author. See Lampert’s report quoted in Kussmaul, p. 24. For a detailed history on the development and underlying concepts of German ethnological museums in Germany, see H. Glenn Penny *Objects of Culture: Ethnology and Ethnographic Museums in Imperial Germany*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003; George Steinmetz’s article ‘The uncontrollable afterlives of ethnography; Lessons from ‘salvage colonialism’ in the German overseas empire’, in *Ethnography*, (2004), Vol. 5 (3), pp. 251 288, Hans Fischer “Ethnologie als wissenschaftliche Disziplin”, in Hans Fischer /Bettina Beer, eds. *Ethnologie, Einführung und Überblick*, 5th edition, 1995. For the impact of ‘salvage anthropology’ on ethnology in general, see the collection of essays in Michael O’Hanlon and Robert Louise Welsch, *Hunting the Gatherers: Ethnographic Collectors, Agents and Agency in Melanesia, 1870-1930*, New York, 2000; and Fredrik Barth, Andre Gingrich, Robert Parkin and Sydel Silverman, *One Discipline, Four Ways: British, German, French, and American Anthropology*, University of Chicago Press, 2005.
Krämer also intended his publication to complement the ethnographical collection he had accumulated, but also to include his natural scientific findings and observations he had made during his journeys. He therefore aimed to publish a three volume monograph on Samoa.\textsuperscript{283} The first volume, which he planned to finish shortly after his return, was to deal with ethnological topics such as genealogies (\textit{gafa}), constitutions and traditions. In the second volume, which was to follow a year later, he planned to focus on ‘trade, fishing, cooking, medicine, dance, songs, tattooing, weaving, tapa and so on’.\textsuperscript{284} His investigations on the coral reefs, their formation and their ecological organisation was to fill the third volume.\textsuperscript{285} Since this publication stood in direct relation to Krämer’s collection held at the \textit{Naturalien-Cabinett}, he hoped to find a local publisher. The \textit{Schweizbartsche Verlagsbuchhandlung} (publishing house) and its director, Mr. Nägele, responded to his call. Eventually they concluded an agreement that, by receiving a financial support of 3000 Marks (US$ 750), Nägele agreed to publish Krämer’s ethnological work, which also included his zoological work.\textsuperscript{286} Although this agreement left Krämer in high hopes, realisation was to prove rather difficult.

\textbf{Krämer’s life and work during the publication of \textit{Die Samoa-Inseln}}

In early April 1899, Krämer left Stuttgart to return to Kiel to await further deployment. Eventually he received the task to stand in for \textit{Marine Stabsarzt} (Navy Surgeon) Ehrhardt on board the SMS \textit{Molike}.\textsuperscript{287} In early June, Krämer was back in Stuttgart for a brief holiday, arriving just in time to celebrate his sister-in-law’s 30\textsuperscript{th} birthday.\textsuperscript{288} On his return to Kiel a

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{282} See Krämer’s preface in \textit{Die Samoa-Inseln} Vol. I [translation by Dr. Verhaaren, p. 2].
\item \textsuperscript{283} See Krämer’s letter to Lampert dated 9 February 1900, in which he outlines his plan to publish a three volume monograph, he calls ‘\textit{Die Samoa-Inseln. Versuch einer Monographie}’ (‘The Samoa Islands. Attempt of a Monograph’), Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.
\item \textsuperscript{284} Ibid, translation by the author.
\item \textsuperscript{285} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{286} See Krämer’s letter to the Royal Württemberger Ministry of Church and School Matters dated 22 March 1900, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.
\item \textsuperscript{287} See Krämer’s diary, Linden-Museum. Navy Surgeon (\textit{Marinestabsarzt}) Ehrhardt, as Krämer reports, ‘had been sick for some time’, translation by the author.
\item \textsuperscript{288} See Krämer’s diary, Linden-Museum. In his diary, Krämer mentions to have arrived just in time to celebrate Maria’s birthday on 8 June.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
few days later, he made a brief excursion to Berlin, where he met Dr. Raffel, whom he knew from his time in Samoa. Raffel had been the president of the municipal government in Samoa until his recall to Berlin in early 1899. By now Raffel was working for the Kolonialabteilung des Auswärtigen Amt (Colonial Department of the Foreign Office) in Berlin. He was certainly of great interest to Krämer, who tried to intensify his contacts with the Foreign Office in order to receive assistance with the publication of his experiences. A further person Krämer visited during his brief stay in Berlin was Dr. Felix Ritter von Luschan (1854-1924), curator at the Ethnological Museum in Berlin.

This meeting was the beginning of an increasing contact between Krämer and Luschan, as during the following years Krämer quite frequently visited Berlin to call on Luschan. Eventually, this relationship proved of great importance for Krämer, not only in regard to his planned publication, but also for his further professional development and career.

---

289 See Krämer’s diary, Linden-Museum, as well as Krämer’s letter to Lampert, dated 12 June 1899, in which he informs him of having met Dr. Raffel, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.

290 Dr. Raffel’s recall was a direct result of the developments in Samoa at the time. During the crisis of 1898/99 Raffel, whom contemporaries describe as a “daredevil” ("Draufgänger"), had a sharp confrontation with the British consul Mr. Maxse and the Chief Justice Mr. Chambers which caused considerable diplomatic uproar. For details, see Krämer Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, p. 547-550 and Otto Riedel, p. 127-144. In his position as president of the municipal government, Dr. Raffel was eventually replaced by Dr. Wilhelm Solf.

291 See Krämer’s diary, Linden-Museum. Also see Krämer’s letter to Lampert, dated 12 June 1899, in which he reports to Lampert of his meeting with Luschan, “who sends his regards”, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.

292 Krämer’s correspondence with Lampert reveals that Krämer visited Luschan on a number of occasions during the following years, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart. Also see Krämer’s diaries, Linden-Museum.
FIG. 3.2 Felix Ritter von Luschan (1854-1924)

Felix von Luschan was not only the director of the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin. He was also one of Germany’s leading ethnologists at the time.²⁹³ In this position Luschan had succeeded Adolf Bastian (1854-1905), the founder of the Museum, who is generally referred to as the ‘father of anthropology in Germany’.²⁹⁴ He was also among the few ethnologists (apart from Georg Thilenius, P. Wilhelm Schmidt and Richard Thurnwald), who took part in the first Kolonialkongress in 1902. In his function as director, Luschan, together with officials from the Navy and the Colonial Department, organised numerous ethnological

²⁹³ For more information on Felix von Luschan, see Appendix II.
expeditions to the Pacific. Among them were the Deutsche Marine-Expedition, the expeditions of Richard Thurnwald and the Sapper-Friederici-Expedition.\textsuperscript{295} Luschan saw the main aim of these endeavours as the collection and preservation of ethnological knowledge and ethnographical objects.

Although this contact with him was to prove important for Krämer’s career, it was just one of the reasons which drew him back to Berlin frequently during the following years.\textsuperscript{296} The second reason was more of a private nature, as it was during his visits Krämer got to know Elisabeth Bannow (1874-1945), the daughter of a chemical fabricant. Eventually, in 1904, Elisabeth became not only his wife, but also his research and travel companion for his later expeditions to the Pacific.\textsuperscript{297}

On his return to Kiel in early summer, Krämer was notified of his deployment aboard the training vessel SMS \textit{Stosch}, from 20 June 1899.\textsuperscript{298} For the next ten months, the ship was cruising the Atlantic, the Mediterranean and eventually the West Indies.\textsuperscript{299} During a stay in Venezuela in October 1899, the \textit{Stosch} observed the battle of Puerto Cabello, before leaving again on 19 November.\textsuperscript{300}

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{295}{For information on these expeditions and Luschan’s contribution, see Markus Schindlbeck’s article ‘Deutsche wissenschaftliche Expeditionen und Forschungen in der Südsee bis 1914’, in Hermann J. Hiery ed. \textit{Die deutsche Südsel 1884-1914: Ein Handbuch}, Ferdinand Schöningh, Paderborn, 2001, pp. 132-155. For Information on Richard Thurnwald and his relationship with Luschan, see Marion Melk-Koch \textit{Auf der Suche nach der menschlichen Gesellschaft: Richard Thurnwald}, Dietrich Reimer Verlag Berlin, 1989.}

\footnote{296}{Over the next few years Krämer frequently paid visits to Berlin. See Krämer’s diaries, Linden-Museum, and his correspondence with his friend Kurt Lampert, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart. Krämer conducted these visits either on his short shore leaves during his deployment or during his holidays when travelling to or from Cannstatt and Stuttgart.}

\footnote{297}{Krämer met Elisabeth Bannow during one of his frequent visits to Berlin. Eventually they married in 1904. After their honeymoon in Italy, Elisabeth became a constant companion and devoted research colleague to her husband during their following three voyages to the Pacific between 1906 to 1910. For more details on Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, see Chapter Four.}

\footnote{298}{Ibid.}

\footnote{299}{For Krämer’s travels on board the SMS \textit{Stosch}, see Krämer’s diaries, Linden-Museum, and Krämer’s correspondence with Dr. Lampert, whom he kept informed of his travels and his progress with his work, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart. See also Augustin Krämer ‘Wissenschaftliche Anmerkungen’ (‘scientific remarks’), in Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow’s book \textit{Bei kunstsinnigen Kannibalen der Südsee: Wanderungen auf Neu Mecklenburg, 1908-1916}, Berlin: D. Reimer, 1916, p. III, where he states that he went on a 9 month trip on board the SMS \textit{Stosch}.}

\footnote{300}{By the end of the nineteenth century Venezuela was the place of a fiercely fought civil war which, as the battle of Puerto Cabello illustrated, happened on land and sea. The battle took place when, on the morning of 11 November, Venezuelan canon boats opened fire. For more details, see newspaper article in Krämer’s diaries, probably from the \textit{Kieler Morgenpost}, Lindenmuseum. For a brief overview on the developments in Venezuela at the time see Johannes Bagusch, ed. \textit{Illustrierte Weltgeschichte}, Corvus Verlag, Berlin 1981, pp. 344-346. The training ship SMS \textit{Stosch} was just an observer and, as Krämer’s diary illustrates, left Puerto Cabello on 19 November ‘in haste without waiting for the visiting [SMS] \textit{Molke}, which lay in La Guayra for nearly two days’, translated by the author, Linden-Museum.}
\end{footnotes}
in his New Year address to Krämer, not without irony, that: ‘Your year started with the war in Samoa and ended with the battle in Venezuela’.

The ship remained Krämer’s main place of operation for the next two years. His assignment to the Stosch was yet another example of the support he received from the German Navy. Krämer’s official activities and duties, as Dietrich Schleip reports, ‘consisted mainly of attendance and availability in case of eventual cases of illnesses’. This left him with ample of time to focus on his research and to revisit his notes and findings. It has to be added that similar conditions also applied to Krämer’s deployments on other ships over

FIG. 3.3 Postcard: S.M. Schulschiff (training vessel) Stosch in the Kaiser-Wilhelm Canal at the high bridge by Levensau
(Website www.kaiserliche-marine.de)

301 See letter from Dr. Lampert to Augustin Krämer dated 19 December 1899, translation by the author. Letter held at the Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.
302 See Krämer’s diaries, Linden-Museum. The SMS Stosch was a Schulschiff (training vessel) with a water displacement of 2850 t, armed with 10-14 canons of 15 cm calibre and 2 fast firing canons of 8.8 cm calibre. It had a maximum high speed of 12 knots and was build by A.G. Vulcan in Stettin. Launched on 8 October 1877, the Stosch had a crew of around 450 people. During the Morocco Crisis in 1895 the Stosch was part of the German fleet visiting Morocco. The ship was dismantled in 1907. For more details on the Stosch see http://www.deutsche-schutzgebiete.de/sms_stosch.htm, visited on 25 June 2007.
subsequent years. Occasionally, as Krämer’s article ‘Ein Besuch von Gran Canaria’ illustrates, he used his time aboard to conduct further ethnological observations. He also used the many stopovers to visit museums and institutions, like the British Museum in London in July 1899, where, as his diaries illustrate, Krämer conducted some research on the Oceanic artefacts that were on display. However, he spent most of his time aboard working on his Samoan monographs.

In spring 1900 Krämer had finished a complete version of the manuscript for his first volume. In a letter to Kurt Lampert, dated 12 March 1900, he remarked that ‘the manuscript even now has a thickness of 13 cm (its weight I haven’t measured yet) and with the additional material it will probably come to 15 cm’. He acknowledged that a publication:

Is out of question without financial support’, before adding that ‘from July onwards I will leave for another 9 months, [thus] great hurry is called for if I want to bring the first volume into print! Otherwise I would have to wait for another year.

Krämer hoped that the King and the Government of Württemberg would support the publication of his Samoan monographs. Not only had he dedicated his previous publications to the King of Württemberg, but he had also made sure that his collected material remained in Stuttgart. In a letter to the königlich württembergische Ministerium für Kirchen- und Schulwesen (Royal Württemberger Ministry of Church and School Matters), Krämer applied for the financial support for his planned ethnological and zoological work on Samoa. In his application Krämer asks for a financial support of 3000 Marks (US$ 750), which he required to bring his planned work into print, remarking that the publisher had to insist on such an

---

304 During his time as member of the Navy Krämer served on a number of vessels, often being able to engage in cultural activities, like visiting the opera, or even brief travels, such as his later stays at Plymouth, England. See Krämer’s diaries, Linden-Museum, as well as his correspondence with Kurt Lampert, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.

305 See Krämer’s article ‘Ein Besuch von Gran Canaria’, published in Globus, Bd. 78 (1900), pp. 365-370.

306 See Krämer’s diaries, Linden-Museum. Apart from his visits to museums and galleries, Krämer also used these stopovers to visit operas, concerts, libraries and other theatrical performances. On a stopover in Portsmouth in early July 1899, Krämer used this occasion to visit the British Museum, where he even did some sketches of the artefacts on display. In January 1900 Krämer used his stop-over in Madrid to visit the local museums and galleries.

307 See letter from Krämer to Lampert dated 12 March 1900, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart, translation by the author.

308 Ibid, translation by the author.

309 Krämer’s book Über den Bau der Korallenriffe und die Planktonverteilung an den Samoanischen Küsten, which he published in 1897 with financial support from the Navy, was dedicated to the King Wilhelm of Württemberg. Krämer’s correspondence with Kurt Lampert, as well as with the Royal Württemberger Ministry of Church and School Matters further highlights Krämer’s contribution to the collection of the Naturalien-Cabinet. Correspondence held at the Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.

310 See Krämer’s letter, dated 22 March 1900, to the Royal Württemberger Ministry of Church and School Matters. See also Kurt Lampert’s correspondence with the Ministry; both held at the Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.
advance since ‘high returns can not be expected from such a highly scientific work’. The first volume, he claimed, ‘is so far processed, that a part can go to print right now and the rest will follow in a few months time’, promising that ‘the second volume would follow in a year’s time’. He argued, that his research on Samoan genealogy and myths ‘goes back well over 500 years’, thus making his work ‘the most elaborate [work] ever published on a Naturvolke (‘nature-people’). Krämer’s petition was strongly supported by the Naturalien-Cabinett. In a letter accompanying Krämer’s application, Dr. Lampert argued that he ‘fully supports Dr. Krämer’s petition, as the rich collection of Dr. Krämer would receive special scientific importance from an elaborate publication’. Despite the anticipated support, the application was rejected by the Ministry. In May 1900 the Secretary of the Staats-Ministerium der Finanzen (Finance Ministry) of Württemberg, K. Zeyer, argued that despite ‘the fact that the deposition fund for the year has already been allocated, [the Ministry] takes the view that it were not as much Württemberg’s regional interests, as much more the interests of the Empire’ that the planned publication would address. He therefore suggested that ‘the petitioner might ask to receive support from other budgets of the Empire’. Indeed, a similar line of argument was also shared by the Kolonialabteilung des Auswärtigen Amt (Colonial Department of the Foreign Office) in Berlin and its director, the Geheimen Legationsrat Dr. Oscar Stuebel (1846-1925). Stuebel himself had spent a considerable time in Samoa where he had been the German Consul from 1883 to 1886. During his time in Samoa, he got involved in ethnological research, eventually publishing a collection of

311 See Krämer’s letter to the Royal Württemberger Ministry of Church and School Matters dated 22 March 1900, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart, translation by the author.
312 Ibid.
313 Ibid.
314 See letter by Dr. Lampert to the Royal Württembergische Ministerial Office for Church and School Questions, dated 27 March 1900
315 See letter by secretary K. Zeyer from the Royal Württembergische Ministerial Office Finance to the Royal Württemberger Ministry of Church and School Matters dated 10 May 1900, translated by the author. This letter, as an additional remark illustrates, was then given to Kurt Lampert in order to inform him on the decision of the Ministry, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.
316 Ibid, translation by the author.
317 See Krämer’s preface Die Samoa-Inseln, Vol. I, p. IV. However it has to be added that Krämer’s relationship with the Colonial Office and Stuebel was not always an easy one. In a letter to Count von Linden dated 20 October 1903, Krämer reports ‘my contacts to the authorities in Berlin are few, if any at all. Only through Rose [Fritz Rose had been consul in Apia during Krämer’s stay], who is part of the council of the Colonial Department do I have some indirect influence and I hope to win over Stuebel through my work on Samoa’, translation by the author, held at the Linden-Museum.
318 During his time in Samoa, Stuebel played an important role consolidating Germany’s claim in Samoa. See Paul Kennedy The Samoan Tangle, pp. 31-35. For information on Oscar Stuebel and his career within the Colonial Department, see Deutsches Kolonial Lexikon, online available at http://www.stub.bildarchiv-dkg.uni-frankfurt.de/Bildprojekt/Lexikon/lexikon.htm, visited on 10 May 2007.
Samoan texts and myths under the title *Samoanische Texte* in 1896. Stuebel certainly shared Krämer’s view on the importance of ethnological knowledge for the colonial process. Although the closer details about Krämer’s contact with the Colonial Department remain unknown, it can be presumed that Stuebel’s involvement, as well as Germany’s growing colonial interest in Samoa, played an important role in the fact that Krämer was eventually awarded financial support for his work by the Colonial Office. In late summer 1900, with funding secured, the task of typesetting was started by the publisher Nägele. Krämer’s ethnological work on Samoa was finally on its way to being published. In July 1900, Krämer began to spread the word of his forth-coming publication. He wrote to Dr. Richard Andree (1835 -1912), editor of the illustrated journal *Globus*, eventually asking him to inform his readers on the coming publication.

---


320 See Krämer’s introduction in *Die Samoa-Inseln*, Vol. II, p. IIV-V, where he argues: ‘How much money could have been saved by a thorough knowledge of the area and its inhabitants, namely at the beginning of the colonial process’, translated by the author. For more information on the relationship between German colonial policy and ethnological research, as well as Krämer’s position within, see George Steinmetz ‘The uncontrollable afterlives of ethnography: Lessons from ‘salvage colonialism’ in the German overseas empire’, in *Ethnography*, (2004), Vol. 5 (3), pp. 251 288; Schleip ‘Ozeanische Ethnographie und Koloniale Praxis, Das Beispiel Augustin Krämer’, pp. 153-161; Rainer Buschmann ‘Colonizing Anthropology: Albert Hahl and the Ethnographic Frontier in German New Guinea’, in Matti Bunzl and Glenn Penny, eds. *Worldly Provincialism: German Anthropology in the Age of Empire*, pp. 230-255. All demonstrate that Krämer, as well as German ethnologists in general, had quite an important impact on the development of German colonial rule in the Pacific.

321 Unfortunately the details of this support remain largely unknown, since it was not possible to find any details or letters in Krämer’s estate or in the relevant archives in Potsdam and Berlin on the decision of the Colonial Department to finance his publication. However, it can be presumed that it was during the later half of 1900 that Krämer received notification of the financial support from the Colonial Office, as a letter of his to Kurt Lampert, dated 25 June 1900, illustrates this. There he states that ‘it’s good for Nägele to know that these persons “up-there” know about it’, held at the Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart, translation by the author. This support of Krämer’s work was certainly also influenced by the important position Samoa took in regard to the ongoing political debate on German imperial policy. For example, see Horst Gründer ‘Die historischen und politischen Voraussetzungen des deutschen Kolonialismus’, in Hermann Hiery, ed. *Die deutsche Südsee 1884-1914: Ein Handbuch*, pp. 27-57.

322 See Krämer’s letter to Lampert dated 25 June 1900, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.

323 See letter from Krämer to Dr. Richard Andree dated 11 July 1900, Braunschweig Stadtarchiv. Indeed, as early as in 1901, Krämer’s work was mentioned in the news section of the *Globus*, Bd. LXXX, No. 1 (July) 1901. For information on Richard Andree, a Geologist and *Völkerkundler* (Ethnologist), see *Braunschweiger Stadtlexikon*, Johann Heinrich Meyer Verlag, Braunschweig, 1992, pp. 19-20.
FIG. 3.4  Dr. Richard Andree (1835-1912)

The GLOBUS, Illustrierte Zeitschrift für Länder- und Völkerkunde (‘Illustrated Magazine for Geography and Ethnology’), which has been described as the ‘German National Geographic’ of the early twentieth century, covered a wide range of topics: from natural scientific observations and botanical topics, to geographical, socio-historical even ethnological topics.

It thus became an important correspondence paper for the development of ethnology in Germany. Eventually the journal published a detailed review article on Krämer’s work in 1904. The Globus also became an important contact for Krämer’s further publications, which in turn contributed to his high publication record.

---


325 See Georg Thilenius ‘A. Krämer, Die Samoa-Inseln’, in GLOBUS, (1904) Bd. 85, pp. 53-59. In his review, Thilenius describes Krämer’s work as very detailed and a valuable contribution to the field of ethnology.

Krämer followed a similar advertising strategy when he sent a copy of his first volume to Edward Robert Tregear (1846-1931) in Auckland, New Zealand in February 1902. He asked Tregear ‘to bring a notice about the book in the Journal of P. S. [Polynesian Society] or in other papers’. Krämer had first met Tregear, who was the President of the Polynesian Society, during his first travels to the Pacific in 1895. Eventually, sending him a copy of his work was also a way for Krämer to show his ‘deep veneration which I feel for your numerous Polynesian treaties and works’. However, the actual printing of Krämer’s monograph left much to be desired. In a letter to Lampert in September 1900, Krämer acknowledged that ‘Nägele has already started to print parts of the first volume, but it goes rather slow – in 2 months just about 2 sheets’. Adding that, ‘if it goes on like this, you can not hope for it to be published in this life’. The slow process was undoubtedly based on Krämer’s planned layout. He wanted to have the original Samoan text opposite his German translation. This proved to be a problem in the typesetting, as presumably no one at the printing house was able to speak nor write Samoan, which in turn certainly had an effect on the operation. In order to speed up the process, Krämer spent much of his time in Stuttgart to assist with the typesetting and printing, as well as illustrating and securing photos. At this point it needs to be stressed that Krämer’s continued participation in the printing process of his work probably contributed to the high quality of the Samoan language content used in his book. This quality, in turn, illustrates Krämer’s high command of the language.

The Harvard-trained ethno-botanist Paul Cox assesses that, ‘if Krämer had merely transcribed the words of Samoan informants, he could not have taken this very detailed Samoan data back to Germany and shepherded them through the publication and proofreading process.


328 See Krämer’s diaries, Linden-Museum, as well as Howe, pp. 143-144.

329 Krämer cited in Howe, pp. 143-144.

330 See letter from Krämer to Lampert dated 9 September 1900, held at the Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart, translation by the author.

331 Ibid.

332 See Krämer’s preface in Die Samoa-Inseln, Vol. I, p. IV.

333 See Krämer’s diaries, Linden-Museum. Furthermore see Krämer’s letter to Lampert and to Heinrich Fischer, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart. Fischer was responsible for reproducing and developing some of the photographs in Krämer’s publication. See Die Samoa-Inseln, Vol. II, p. V.
avoiding the introduction of errors, without a very solid knowledge of the Samoan language.

Just as for his first volume, Krämer also displayed a great concern for detail in his second volume. From early 1902 onwards, he spent much time sorting out the details of the natural science aspects for his work on Samoan ethnography. In due course, Krämer established contact with numerous naturalists, geologists and zoologists throughout Germany and abroad. He even rescheduled the printing until December 1902, to allow more time for getting the correct names, species and taxonomical details of the birds, plants, crabs and other specimens that he had collected during his voyages to Samoa. This attention to detail earned much praise among contemporary naturalists.

The publication of Die Samoa-Inseln and its meaning for Krämer’s career as an ethnologist

Finally, in late summer 1902 and after nearly a year’s delay, the first volume of Die Samoa-Inseln appeared, followed by the publication of his second volume just a year later. Both volumes were published by the Schweizerbartsche Verlagsbuchhandlung with ‘the Support of

---

334 Paul Cox cited by Paul Shankman, in his article ‘Virginity and Veracity: Rereading Historical Sources in the Mead-Freeman Controversy’, pp. 491-492. Cox’s view, however, is challenged by Mary E. Cox who, in her article ‘Indigenous Informants or Samoan Savants? German Translation of Samoan Texts in Die Samoa-Inseln’, in Pacific Studies, 2009 Vol. 32, No. 1 (March 2009), pp. 23-47, argues that his understanding of the Samoan language was not as sophisticated as generally thought. In her study she argues that the Samoan text could not have been written by him without help from the Samoans.

335 See Krämer’s correspondence held at the Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart. In his letters to Lampert and to Fischer, Krämer frequently asks for their expert advice in the determination of species and taxonomies.

336 Among these scientists were the American pathologist and zoologist Dr. Alexander Agassiz and his assistant Mr. Woodworth, the later eventually contributed an article on the palolo worm to Krämer’s second volume. Further there was the German zoologist Dr. Büchner from the University of Marburg, and of course Dr. Georg Thilenius and Dr. Felix von Luschan. See Krämer’s correspondence at the Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.

337 See letter from Krämer to Lampert dated 9 August 1902, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart. In his review on Krämer’s monograph, ‘A. Krämer, Die Samoa-Inseln’, in Globus, (1904) Bd. 85, Georg Thilenius (p. 59) explicitly praises Krämer’s list of the Flora and Fauna, as it combines the Samoan terms with the results of Krämer’s scientific observations.

338 Indeed, Krämer’s thoroughness in regard to natural scientific and zoological aspects was well received among contemporaries. For example, see Dr. Franz Reinecke’s remarks in his book Samoa, 1902. In his chapter on bird life, Reinecke refers to Krämer’s ornithological work on Samoa praising his thoroughness (pp. 286-287). In his chapter on the Palolo-worm Reinecke mentions that Krämer has made a great contribution to an hitherto unknown field, p. 294. Further see Georg Thilenius in his review on Krämer’s work, pp. 53-59.

339 Eventually Krämer had decided to limit himself to two volumes despite the three he had planned originally. However, his 1906 published book Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, Verlag Strecker & Schröder, Stuttgart, which is mainly a travel description of his second voyage to the Pacific, has to be seen in close regard to his monographs, eventually even as the missing third volume.

85
the Colonial Department of the Foreign Office’. His work received an acknowledgement by the Colonial Office, as well as by the Emperor Wilhelm II himself. On 17 June 1903 Krämer notes in his diary:

Letter of thanks from his Majesty, the Emperor arrived. His Majesty had the graciousness to highly praise the care and expertise with which the present work had been completed and to express his sincere hope that this work might contribute to represent the interests of the [German] people in the Islands.

Krämer had met the Emperor in early March 1903 during a four day visit by the Emperor on board the SMS *Kaiser-Wilhelm II*, the Emperor’s private yacht, where Krämer had been deployed since November 1902. During the Emperor’s brief visit, Krämer had the chance to meet him in person and even to introduce his work. Proudly Krämer had noted that, on his ‘farewell [he] shook my hand’. Krämer’s deployment on board the *Kaiser-Wilhelm II* was yet another example of the support he received from the Navy during the completion of his monograph. This becomes illustrated, when Krämer describes his situation on board in a letter to Lampert, claiming that ‘I have a nice big room aboard, in which I can work undisturbed’. It was on board the *Kaiser-Wilhelm II* that Krämer finished the preface to his second volume.

A further acknowledgement for his work was received from the King and the government of Württemberg in 1904. In February that year, on decree of King Wilhelm of Württemberg, he was given the title of ‘Professor’. Although, as Dietrich Schleip argues, the government had shown some reservation earlier, ‘it was even more generous with non-expensive forms of honouring’. This rather unusual form of honouring, however, was, as the writing secretary remarked in a letter to the Ministry, based on Krämer’s own wish. Eventually, the title of

---

341 See Krämer’s diary entry from 16 June 1903, translation by the author. Diary held at the Linden-Museum.
342 See Krämer’s diaries, Linden-Museum. For further information on Krämer’s deployment, see Krämer’s correspondence with Lampert, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.
343 See Krämer’s letter to Lampert dated 30 March 1903, in which Krämer reports to Lampert that the Kaiser had come on board for 4 days. During this time, as Krämer writes, ‘we spoke a lot about zoology, a topic in which the Kaiser proved quite knowledgeable, like in many other areas, quite extraordinary one might say. These were a few interesting days!’
344 Krämer’s diary, Linden-Museum.
345 See Krämer’s letter to Lampert dated 5 November 1902, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart, translation by the author.
348 In a letter to Dr. von Weizsäcker, Director of the Royal Württembergische Ministerial Office for Church and School Matters, dated 12 November 1903, the Secretary of the *Naturalien-Cabinet*, Mr. Gemmingen asks if Krämer could be awarded the title of Professor, ‘on his own wish’, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.
Professor ‘honoris causa’ [rank VI] was conferred on Krämer after it had been established that he did not occupy a teaching position. Dr. Felix von Luschan, when approached by the Colonial Department for his advice on Krämer’s work, argued that he ‘had read [Die Samoa-Inseln] with enthusiasm and that he would not hesitate to count this monograph among the most valuable in the area of ethnology’. In a letter Luschan congratulated Krämer personally for compiling such an ‘outstanding work’. Being accepted by the ethnological community was important for Krämer, since he had already begun to see a further career in ethnology. In March 1901 he had acknowledged his new professional preference. In a letter to his friend and patron Kurt Lampert he explains: That I have passed over to the ethnographers, perhaps even the ethnologists- that is were you have developed your perspicacity. I do not regret having served zoology for so long, but, apart from the fact that here I just earned ungratefulness, anthropology appeals more to me and it certainly suits my interests much better. That I have not been completely unfaithful towards zoology, at least in an ethnographical relationship, you will see in my following work. Eventually Krämer’s aspiration became reality. His work, as well as his reputation as collector, helped Krämer to establish himself as an ethnologist (Völkerkundler). In 1903 he even became a member of Germany’s leading ethnological society, the Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte (German Society for Anthropology, Ethnology, and Prehistory) in Berlin. Due to his contacts with Berlin, in particular with von Luschan,

349 In a responds to the Naturalien-Cabinett, Dr. von Weizsäcker states that, although Krämer was to remain in the service of the Reichsmarine, he would support the award of the title Professor ‘honoris causa’ to Krämer, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart. This title, however, was just an honorary title, which had no importance in regard to academic teaching. Therefore, it was fundamental to establish that Krämer held no teaching profession. Eventually, as an official document reveals, the title was awarded to Krämer in February 1904.


351 See von Luschan’s letter to Krämer dated 12 December 1900, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart, translation by the author. In this letter, Luschan reports that he had been approached by the former German Consul of Samoa, Fritz Rose, to give his expert advice on Krämer’s work.

352 Ibid, translation by the author.

353 See Krämer’s letter to Lampert dated 9 March 1901, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart, translation by the author.

354 This Society had been founded by the Medical Doctor and Pathologist Dr. Rudolf Virchow in 1869 as the “Antropological Society Berlin”. Eventually, the Society, which produced its own serials, the Zeitschrift für Ethnologie and the Korrespondenzblatt der deutschen Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte, saw the foundation of numerous local branches in cities like Göttingen, Bonn, Stuttgart and so on. Both the Society and its serial exist to the present day, see Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte Homepage, available at: http://www.bgaeu.de/, visited on 12 June 2006. Krämer eventually became chairperson of the Society in 1911. See Chapter Seven.
Krämer eventually received the chance to return to the Pacific once again, but this time in his function as ethnologist. Hence it can be argued that Die Samoa-Inseln indeed confirmed Krämer’s conversion from naturalist towards ethnologist.

The Legacy of Die Samoa-Inseln: An Addendum

Die Samoa-Inseln not only marked Krämer’s shift of interest, as its continuous use by Pacific scholars and ethnologists reveals, it contributed to Krämer’s emergence as a leading ethnologist and expert on Samoa. Since their publication, the monographs have been described and generally regarded as ‘a big lavish [two-volume] work, with a generous selection of photographs’, which captured the essence of Samoan culture.


For quote, see Harry Liebersohn ‘Coming of Age in the Pacific: German Ethnography from Chamisso to Krämer’, in Matti Bunzl and Glenn Penny eds. Worldly Provincialism, pp. 42-43. Liebersohn’s impression, however, is exemplary. The pure size of Krämer’s work has always been mentioned, from early reviews by contemporary ethnologists to more contemporary reviews. Furthermore, all these descriptions have not failed to mention Krämer’s great contribution to the ethnological understanding of Samoan culture. See, for example, the reviews by Luschan and Thilenius in 1903 and 1904 respectively, who both highlight the size of Krämer’s work, ‘nearly 1000 pages in a large size’ (Thilenius, p. 53), and also praise its high quality of ethnological observation. A similar assessment has also been made by Derek Freeman, “All Made of Fantasy”: A Rejoinder to Paul Shankman, in American Anthropologist, Vol. 100. No. 4. (Dec., 1998), pp. 972-977, who called the work 88
The first volume Krämer devoted to the study on constitution, history, and kinship in Samoa.
The heart of this volume however is the listing of the faʻalupega (ceremonial greetings
establishing rank and title), the gafa (genealogies) of leading families, and the oral traditions
for each district and village. The book is thereby separated into four parts: Savaiʻi, Upolu,
Tutuila and Manuʻa which, as Krämer argues, ‘form the Samoan entity’. 357 Throughout the
volume, the Samoan original text and the German translation are set out in large, full type
side by side (making it nearly bilingual, apart from his introduction and observations).

The second volume is committed to what Krämer calls, the ‘material culture of Samoa’. 358 In
this volume he provides a very broad, but nevertheless very detailed, coverage on topics such
as childbirth and child rearing, tattooing and incision, medical illness and treatments, food,
cooking, fishing, carving and house building, clothing, weaving, tapa manufacture, games
and war, flora and fauna, as well as a separated addendum focusing ‘On the most important
skin diseases in the South Seas’. 359 As with the first volume, the second volume also
provides the Samoan original with the German translation side by side.

The importance and legacy of Die Samoa-Inseln. Entwurf einer Monographie mit besonderer
Berücksichtigung Deutsch-Samoa’s has further been illustrated by the fact that since their
publication two major attempts have been made to translate Krämer’s work into English, to
‘make the work available to students and ethnologists unversed in the German language’. 360

The first attempt was initiated by the Maori Ethnological Research Board Office in
Wellington, New Zealand, as early as March 1924, when it approached Dora de Beer, a
Librarian at the Hocken Library in Dunedin, New Zealand, asking her to provide a cost and
time estimate for the translation. 361 It was a declared aim of the Board to have the translation
published as soon as possible, in order to make it available to ethnologists and colonial
administrators. However, due to a number of problems and issues, the endeavour lasted well

---

357 Krämer Die Samoa-Inseln Vol. I, p. 8. He argues that the description of parts is most fitting, ‘since only
Savaiʻi is an island by itself while Upolu has numerous small secondary islands …. Tutuila also has a secondary
island Aunuʻu, and Manuʻa is actually a collective term for the three small islands Tau, Olosega and ‘Ofu.’
358 See Krämer’s Schlusswort in Die Samoa-Inseln Vol. II. 
359 For reviews on Krämer’s work, see Liebersohn, Steinmetz and Wilcox, as well as Verhaaren.
360 See letter from the Maori Ethnological Research Board to Dora de Beer from 29 March 1924, MS Papers
1005 Dora De Beers Correspondence 1924-38, held at the Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington.
361 Ibid. In her reply of 2 April 1924, de Beer estimates that the work would probably take ‘from a Year to 18
months’ and that £100 would be ‘reasonable amount’, MS Papers 1005 Dora De Beers Correspondence 1924-38,
held at the Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington.
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into the 1930s. Eventually, in 1938 only a small edition of this translation of Krämer’s work was published.362

A second attempt to translate Krämer’s work was done 56 years later, when, in 1994, Dr. Theodore E. Verhaaren published his translation of The Samoa Islands.363 The translation had been done with the support of academic institutions like the Mitchell Library in Sydney, the Macmillan Brown Centre for Pacific Studies in New Zealand and the Nelson Memorial Library in Apia.364 Undoubtedly, making Die Samoa-Inseln more widely accessible to non-German speaking scholars was also the motivating factor behind this second translation, especially in regard to the high interest Krämer’s work had already received.

However, despite the general regard for Die Samoa-Inseln, Krämer’s work has not remained unchallenged. Derek Freeman, for example, criticised Krämer and his contribution by calling into question ‘the kind of work that Krämer did in Samoa’. Freeman claimed, that ‘Krämer, for all his panache, was not an anthropologist in any “Malinowskian” sense’, arguing that he lacked ‘a command of the Samoan language, and never lived for an extended period among Samoans’ and that at times Krämer ‘just did not know what he was talking about’.365

Freeman’s criticism of Krämer, however, has been again challenged by the American ethnologist Paul Shankman, who disagrees with each of Freeman’s points of critique. Apart from highlighting that Freeman himself had made great use of Krämer’s work in his earlier study on Margaret Mead, Shankman defends Krämer’s work and methods by stating that ‘while Krämer was not a “Malinowskian” ethnographer – who could have been at the time?-

362 Due to a number of unforeseen events, among them de Beer’s persistency to receive permission from Dr. Krämer before beginning the translation and her surprising move to London in late 1925, the translation took well into the 1930s to be completed. During this time, the Board frequently made it clear that it was ‘very anxious to have this [Krämer’s] work translated as soon as possible’ in order ‘to make the work available to students and ethnologists versed in the German language’. In a letter dated 10 May 1928, the Board also explained that the translation may help prevent ‘the misunderstandings that exist in Samoa at the present’. In 1938, a small edition of this translation was printed, which mainly found its way into the libraries of New Zealand, MS Papers 1005 Dora De Beers Correspondence 1924-38, held at the Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington.


364 Ibid, pp. IV-VI. Among the already mentioned institutions, the publishers also acknowledge the assistance of the Australian South Pacific Culture Fund and the Auckland Institute and Museum Library.

365 See Derek Freeman “‘All Made of Fantasy”: A Rejoinder to Paul Shankman”, pp. 972-977. For his critique on Krämer, see pp. 975-976. A similar critique has also been issued by Robert W. Franco, who argued in his book, Samoan Perception of Work: Moving up and Moving around, that Krämer ‘overly romanticized some aspects of aboriginal Samoan culture, and there are some serious misrepresentations in […] Krämer’s account’ (p. 10). Another critique of Krämer’s work has been formulated by Mary E. Cox, pp.23-47, who argues that it was more likely that high ranked Samoans with a good knowledge of the German language, rather than a German scientist with rudimental knowledge in the Samoan language, had completed and written such a monograph.
he was nevertheless an energetic scholar whose work is impressive even by today’s standards’. 366

Krämer, therefore, has to be regarded as a pioneer ethnologist. It needs to be remembered that Krämer was certainly not an ethnologist in the present meaning of the word, nor had he received any training in this area (as it did not exist). Instead, he was an autodidact who developed his own methodology as he went along. 367 In his quest Krämer, as previously illustrated, was strongly motivated and influenced by his belief in ‘salvage anthropology’. 368 However, it is within this paradigm of ‘salvage anthropology’ that the true value of Die Samoa-Inseln is to be found. Its depth and detailed description of Samoan culture prior to any (larger) colonial participation proved soon to be unmatchable. This fact is also illustrated by Margaret Mead who, in 1969, argued that ‘it is no longer possible in Manua to get even such pretentious genealogies as those collected by Powell and Krämer’. 369 Moreover, the importance of Krämer’s work was also heightened by the impact of the influenza epidemic that hit Samoa in 1918. The epidemic, which eventually killed 22% of the population, had huge implications on the economic and social situation in Samoa. 370 The Pacific historian J.W. Davidson remarked that ‘a considerable amount of knowledge of the traditional structure has now been lost to the Samoans’ adding that ‘it is therefore not always possible to go beyond Krämer’. 371 Thus, as Liebersohn summarises, ‘if salvage anthropology was Krämer’s program, then he had proved an able practitioner’. 372

366 See Paul Shankman’s article Virginity and Veracity: Rereading Historical Sources in the Mead-Freeman Controversy’. For quote, see p. 492
367 See Georg Steinmetz, p. 263; and Paul Wilcox, p. 110, who adds that Krämer’s methodology “was not always gentle”. For more information on Krämer’s methods, see Chapter Two.
368 See Footnote 16. Krämer was convinced that the Samoan culture had experienced dramatic changes in the face of European contact. He therefore saw it as his duty and in the name of science to preserve as much ethnological, as well as ethnographical, information as he could collect.
370 Although it needs to be remembered that the influenza killed millions worldwide, its impact on a small population like Samoa was indeed more devastating than on cultures of larger proportion. For information and a history on the influenza outbreak in Samoa, see Michael J. Field Mau: Samoa’s struggle against New Zealand oppression, Wellington, Reed, 1984, reprint 1991, pp. 34-51, as well as Peter J. Hempenstall and Noel Rutherford Protest and Dissent in the Colonial Pacific, University of the South Pacific, Apia, 1984, pp. 32-33.
371 J. W. Davidson Samoa Mo Samoa, Melbourne, 1967, p. 436. A similar opinion is also expressed in regard to his later work on Palau. The director of the Etpison Museum in Koror, Palau, argues that without Krämer’s writings ‘part of our history would have been forgotten’, see Palau Pressemitteilung, available online at: http://www.visit-palau.de/news/1999.html, visited on 26 March 2008, translation by the author.
372 Liebersohn, p. 43.
In late January 1906, Augustin Krämer again left Germany for the Pacific. On this, his third expedition to the region, his focus was set explicitly on ethnological research and on the collection of ethnographic artefacts. This trip, which lasted until July 1907, was as much facilitated as determined by Krämer’s position as a Navy Surgeon and by his contacts with Berlin, which he had developed during the previous years. Through his contact with Felix von Luschan and the Colonial Department of the Foreign Office, Krämer was able to accompany the scientific vessel SMS *Planet* on its travels to the Pacific. This time, however, not in his function as Navy Surgeon, but as an ethnologist. On his arrival in Matupi in German New Guinea in late 1906, Krämer continued in a private expedition to parts of Melanesia and the Caroline Islands. On this expedition he was accompanied by his wife, Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, who had joined him in Matupi. Although the expedition was not crowned by a major publication as his previous travels to Samoa had been, it nevertheless had an important impact on his development as an ethnologist for it not only marked his emerging ethnological interest in Micronesia, especially in the Island of Palau, but also saw him refine his fieldwork methods. Furthermore, the expedition marked the beginning of a close cooperation between Krämer and his wife, which would become an important feature of his later travels in the Pacific.
Elisabeth Krämer Bannow

During the publication of his two-volume monograph *Die Samoa-Inseln* in 1902/03, Augustin Krämer frequently visited Berlin. These visits were also of a private nature, as it was during them that he came to know his future wife.

Elisabeth Bannow was born in Wismar, a small town in Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania, on 29 September 1874. A single child, she grew up in comfortable middle class circumstances. Her mother, Charlotte Bannow (née Beckmann), was the daughter of a pharmacist from Stuttgart and her father, Dr. Adolph Bannow, was a chemist. Due to his career, the family

---

373 See Chapter Three.
374 For Information on Elisabeth Bannow and her family situation, see Anna Pytlik’s book *Träume im Tropenlicht; Forscherinnen auf Reisen*, Coyote Verlag, Reutlingen, 1997, p. 13. In her work, Pytlik presents the case study of two early female researchers and their work, Marie Pauline Thorbecke in Cameroon and Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow in Oceania. See also Krämer’s letter to Karl Lampert dated 5 October 1903, in which he provides a brief biography of his wife to be, Naturkundemuseum Stuttgart.
soon moved to Berlin, where Dr. Bannow was employed by the chemical factory C.A.F. Kahlbaum in Kreuzberg. He not only became a close confidant of the owner, Johannes Kahlbaum, but eventually became a director of the firm. Subsequently, the Bannow family resided in the representative front building of the firm in the Schlessiger Strasse 33, near the river Spree in the growing Berlin suburb of Luisenstadt.

Although the details about Elisabeth’s childhood, up-bringing and education remain unknown, it can be assumed that she followed the then-typical Mädchenschule (program of girls education). This included instruction in art and music as well as in domestic activities. In her investigation of Elisabeth’s life, Anna Pytlik observes that her concern for the arts was very marked, as was her interest in weaving. While her ability in the arts, like drawing and painting, was probably a result of her education, the source of her weaving ability, as Pytlik states, remains unknown. It is certain that her interests were supported by her father, who himself was a dedicated illustrator.

It was however, through her relationship with Augustin Krämer that Elisabeth’s life became more visible in the historical record. By 1903, as his diaries reveal, Krämer had become a frequent visitor to the Bannow residence in Berlin, where he spent much of his time with his

---

375 See Anna Pytlik, who assumes that the family’s move to Berlin was closely related to Dr. Bannow’s professional career, p. 13. However, it seems that even prior to Elisabeth’s birth he had been working in Berlin, namely at the laboratory of August Wilhelm Hofmann at the University of Berlin since 1868, before he started to work at the chemical factory C.A.F. Kahlbaum, see ‘Chronik: Berlin am 26. Oktober, Fakten Jahr für Jahr’, online available at: http://www.huise-berlin.de/Kalender/Tag/Okt26.htm, visited 9 June 2008.

376 See Pytlik, p. 13. She reports that the owner, Johannes Kahlbaum, made Adolph Bannow the executor of his last will. Referring to the file ‘Kahlbaum’ at the Landesarchiv Berlin, Pytlik mentions in her notes that Adolph Bannow received a “generous token” of the inheritance, p. 181. See also Horst Köhler, pp. 49-50.

377 See Pytlik, p. 13.


379 Pytlik, p. 13.

380 Ibid. Pytlik suggests that Elisabeth’s weaving abilities probably also resulted from her participating in a number of courses, arguing that ‘at the turn of the century, there were quite a number of courses and training possibilities for textile work, especially in a city like Berlin’, p. 13.

381 Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow’s father not only supported her training in the arts, but also supported her travels and subsequently her publication. In her book Bei kunsttönigen Kannibalen der Südsee: Wanderungen auf Neu-Mecklenburg, 1908-1916, Berlin: D. Reimer, 1916, one can find a number of illustrations which were done by A. B. (short form Adolph Bannow). See for example the picture ‘At Work’ in the present chapter. Elisabeth’s father might also have shaped Elisabeth’s education and interests in other ways, becoming an official member of the Verein für Mecklenburgische Geschichte und Altertumskunde (the Society for Mecklenburg’s History and Ancient History) in January 1918. See Friedrich Stuhr ‘Jahresbericht des Vereins für Mecklenburgische Geschichte und Altertumskunde über das Vereinsjahr vom 1. Juli 1917 bis dahin 1918: Schwerin, 1. Juli 1918’, online available at: http://dlib.uni-rostock.de/servlets/YearbookInquiry?docid=78, visited on 29 January 2008.
‘Lise’, as he called her. By September 1903, Augustin and Elisabeth announced their engagement.

During Krämer’s stay over Christmas that year they finalised their marriage arrangements. With a visit to the civil registry office on 24 December, they set the date for their marriage for mid-January 1904.

FIG. 4.2 Engagement Announcement

(Krämer Diary, Linden Museum)

382 See Krämer’s diaries, held at the Linden Museum in Stuttgart. On 4 August 1903, he noted ‘bei Bannow’s 2 Uhr zum Essen’ (‘at Bannow’s at 2 pm for lunch’), translation by the author. In September he was back, celebrating ‘Lise’s birthday [the 29 of September] with a trip to Treptow and a subsequent walk through the park’.

383 See Krämer’s diaries, held at the Linden Museum Stuttgart, for a copy of the announcement. Also see Krämer’s correspondence with Kurt Lambert and Count von Linden, in which they congratulate him on the occasion. The correspondence is held at the Naturkundemuseum and the Linden Museum in Stuttgart respectively.

From then on things progressed quickly. On 12 January Krämer received 31 days holiday, and immediately travelled to Berlin. There, on 15 January, he and Elisabeth celebrated their *Polterabend* (*eve-of-wedding party*) at the Kahlbaum’s residency. It seems that the close relationship between Kahlbaum and the Bannow family also translated to the newly engaged Krämer couple, a relationship which had great implications for their later life. Johannes Kahlbaum not only became *Trauzeuge* (*witness to the marriage*), but also became a major patron of the Krämer’s subsequent expedition.

The marriage took place on 16 January 1904. After the official ceremony at the civil registry office and the church ceremony at the *Neuen Kirche*, the marriage was celebrated with a feast in the *Norddeutschen Hof* restaurant in Berlin. ‘The celebrations’, as Krämer remarked in his diary, ‘proceeded warmly and were nice’.

That same night the newlywed couple left Berlin for their honeymoon, which, in keeping with the times, led them to the South. Travelling by train via Munich to Italy, they made their way through the south of France back to Berlin.

On this excursion, Krämer also had the chance to discover the patience and nursing ability of his wife. He had fallen ill, with stomach pain in Nice. ‘In my pain’, as he exclaimed in a letter to his friend and patron Kurt Lampert, ‘I noticed the luck of having a loving wife’.

This ‘luck’ of his, however, also extended itself into his scientific career. This is illustrated in another letter to Lampert, where he states:

[Elisabeth] had spent many months in Ceylon during the last few years, and is very musical and paints wonderfully. Her artistic abilities are only surpassed by her kindness. She declared that she would accompany me everywhere and that she would

---

385 Krämer’s diaries, which are held at the Linden Museum, provide an interesting and quite detailed look into the events leading up to their marriage. His diaries also reveal that he must have had some disagreement with his brother Carlos, who, as Krämer noticed, ‘refused to come to the wedding’. The particular circumstances of this disagreement, however, remain unknown and it should be mentioned that it was probably resolved later on, since Elisabeth visited Carlos in 1905, as Krämer’s diary reveals.

386 For information on Kahlbaum, see Pytlik p. 182. For Kahlbaum’s support, see also Krämer’s Introduction in *Palau, I. Teilband, Abteilung: I. Entdeckungsgeschichte und II Geographie, aus Ergebnisse der Hamburger Südsee-Expedition 1908-1910*, edited by Dr. G. Thilenius, Hamburg, 1917, p. vii, where he acknowledged Kahlbaum’s support. Also see Krämer’s correspondence with Linden, held at the Linden Museum. This correspondence is mentioned in Dietrich Schleip’s work, “Ozeanische Ethnographie und Koloniale Praxis, Das Beispiel Augustin Krämer”, MA Thesis, Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen, 1989, pp. 56-57, in which he notes that Krämer kept the details of this support rather secret, and did not even mentioned Kahlbaum’s name.

387 See Krämer’s diary entry from 16 January 1904, Linden Museum Stuttgart.

388 Ibid. ‘Das Fest verlief sehr leib und nett’, translation by the author.

389 According to Krämer’s diaries, the couple left Berlin by train on 16 January at 11pm. They eventually returned at the end of February 1904, Linden Museum Stuttgart.

390 See Krämer’s letter to Kurt Lampert, dated 1 March 1904, held at the Naturkunde Museum in Stuttgart. In his letter he stated that he had fallen ill with stomach pain in Nice for 14 days, thereby noticing ‘wie herrlich es auch im Unglück ist eine liebe Frau zu haben’, translation by the author.
be proud to assist me in my work. You see that it just needs a stroke of luck for me not get totally unfaithful to anthropology.  

They were not long into their marriage before Krämer called upon her to keep her promise.

**Preparations for Krämer’s Third Expedition to the Pacific**

It can be presumed that, as with the end of his first visit to the Pacific, Krämer envisioned a renewed expedition, when he returned from his second trip to the Pacific. In this regard, it seems characteristic that he finished work on the manuscript of his previous travels and experiences just as he was embarking on his third expedition to the Pacific. This is illustrated in a review of Krämer’s book, *Hawaii, Ostmikronesien und Samoa, Meine zweite Südseereise (1897-1899) zum Studium der Atolle und ihrer Bewohner*, where it is stated:

The author [Krämer] hopes, during his third voyage to the South Seas, in which he is at present engaged, to throw more light on this interesting point [referring to the close cultural connection between the Gilberts and the West Caroline Islands].

Ethnological research, as well as the collection of ethnographic artefacts, were the main motivations for Krämer’s third expedition to the Pacific. In addition, Krämer was interested in anthropometrical data collection. This interest was an expression of the importance early

---


392 See Chapter Two, where it is mentioned that on the return to Germany after the end of his deployment in 1895, Krämer already had begun to plan for a return to Samoa.


German anthropologists placed on physical features. Thereby Krämer was influenced by his contact with Felix von Luschan, who, together with Rudolf Virchow, was among the vanguard of German physical anthropologists in the late 19th century. 396

Krämer’s diaries reveal that he was a regular visitor to Luschan and to the Ethnological Museum in Berlin. 397 Apart from a growing concern for physical anthropology, Krämer also demonstrated keen attention to the development of the Museum, as is illustrated in his article ‘Der Neubau des Berliner Museums für Völkerkunde im Lichte der ethnographischen Forschung’, where he presented his ideas for a new building to house the ethnological collections. 398 Although the finer details of their relationship remain unknown, it can be presumed that Luschan’s involvement, as well as his contacts with the Navy and the Foreign Office, were of great significance for the planning of Krämer’s third expedition. In his diaries, for example, Krämer acknowledged that he received the sum of 5000 Marks (US$ 398

---


397 The contact between Luschan and Krämer had started in the process of his publication Die Samoa-Inseln, see Chapter Three. Krämer’s diaries, which are held at the Linden Museum, illustrate that Krämer was a frequent visitor to Luschan. In July 1904, for example, he visited Luschan on at least two occasions (on 8 July and again on 28 July). See also Dietrich Schleip, p. 50.

1250) from the Generalverwaltung der Kaiserlichen Museen (the General Administration of the Imperial Museums) in Berlin. 399

In late 1905 Krämer’s plans became more concrete. In a letter dated 14 October to his friend and mentor Karl Count von Linden, he states:

The consultation in Berlin during the Kolonialcongress (Colonial Congress) with the possible superiors [refering to the Auswärtige Amt, Kolonialabteilung (Colonial Department of the Foreign Office) and the Generalverwaltung der Kaiserlichen Museen Berlin (the General Administration of the Imperial Museums)] went unexpectedly smoothly. I have been granted everything, and if nothing happens in between, I will leave early Dec. on board the new surveying ship Planet via and around Africa and the Sundainseln (Indonesia) towards Matupi, where I will leave (the ship). 400

Just a few weeks later he informed Linden that he had ‘received notification from Berlin, that my application for a command on board the SMS Planet has been granted.’ 401

399 Neither in Krämer’s correspondence nor in his publication does he elaborate on Luschan’s contribution in realising his planned expedition. However, in his diaries Krämer made a note in regard to the financial support he received on the recommendation of Luschan. See Krämer’s diaries held at the Linden Museum.

400 See Krämer’s letter to Count Linden dated 14 October 1905, held at the Linden Museum. In his letter, Krämer wrote: ‘die Rücksprache in Berlin während des Kolonialcongresses mit den in Betracht kommenden Vorgesetzten verlief unerwartend glatt. Man hat mir alles zugestanden, und wenn nichts dazwischen kommt, werde ich Anfang Dez. mit dem neuen Vermessungsschiff Planet die Ausreise um Afrika herum und über die Sundainseln nach Matupi antreten, um mich dasselbst auszuschießen’, (translation by the author). Krämer’s diaries indicate that he had used his participation at the Kolonialkongress of 1905 to raise the matter of his planned expedition. His entry from 3 October 1905 reads: ‘Nachmittags nach Berlin zum 2. Colonialcongress und zur Besprechung der Planetreise’ (‘In the afternoon to Berlin, for the 2nd Colonial congress and to discuss the Planet travels’), Krämer’s diary held at the Linden Museum, translation by the author.

401 See Krämer’s letter to Count Linden dated 4 November 1905, in which he states: ‘von Berlin hab ich heut Nachricht erhalten, dass mein Gesuch zur Mitfahrt an Board SMS Planet genehmigt ist’, translation by the author. Letter held at the Linden Museum. His diary from 1905 illustrates that Krämer had applied for a command on board the SMS Planet on 12 October that year. The diary is held at the Linden Museum.
The *Planet* was a purpose-built survey vessel. It had been commissioned to replace its sister ship and predecessor, the *SMS Möwe*, which had been based in the Pacific since 1895. As its replacement, the *Planet* served in the Pacific and Atlantic Ocean until it was sunk off the coast of the island of Yap in 1914 to prevent it falling into enemy hands during World War I.

One reason for Krämer’s decision to apply for a position aboard the *Planet* was certainly the chance to visit over 24 ports and to spend four weeks in South Africa at the expense of the

---

402 The *SMS Planet* was launched in Bremen on 2 August 1905. It was 49 m long, 9.8 m wide and had a depth of 2.8 m with a crew of approximately 102 men. Its scientific purpose was expressed through its lack of arms, which consisted of just 3 x 3.7 revolver-canons. For details on the *Planet*, see the website [http://www.deutsche-schutzgebiete.de/sms_planet.htm](http://www.deutsche-schutzgebiete.de/sms_planet.htm), visited 23 June 2008; Volume I of *Forschungsreise S.M.S. Planet, 1906-7*, p. xv; and Markus Schindlbeck’s article ‘Deutsche wissenschaftliche Expeditionen und Forschungen in der Südsee bis 1914’, in Hermann J. Hiery ed. *Die deutsche Südsee 1884-1914: Ein Handbuch*, Ferdinand Schöningh, Paderborn, 2001, pp. 145-147.

403 See Schindlbeck’s article, pp. 145-146. He reports that the *SMS Möwe* (or *Seagull*), a survey ship, arrived in Matupi on 8 September 1895. During its service, the ship had been home to a number of scientists, among them the famous bacteriologist Dr. Robert Koch and the geologist Alexander Pflüger. See also Andrew Zimmerman *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2001, who stresses that the surgeons on board the *Möwe* and later the *Planet* had received some ethnological training and a ‘lower paymaster was placed in charge of purchasing objects’, pp. 153-155.

404 See the website [http://www.deutsche-schutzgebiete.de/sms_planet.htm](http://www.deutsche-schutzgebiete.de/sms_planet.htm), visited 23 June 2008, as well as Schindlbeck’s article, pp. 145-147.
Navy whilst receiving full pay.\footnote{Krämer’s diaries clearly indicate that he actively applied for a command on board the \textit{Planet}. The reasons for his decision remain unclear. However it seems that the position, salary, as well as the opportunity to visit and travel in Africa, were the main motivations.} \footnote{Schleip, p. 55.} Indeed, as Schleip points out, Krämer received full ‘\textit{Kommandantentafelgelder}’ (‘Officer’s pay’), which he argues was more important than his rank in the on board hierarchy.\footnote{See Chapter Five.} Although his high-ranking place on board was certainly important for Krämer’s ego, the income was undoubtedly of equal importance, as it allowed him to engage in his ethnological research. Another reason was probably more long term; travelling on the \textit{Planet} gave Krämer the chance to get to know the ship and its crew, a contact which was certainly of importance for the future. Indeed, during his next expedition to the Pacific, Krämer remained in close contact with them, as the \textit{Planet} became the main support and supply vessel for the \textit{Deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09}, an Expedition he was going to lead in its second year.\footnote{See Krämer’s diaries, held at the Linden Museum. Whereas the support of the former two institutions was certainly helped by Luschan’s involvement, securing money from the \textit{Museum für Völkerkunde} was based on Krämer’s ongoing contact with Dr. Georg Thilenius (see Chapter Two), who had become director of the institution in 1904 and, as Krämer’s diaries illustrate, had been a guest of Krämer in Kiel.}

With regard to Elisabeth’s participation, who, as a female, was not allowed to accompany her husband on board a ship of war, it was decided that she and Krämer would meet in Matupi (a small island near Rabaul, the administration centre of German New Guinea at the time) in late 1906.\footnote{Indeed, it seems Elisabeth’s participation was never questioned. A keen interest in travel as well as a second honeymoon are seen by Schleip as possible reasons for this acceptance of her presence. He also poses the question that it might be interesting to know if research with a specific female focus, such as that which took place on Krämer’s later expeditions, had already been planned. See Schleip’s thesis, p. 54.} While Krämer would disembark from the \textit{Planet} in Matupi, Elisabeth was to travel there by private means. Once reunited, Krämer and Elisabeth planned to engage in a longer journey through Melanesia and the Caroline Islands.\footnote{Krämer had planned his expedition in two parts, due to the circumstances. The first was based on his travels on board the \textit{SMS Planet} and the second based on his private expedition through the Pacific region. See Krämer’s correspondence to Count Linden, in a letter dated 4 November 1905, for example, Krämer provides detailed on the planned expedition with his wife, Linden Museum. See Schleip, who argues that the second leg of the expedition was planned to last a year, p. 54.} In financing his expedition and the participation of his wife, Krämer was able to secure funding from a variety of sources. Apart from private donations, his diaries indicate that he was awarded 5000 Marks (US$ 1250) each from the \textit{Auswärtige Amt, Kolonialabteilung} (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Colonial Office), the \textit{Generalverwaltung der Kaiserlichen Museen Berlin} (General Administration of the Imperial Museums Berlin) and the \textit{Museum für Völkerkunde Hamburg} (Museum of Ethnology).\footnote{Krämer had planned his expedition in two parts, due to the circumstances. The first was based on his travels on board the \textit{SMS Planet} and the second based on his private expedition through the Pacific region. See Krämer’s correspondence to Count Linden, in a letter dated 4 November 1905, for example, Krämer provides detailed on the planned expedition with his wife, Linden Museum. See Schleip, who argues that the second leg of the expedition was planned to last a year, p. 54.}
Apart from granting Krämer ‘considerable (financial) support’, the Colonial Department also gave ‘direction to the officials to support [him] with action and advice’. This support, as Schleip points out, was of great importance in practical terms, as it granted Krämer transport

on Navy vessels, as well as the use of ‘military logistical institutions’. It must be stressed that this directive was eventually applied so as to include his wife, whose participation was further helped by the large grant from Johannes Kahlbaum. Thus, with the financial aspect of the expedition secured and the planning finalised, Krämer was able to embark on his third expedition to the Pacific.

Krämer’s Travels on board the SMS Planet

On the morning of 21 January 1906 Krämer left Kiel on board the Planet. Bound for the Pacific, the ship travelled via Africa and Asia. The later published report about the expedition, Forschungsreise S.M.S. Planet, 1906-7, provides the following overview of the itinerary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. 1. – 3. 2.</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2. – 17.2.</td>
<td>Porto Grande</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.2.– 28.2.</td>
<td>Freetown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.3. – 18. 3.</td>
<td>St. Helena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4. –14. 4.</td>
<td>Cape Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 – 14.5.</td>
<td>Durban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.5. – 2.6.</td>
<td>Tamatave (Madagascar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6.</td>
<td>St. Mary (Madagascar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6. – 13. 6.</td>
<td>Port Louis (Mauritius)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

412 Schleip, p. 56.
413 Although there is no reference to Elisabeth in the official direction, her travels on the Seestern, the German administrative yacht in German New Guinea, in December 1906 illustrate that she was allowed to accompany her husband on his later expedition. In a letter to Count Linden dated 4 October 1905, Krämer indicates that Kahlbaum’s support was enough to guarantee his planned expedition, which included her participation, Linden Museum. As an aside, it needs to be mentioned that he nevertheless subleased his residence in Kiel. A cut out advertisement in his diaries reads: ‘Zu Vermieten: Villa Molkestr. 70, 8 Zimmer nebst Zubehör und Garten zum 1. Januar zu vermieten. Besichtigung von 11 –12 Uhr’ (For rent: Villa Molkestr. 70, 8 Rooms with accessories and garden for rent from 1 January. Visits from 11 to 12 o’clock), translation by the author.
414 Krämer’s diaries illustrate that a few days before departure, on 18 January 1906, he boarded the ship which left ‘the shipyard at 8 o’clock’ on 21 January. Diaries held at the Linden Museum.
415 The table of the ship’s travel plan is taken from Forschungsreise S.M.S. Planet, 1906-7, Reichs Marine Amt, ed. Vol. II, p. 1, translated by the author. See also Schleip, p. 58. Compared to Krämer’s diaries held at the Linden Museum, there are some minor divergences in relation to the arrival/departure dates. For example, his diaries mention the arrival in Lisbon on 28 January instead of 29 January. These differences are probably based either on the many nights of travel the ship engaged in, or relates to Krämer’s use of a different dateline.
16.6. – 17.6 Rodríguez (Mauritius)
29.6. Suvadiva Atoll (Maldives)
3.7. – 13.7. Colombo
20.7. – 22.7. Lugu Bigo Bay on Simalur
25.7. – 29.7. Padang (Sumatra)
3.8. – 8.8. Batavia
29.8. – 3.9. Ambon
15.9. – 2.10. Hermit Islands

3.10. – 5.10. Andrew-Hafen (Admiralty Islands/Manus)
5.10. – 6.10. Pak (St. Gabriel) (Admiralty Islands/Manus)
7.10. – 10.10. Bird Island (Admiralty Islands/Manus)
13.10. Herbertshöhe (today Kokopo)
13.10. – 5.1.1907 surveying in the Bismarck Archipelago
6.1. – 7.1. Nusa (New Mecklenburg, today: New Ireland)
16.1. – 20.1. Yap (West Caroline Islands)
22.1. Korror Harbor (Palau-Islands)
8.2. – 12.2. Manila
17.2. Arrival in Hong Kong

From the start, as Schleip points out, there was a ‘pre-programmed’ conflict between Krämer and the captain of the Planet, Captain Lebahn, caused by their differing duties and interests. The main tasks of the ship, as expressed in the official report, were geographic and metrological investigations as well as the testing of scientific instruments and equipment. The focus of Krämer’s research, on the other hand, was ethnological. Due to Krämer’s wish for longer stays in the harbours and Captain Lebahn’s preference for staying on the open seas

416 This, as Schleip points out, included the islands of Akih, Maron, Luf and Djalin, p. 58. See also Krämer’s diary, Linden Museum.
417 On arrival in Herbertshöhe part of the crew, including Krämer, disembarked from the ship. For details see Vorwort (Preface) in the Vol. I. Forschungsreise S.M.S. Planet, 1906-7, pp. xvii-xviii, which gives details and names of the changing officers.
418 See Schleip, pp. 58-59. He argues that the conflict was based on a ‘programmierter Interessenkonflikt’ (‘pre-programmed conflict of interest’). Although this is certainly true, Krämer’s diaries and letters do not provide any finer details about the extent and impact of his conflict/relationship with Kapitänsleutnant (Commander) Lebahn. Lebahn died on the return travel of the SMS Planet in Colombo in early 1907. See Forschungsreise S.M.S. Planet, 1906-7, Vol. I., Preface, which mentions his death.
419 For the official tasks of the Planet, see the Allerhöchste Kabinetts-Order (Highest Cabinet Order), as quoted in Vol. I of the Forschungsreise S.M.S. Planet, 1906-7, pp. xvi-xvii
conflict arose. This conflict was certainly also based, as Schleip argues, on ‘verletzten Eitelkeiten’ (‘wounded vanity’), since Krämer, despite his official position as a commanding officer, was not listed as part of the officers staff on board, but instead was listed as ‘on board for his own purposes’. As such it was also an expression on Krämer’s difficult personality, which was to characterise much of his later career.

In his subsequent publication, Krämer expresses his opinions about the situation, arguing that due to the prolonged stays on the open sea he had ‘only 4 days on land, [so] ethnological work had to be well timed’. However, it has to be stressed that the average stay of four days whilst the Planet remained at each of the different harbours corresponded clearly with Krämer’s previous experiences during his travels in Samoa. During his stays in port, Krämer therefore decided to employ a ‘quick survey method’ (similar to the one he had successfully used during his previous travels). His focuses were:

1. Anthropological measurements and photographs
2. Phonographic recordings, together with song collection
3. House construction
4. Ship-building
5. Weaving

This was also the order of his research preference. During his stays in these nine different harbours, Krämer measured around 124 different individuals, but he published the resulting ethnographical data from only one of his stops: the Hermit Islands.

---

420 See Schleip, p. 58. For Krämer’s position on board the Planet, see Vol. I of the Forschungsreise S.M.S. Planet, 1906-7. pp. xv-xvi.
421 In Volume V of the Forschungsreise S.M.S. Planet, 1906-7, which was dedicated to his ethnological research, Krämer states that, due to the brief stays of only 4 days, ‘völkerkundliche Studien [mussten] genau bestimmt werden’, translation by the author, p. ix. However, Schleip argues that Krämer was able to influence the travel plans of the SMS Planet on three occasions: a stay on Rodriguez to visit the reefs; ‘a brief stop over (of 3-4 hours) on Suvadiva; and a stop over (also of 3-4 hours) on Menawei for drawing local Tatau (Tattoo) patterns’, p. 63.
422 See Chapter Two. During Krämer’s two previous expeditions he had experiences of stays often of limited duration, for example, in Nauru. See also Schleip, p. 59.

- in Freetown (Sierra Leone) 18 [people]
- in Kimberley (bush people) 12
- in Durban (Zulu) 9
- in Tamatava (Madagascar) 9
- in Padang (Sumatra) 12
- in Batavia (Java) 24
- in Makassar (Celebes) 18
- in Ambon (Moluccas) 9
- in Luf (Hermit Inseln) 13
To gain access to the needed ‘Menschenmaterial’ (‘human material’), and due to the imposed time limitations, Krämer eventually resorted to visiting local prisons, which generally held many indigenous prisoners from the surrounding area. ‘Through the help of governors and residents’, as he later wrote, ‘the gates of the prisons opened and, at the same time, I also received details about the origin, age, etc of the individuals’. In the course of his visits to the local prisons, Krämer also highlighted the cooperation he received from English and Dutch administrators and officials. As an aside, it has to be pointed out that his acknowledgement of the English support is certainly an exception, as he was certainly not that fond of the British and their colonial administration.

At this point it needs to be stressed that Krämer’s plan of action, although unethical, was by no means exceptional. On the contrary, the use of prisoners for anthropometrical measurements was a common practice among early anthropologists, as prisons not only provided a variety of different human types but also had the methods in place to force them to cooperate. This fact becomes more evident when examining the facial expression shown in the following picture:

These measurements were followed by only an additional 47 during his subsequent travels through the Caroline islands (21 in Yap, 9 in Pelau and 17 in Truk). These measurements as well as the anthropometrical photographs were taken, as Krämer acknowledges, in accordance with Luschan’s instructions. In regard to Krämer’s anthropometrical work see also Schleip, p. 59. However his numbers are not consistent with the ones given by Krämer.

426 See Vol. V. Forschungsreise S.M.S. Planet, 1906-7, Chapter IV ‘Beiträge zu einer Monographie der Hermit-Inseln (Luf Archipel)’, pp. 58-122. The Planet arrived on the islands on 15 September 1906 and remained there to measure the Lagoon, allowing Krämer time for some more in-depth work. Schleip argues that, apart from Krämer’s work on the Hermit Islands, there exists an unpublished manuscript of his ethnological observation on the Cape Verde Islands, pp. 59-60.

427 For the quote, see Krämer’s second chapter ‘Einige Bemerkungen zu dem anthropologischen und photographischen Arbeitsverfahren auf der Planetreise’, pp. 25-26, translation by the author. Indeed, throughout the publication of the Forschungsreise S.M.S. Planet, 1906-7 there are references to be found in regard to the anthropometrical research and prisons, eg. Vol. I., p. 40, 64; Vol. V., p. 2 and 71. See also Krämer’s article ‘Anthropologische Notizen über die Bevölkerung von Sierra Leone’, in Globus, Bd. 90, (1906), p. 14.

428 See Vol. V. Forschungsreise S.M.S. Planet 1906/07, p. 25. On this page Krämer highlights the the ‘grosse Entgegenkommen der Behörden in den englischen und holländischen Kolonien’ (‘the great help of officials in the English and Dutch colonies’) during his travels through Africa and Indonesia. For his critical relationship towards the British administration, see also pp. 32ff.

429 For Christopher Paul’s article, ‘Das Problem der Akphotographie im ethnographischen Zusammenhang’ in Volker Harms, ed. ‘Südseebilder’: Materialien zu einer Ausstellung, Völkerkundliches Institute Tübingen, Tübingen, 1992, in which he argues that the taking of anthropometrical photos is ‘a violent act ..., often these were done in jails, where there was not only a variety of human resources to choose from, but also the mechanics in place to force prisoners to participate’, p. 69, translation by the author. Anthropometrical measurements and photos were later also taken in German prisoner-of-war camps during World War One, as Andrew D. Evan’s article ‘Anthropology at War: Racial studies of POWs during World War I’, in H. Glenn Penny and Matti Bunzl, eds Worldly Provincialism: German Anthropology in the Age of Empire, Bristol: University Presses Marketing, 2003, pp. 198-229 illustrates.
FIG. 4.5  Anthropometrical Photograph by Dr. Augustin Krämer
from the Island of Java, 1906
(Volker Harms Südseebilder, p. 169)

Given the anthropological and ethnological focus of Krämer’s research, the travel through the Atlantic gave him, by his own account, ‘little to do’. This changed when the Planet arrived in Cape Town. Whereas the ship continued on a scientific expedition to the Antarctic, Krämer disembarked for a planned four week stay in South Africa. Travelling by train via Kimberley, Johannesburg to Pietersberg (Pietermaritzburg), he made his way to Durban, where he was to rejoin the Planet in early May.

429 In his article ‘Die Forschungsreise S.M.S. “Planet”’, in Globus, Bd. 90, (1906), p. 102, Krämer reports that ‘anthropologisch im Atlantik bei den kurzen Hafenaufenthalten wenig zu tun [war]’, translation by the author.
430 As the official report demonstrates, the Planet engaged in a nearly four week long scientific expedition in the Southern Antarctic, engaging in metrological and hydrological research and experiments. See Vol. I. Forschungsreise S.M.S. Planet 1906/07 for details. See also Vol. V. of the same publication, p. 1. Krämer’s four week expedition away from the ship had been an important in his planning. See ‘Preparations for Krämer’s third expedition to the Pacific’ in this chapter.
431 For Krämer’s travels in Africa, see Vol. V. Forschungsreise S.M.S. Planet 1906/07, pp. 1-24. In his report he praises the British nation for building a railroad which lead ‘into the heart of Africa’, p. 1. On his arrival in Durban, as Schleip reports, Krämer ‘unexpectedly’ had another 14 days time, which he used for anthropometrical photos in the local prison, p. 62.
In his travel route Krämer followed Felix von Luschan, who had visited this area a few years earlier. This was certainly a double-edged sword for Krämer. On the one hand, Luschan’s contacts undoubtedly helped Krämer to gain a visa and travel through the British colonies. On the other hand, this path limited Krämer’s research, since ‘von Luschan had already been anthropologically active [in the area]’, as he later remarked. His travel in South Africa was therefore characterised by the abandonment of his collecting activity. Instead Krämer decided to focus on the legendary pygmy tribe of the Kattea (Vaalpens), whom, together with the Bushmen-Hottentot, became ‘central figures in the emergent German science of the Other’. However, due to time constraints (and a lack of evidence and cooperation among the native population) Krämer eventually decided to abandon this focus, instead concentrating on the Basuto people.

On 20 April 1906 Krämer arrived in Pietersburg, where he took quarters at a German settler’s house. With a rented coach he conducted expeditions within relatively close vicinity. Eventually he visited the mission station Leipzig, where he spent another four nights. This station, which included a hospital with 100 to 300 patience, had been founded by the missionary Franz and his wife. Krämer regarded this hospital as an ‘anthropologically unique specimen’ due to the large catchment area of patients, which allowed him to recruit information from essentially ‘captive’ people. With the help of Franz, who functioned as

---

432 Between August and September 1905, Felix von Luschan and his wife had been guests to the 75th Meeting of the British Association in Cape Town. In due process, Luschan travelled along the same route, engaging in ethnographic collection and anthropological research. See Felix von Luschan ‘Bericht über eine Reise in Südafrika.’, in Zeitschrift für Ethnologie, Bd. 38 (1906), pp. 863-924.
433 Luschan’s travels on this route are also acknowledged by Krämer, see Volume V. Forschungsreise S.M.S. Planet 1906/07, p. 1.
434 On his travels, Krämer had to cross through three British colonies: Cape Colony, Transvaal and Natal. It has to be assumed that Luschan’s previous contacts were certainly of help to Krämer, since Luschan had been an official guest to these colonies at the bequest of the British government.
436 For Krämer’s research focus, see ibid., pp. 1-24. Krämer’s research interest in the pygmies and so-called Bushmen is a reflection of common interests of German ethnologists/anthropologists at this time. See Robert J. Gordon’s article ‘Gathering the Hunters: Bushmen in German (Colonial) Anthropology’, in H. Glenn Penny and Matti Bunzl, eds Worldly Provincialism: German Anthropology in the Age of Empire, pp. 256-282, quote on p. 259. For information on the relationship between pygmies and the development of ethnology in Germany, see Suzanne Marchand’s article ‘Priests among the Pygmies: Wilhelm Schmidt and the Counter-Reformation in Austrian Ethnology’ in the same publication, pp. 283-316.
438 The name of the settler was Herr (Mr.) Pahl, who, as Krämer acknowledged, had been supplier of zebras and antelopes to the Zoological Garden in Berlin, see Vol. V. Forschungsreise S.M.S. Planet 1906/07, p. 2
439 Ibid., pp. 2-5.
440 Ibid., pp. 5-6.
441 Ibid., p. 5. Krämer describes the mission station Leipzig as ‘anthropologisches Unikum’. Here he had hoped to find clues about the existence of the pygmies, a hope which did not come to fruition, although he found two girls and a boy he thought to be part of the tribe. However, the identification was not conclusive nor were they willing to give any information. See p. 6, where he also published a photo of them.
translator and guide, Krämer was eventually able to collect information about the Basuto people. This included details about their language, tools, clothes, jewellery, as well as political and social organisation.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 7-24. See also Schleip, p. 62.}

On 1 May 1906 Krämer arrived in Durban, where he was to rendezvous with the \textit{Planet}.\footnote{Krämer’s diary illustrates that he arrived in Durban at 8am on 1 May 1906. He eventually took a room in the Marine Hotel. Krämer’s diary is held at the Linden Museum.} However, since the ship was late, Krämer unexpectedly had more time to engage in some more anthropometrical research in the local prison at Durban, as well as for a brief excursion into the surrounding lands.\footnote{On his arrival in Durban, Krämer received a telegram from the \textit{Planet} notifying him of the delay of the ship, thus from 9-11 May, Krämer engaged in a excursion to Somkele in Zululand, diaries held at the Linden Museum.}

Reunited with the \textit{Planet}, Krämer eventually left Africa in mid-May. Travelling via Madagascar, Mauritius Islands and Colombo, the ship made its way to the Malayan Archipelago. From an anthropological/ethnological perspective, this part of the expedition provided few interesting subjects for research. During their brief stopovers on land, as

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{krämer_diagram.png}
\caption{Krämer’s sketch of the Mission Station \textit{Leipzig} (Krämer Diary, Linden Museum)}
\end{figure}
Krämer’s diaries illustrate, he and the other officers were normally guests of the local German consuls, lived among the European population and occasionally engaged in tourist activities. The lack of anthropological research was also reflected in Krämer’s collecting of ethnographic materials. In a letter to his friend Count Linden, Krämer remarked:

If you cannot make any money available for collections, it does not matter, as the big Sunda places [Sunda Archipelago in Indonesia], which the Planet visits, provide little material.

Only on the island of Tamatave did Krämer finally have a chance to engage in some ethnological work. He was able to extend his stay for five days, as he was able to follow the Planet to Port Louis via a French postal steamer. He used this time mainly for musical recordings and collecting information on weaving techniques.

With the arrival in Kaiser-Wilhelms-Land [the New Guinea mainland] and its offshore islands, Krämer’s work finally became more intensive. Whereas the Planet was to engage in extensive surveying, he was to concentrate on his ethnological and anthropological research, which he planned to conduct on Luf Island in the Hermit Islands.

However, Krämer’s first impression of the Hermit Islands was depressing, thus providing evidence of the ‘salvage anthropological’ mentality:

As to weapons and other peculiarities of the Island nothing is left on the spot. Over time the people have not only lost their possession of these artefacts, but also their own individuality in response to contact with the white race. A dull, tired facial expression marks their visage, a fatalistic surrender in their fate their appearance. ... Today Akib and Maron are, apart from a small plot near the [big] house, deforested due to the establishment of coconut plantations. ... Only Luf has retained its original forest. ... Today there is the only village .... The natives, in the past a wild tribe, are completely peaceful and do their service as workers.

---

444 See Krämer’s diaries held at the Linden Museum. On his visit to Colombo in July 1906, Krämer and the other officers were guests of the local German Consul. They also participated in a little sightseeing trip around the town. Similar events also occurred during other stop-overs of the Planet. See also Schleip, p. 63.

445 In his letter to Count Linden dated 27 September 1906, Krämer remarked: ‘das sie keine Gelder mehr für Sammlungen meinerseits flüssig machen können, schadet nun nichts, da die grossen Sundaplätze, welche die Planet besucht, wenig Material liefern’, translation by the author. Letter held at the Linden Museum. Apart from Krämer’s disappointment about a lack of artefacts, his response to Linden was also characterised by his duty to collect for the Museum in Berlin and the patron of the expedition.

446 Krämer’s stay on Tamatave is mentioned in Vol. V. Forschungsreise S.M.S. Planet 1906/07, p. 45, as well as in his diaries, which are held at the Linden Museum. See also Schleip, p. 62.

447 See Krämer’s diaries, which also contain a few sketches of weaving frames, as well as notes. Diaries held at the Linden Museum.

448 See Forschungsreise S.M.S. Planet 1906/07. Vol. I illustrates that upon its arrival in the area, the SMS Planet was to engage in some larger surveying work, including the measurements of the current and ocean depth. Krämer was using these 14 days for an extended stay on Luf Island (Hermit Island), see his preface in Vol. V., p. x.

449 The description of the Hermit Islands is mentioned in Vol. I. Forschungsreise S.M.S. Planet 1906/07, pp. 81-83, translation by the author.
These developments were due to a punitive expedition the German administration had conducted in 1882/83, whereby the German ships-of-war, the SMS *Hyäne* and SMS *Carola*, destroyed 67 houses and 54 boats, as well as killing numerous inhabitants. This expedition, as Krämer acknowledged, had the effect that the ‘Lufiten [inhabitants of Luf] gave up their resistance to the white settlers and colonists, and became peaceful’. On 17 September Krämer left the *Planet*. In the company of a seaman, he set up camp on Luf for ten days while the ship continued with its surveying tasks around the archipelago. During his stay on the island Krämer lived in a native house in the middle of Luf, stating that ‘during day time the head of the house, Nemin, among with other men and women stayed in the house, at nighttimes I was alone with my lad.’ Despite this close proximity to the islanders, communication proved difficult, since ‘the old Nemin spoke just a few words of Pidgin-English’. It was this communication barrier which again laid bare the conflicting research aims of Krämer and the commander of the *Planet*. That was attested to when Krämer remarked that ‘the only useful [translator] was Morat who, as a pilot of the *Planet*, was in heavy demand to the extent that I had little access [to his services as translator].’ Thus, it can be anticipated that Krämer, when he finally disembarked from the *Planet* at Matupi, was certainly looking forward to his private expedition, which he envisioned to be less regulated by official duties and regulations.

---

450 On the development and impact of the punitive expedition, see Krämer Vol. V. *Forschungsreise S.M.S. Planet 1906/07*, pp. 58-59.
451 Ibid., p. 59.
452 Ibid., p. 58. Krämer even gives the name of the seaman who accompanied him: Carl Pries. Together they stayed ten days on the island, three of which were used for excursions around the island. Although Krämer claimed that the islanders had become peaceful, the presence of the seaman can be seen as a sign that either Krämer or Commander Lebahn did not completely trust them.
453 Ibid., p. 58, translation by the author.
454 Ibid., p. 58, ‘*Der alte Nemin konnte nur einige Worte Pidginenglisch, so dass die Verständigung recht mangelhaft war*,’ (translation by the author).
455 Ibid., p. 58. Krämer continues by arguing that only gifts of cotton shirts and trousers made it possible for him to acquire Morat’s services as a translator. However, Krämer stresses the heavy demand on Morat, specifically on the part of the ship’s commander.
**Wiedersehn (Reunion) in Matupi**

In late October 1906 Krämer disembarked from the SMS *Planet* at Matupi. On his arrival he took quarters at the Thiel’s residence in Raulai to await for the arrival of his wife. Max Thiel, a long time settler and director of the German New Guinea Company, was renowned for his hospitality, and his residence was at the heart of the social life in the colony. Krämer’s contact with Thiel proved of great help, but was also of interest from an ethnographical point of view, as Thiel was a large collector of artefacts and patron to different ethnological institutions. Thiel advised his employees to collect artefacts and even employed Franz Hellwig as a professional collector. He eventually sold Hellwig’s collection to the *Museum für Völkerkunde* in Hamburg for 2000 Marks (US$ 500).

---

456 See preface Vol. I. *Forschungsreise S.M.S. Planet 1906/07*, p. xvii. Although the official report states that ‘at the end of December 1906 there was a change of guard’ at Malupi, Krämer’s diaries reveal that he left the ship sometime during October. Diaries held at the Linden Museum.

457 Ibid. His notes further illustrate the fact that he took quarter at Thiel’s residence, as they even containing a small sketch of the bay and house.

458 Maximilian Franz (Max) Thiel (1864-?) had been co-owner of the Deutsch Neuguinea-Kompanie. He was the nephew of its founder, Eduard Hernsheim. In 1892, after Eduard had a stroke and Thiel became the chairman of the company. For information on Eduard Hernsheim, see Peter Sack and Dymphna Clark’s introduction in Eduard Hernsheim’s book *South Sea Merchant*, ed. and transl. by Peter Sack and Dymphna Clark. Institute of Papua New Guinea Studies, 1983, pp. iv - viii. In 1896, Thiel settled on Malupi. Throughout the *Schutzgebiet* (protectorate) he became known for his *Gastfreundschaft* (hospitality), for which he was even called the ‘Sultan of Matupi’. Among Thiel’s guests were not only the officers of the Navy but also other long term residents such as ‘Queen Emma’, Dr. Albert Hahl and Richard Parkinson. For information on Thiel, see Karl Baumann, Dieter Klein, Wolfgang Apitzsch Biographisches Handbuch Deutsch-Neuguinea, 1882-1922; Kurzlebensläufe ehemaliger Kolonisten, Forscher, Missionare und Reisender, 2nd edition, Berlin, 2002, p. 448.

459 Thiel was also a patron of different ethnological museums in Germany. See File ‘Max Thiel’ at the Linden Museum, which contains the correspondence between Count Linden and Max Thiel. From Berlin, Thiel was awarded the medal *Rothen Adlerorden vierter Klasse* (‘Red Eagle fourth Class’) for his services to Völkerkunde museum to Berlin in 1909. See Königliches Geheimes Civil-Cabinet, File: ‘Das Museum für Völkerkunde zu Berlin’, Band IV. 1909, Geh. Zivilkabinett, jünger Periode I. HA Rep. 89, Nr. 20492. Receiving this Prussian Royal Order was, as Andrew Zimmerman points out in his book *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago 2001, a main motivation for many collectors, pp. 168-169. For more information on commercial collection activities in German New Guinea, see Rainer Buschmann’s article ‘Exploring Tensions in Material Culture: Commercialising Ethnography in German New Guinea, 1870-1904’, in Michael O’Hanlon and Robert L. Welsch eds. *Hunting the Gatherers: Ethnographic Collectors, Agents and Agency in Melanisia, 1870s-1930s*, New York, 2000, pp. 55-80.

460 See Bauman, Klein and Apitzsch, p. 448. For more information on Hellwig, see Chapter Six.
Krämer, as his diaries illustrate, used his stay for brief excursions into the interior of the area and as a chance to organise and prepare the collected ethnographical and zoological material for posting back to Germany. Meanwhile, it seems, he anxiously awaited the Wiedersehn (reunion) with his wife. In a letter to von Luschan, he stated that: ‘In a couple of days I await her arrival, which is great comfort since I noticed that I am unwell’. This remark might have been as much based on Krämer’s true feelings towards his wife Elisabeth, as it was based on his disappointment regarding the ethnological work on the voyage so far. However, while Krämer’s activities are well documented, Elisabeth’s activities remain obscure. In late September or early October 1906 Elisabeth must have left Germany to travel

---

461 On 28 October 1906, Krämer noted in his diary ‘Ausritt nach Toma’ (‘Ride to Toma’). A day later he noted that he prepared and sent three parcels to Germany. One was sent to Stuttgart (presumably to Count Linden), one to the Museum in Berlin and one to the Botanical Institute in Berlin. Although he did not specify in detail, the first two contained artefacts and photo plates, the last contained specimens he collected on Luf. Diaries held at the Linden Museum.

462 ‘In wenigen Tagen erwarte ich sie nun hier, was mir ein grosser Trost ist, denn ich merke immer mehr das ich nichts tauge’, Krämer in a letter dated 27 October 1906 to Luschan, quoted by Anna Pytlik, p.18, translation by the author.
to German New Guinea. It is reported that she travelled to Matupi by passenger liner and that she was in charge of taking care of the equipment and the scientific instruments necessary for their private expedition. She had chosen to travel via Hong Kong and Manila. On her voyage to Simpsonhafen, she met the German ethnologist Dr. Richard Thurnwald, who was on his way to New Guinea to collect for von Luschan and the Ethnological Museum in Berlin. On their meeting, Thurnwald, who was a founding member of the ‘Anti-Alkohol-Bewegung’ (‘Anti-Alcoholic Movement’), remarked that ‘unhealthily large amounts of alcohol were consumed on board [the liner]’ and that ‘the wife of Navy officer Professor Krämer … enthusiastically participated in these feasts’.

With some days delay, as Schleip reports, on 5 November 1906 Elisabeth finally arrived at Matupi. The reunion, as Krämer’s diaries record, was celebrated with a dinner at the governor’s residence a few days later. Now finally reunited, Krämer was able to concentrate on the second part of his expedition.

Krämer’s private expedition through the Caroline Islands

In mid-November 1906 the Krämers embarked on their private expedition. From late 1906 to mid-1907 they participated in a number of excursions which saw them travel extensively through the Caroline Islands and into parts of German New Guinea, such as the island of

---

463 Again the details of her travel remain unknown; however, it can be assumed that she travelled on a streamer of the Norddeutsche Lloyd from Bremen, which was one of the main lines at the time. For details on the Norddeutsche Lloyd, see Arnold Kludas ‘Deutsche Passagierschiffs-Verbindungen in die Südsee 1886-1914’, in Hermann Hiery ed. Die deutsche Südsee 1884-1914 Ein Handbuch, Paderborn 2001, pp. 156-176. For her arrival on 5 November 1906, see Krämer’s diaries, Linden Museum. Dietrich Schleip argues that she arrived ‘with a little delay’, p. 72. See also Anna Pytlik, p. 18.
465 Richard Thurnwald quoted in Marion Melk-Koch, p. 64, translation by the author.
466 Krämer’s diaries reveal that she arrived on 5 November, a fact he even noted it in red. In his work on Krämer, Schleip reports that she arrived ‘verspätet’, p. 72.
467 Krämer’s diary. On Sunday 10 November 1906 Krämer noted ‘Alle in H’höh (Herbertshöhe) zum Fest ... und dann zum Essen bei Kraus (the Deputy Governor of German New Guinea at the time)’. The dinner, as Krämer’s diaries further illustrate, was overshadowed by the death of Kohl (probably a seaman), who had been sick for some time.
Buka in Melanesia. Eventually they spent 274 days on Palau and 129 days on Truk (Chuuk).

In early November, the Deputy Governor of German New Guinea at the time, Dr. Emil Krauss, offered the Krämers a place on the *Seestern*, the administration yacht, on a trip to the Caroline Islands.

The trip, which was to commence on 5 December 1906, was intended to be a survey in response to a strong typhoon that had devastated the islands earlier that year. The destruction of food supplies and shelter made resettlements necessary, and these duties were also carried out by the *Seestern*. Dietrich Schleip argues that this response was not only determined by humanitarian ideals but also served economic purposes, as new workers were

---

469 In Melanesia the Krämers visited, among other small islands, the island of Buka. However, their main aim was to research the Caroline Islands, which include all the islands belonging to the present day Republic of Belau (Palau) and the Federated States of Micronesia (Truk, Ponape, Kusaie).

470 See Schleip for the summary of Krämer’s stay on the islands of Palau and Truk, p. 83.

471 The *Seestern* was the official administration vessel of the German colonial administration in German New Guinea. The ship had been commissioned in 1903 and was in service until it disappeared on the 3 June 1909 on a trip to Brisbane. See Arnold Kuldas’s article, p. 176. For the offer by Dr. Krauss, see Krämer’s diaries at the Linden Museum, as well as Schleip, who also acknowledges that the relationship between Krämer and Krauss was not on the best of terms. It was overshadowed by their common interest in the *uli*-figures of the islanders; while Krämer wanted them for Stuttgart, Krauss gave them to a collector in Karlsruhe.

472 In October 1906, the Caroline Islands were devastated by a typhoon, which not only destroyed coconut plantations but also the livelihood of the inhabitants. See Schleip, p. 73.
to be won by the resettlement scheme.\textsuperscript{473} This seems even more plausible when noting the fact that labour shortages were a key problem in the development of the colony.\textsuperscript{474} Krämer and Elisabeth used the time before their departure to collect ethnographical artefacts and to engage in ethnological studies, including phonographic recordings.\textsuperscript{475} They participated on a small excursion to the outer islands between Nukumanu and Buka on board the \textit{S. S. Sumatra}.\textsuperscript{476} During this travel they visited, among other brief stopovers, Kieta (17. Nov.), the Shortland Islands (18. Nov.), Palau (21. Nov.), the Tagu’u Atoll (23. Nov.) and Nissa (Buka) (26. Nov.).\textsuperscript{477} The \textit{S. S. Sumatra} was a small steamer (600 t) of the \textit{Norddeutsche Lloyd} shipping company under the command of Captain Karl Nauer.\textsuperscript{478} Nauer (1874-1962) himself engaged in the collection of ethnographical artefacts.\textsuperscript{479} As the historian Rainer Buschmann argues, he thereby ‘represented the typical ethnographic trader in German New Guinea whose interest in ethnography was less motivated by the study of indigenous people living in the area than by a recognition that some sort of profit could be derived from this trade’.\textsuperscript{480} This assessment also applies to Max Thiel. Whereas Nauer had well established networks allowing him to collect on short notice, Krämer later reported that ‘the steamer’s stopovers were unfortunately very brief, allowing only a few (ethnological) notes to be collected.’\textsuperscript{481}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{473} Schleip, p. 73.
\textsuperscript{475} See Volume V. \textit{Forschungsreise S.M.S. Planet 1906/07}, pp. 123-125, where Krämer lists his phonographic recordings. Although Krämer makes a brief remark about his collection in his diary, he fails to list details to the material collected. See also Schleip, p. 72.
\textsuperscript{476} See Krämer’s diaries, held at the Linden Museum. In regard to his notes, it can be stated that the \textit{Sumatra} left Herbertshöhe on 15 November. Its travels lasted until 27 November 1906.
\textsuperscript{477} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{479} Karl Nauer came to the Pacific as Captain of the \textit{Seestern} in 1903 before entering the service of the Norddeutsche Lloyd. In 1906, he received his command on board the \textit{Sumatra}. Nauer eventually, in 1910, purchased two plantations. Apart from being a captain and planter, Nauer was also a keen collector, who gave much of the material to his home town of Obergünzburg in Southern Germany. However, his collected material is also found in the ethnological museums in Bremen, as he had contact with Dr. Hugo Schauinsland, and in Leipzig and Munich. For biographical details about Karl Nauer, see Buschmann’s article, p. 94 and Klein’s article, pp. 274-278.
\textsuperscript{480} Buschmann, p. 97.
\textsuperscript{481} In his article ‘Studienreise nach den Zentral- und Westkarolinen’, in \textit{Mitteilungen aus den deutschen Schutzgebieten}, Berlin, Bd. 21, Heft 111, (1908), Krämer reports ‘leider war der Dampferaufenthaltüberall nur ein sehr kurzer, so dass nur wenige Notizen gemacht werden konnten’, p. 169, translation by the author.
\end{flushright}
Just a few days after their return to Matupi on 27 November, the Krämers embarked on their trip on board the *Seestern*.\(^{482}\) The time until their departure in early December was dominated by the return of the *Planet* and the packing and posting of material, which the *Planet* was taking to Sydney.\(^{483}\)

The *Seestern* travelled, via the islands of Yap and Tobi to Palau.\(^{484}\) On their arrival in Palau on 15 December, the Krämers decided to remain on the island while the *Seestern* made a trip to the island of Pul.\(^{485}\) The ship was to pick them up again four days later.

\[\text{Map. 4.2 Orientation Map} \]

(Dirk Spennemann ed. Rudolf von Benningsen’s *The German Annexation of the Caroline, Palau and Mariana Islands*, p. xxi)

While on Palau the Krämers stayed at the house of station officer Wilhelm Winkler at Malakal Habour.\(^{486}\) During their brief stay Krämer did some phonographical recordings as

\(^{482}\) Krämer’s diaries reveal that they returned to Matupi on 29 November 1906. Krämer’s diaries are held at the Linden Museum.

\(^{483}\) Ibid.

\(^{484}\) Krämer’s diaries show that the two islands were visited on 12 and 14 December. Diaries are held at the Linden Museum.

\(^{485}\) See Schleip, p. 73, as well as Krämer’s diaries, held at the Linden Museum.

\(^{486}\) Ibid. Krämer mentions he had stayed at the Winkler’s residence in Malakal Habour. Winkler himself, as Margrit Davis reports in her article ‘Das Gesundheitswesen im Kaiser-Wilhelmsland und im Bismarckarchipel’ in Hermann Hiery ed. *Die deutsche Südsee 1884-1914: Ein Handbuch*, Ferdinand Schöningh, Paderborn, 2001, p. 439, had arrived in German New Guinea in 1899 as a nurse. In 1905 he became *Stationsleiter* of Palau. See also Schleip, who argues that Winkler was the man ‘representing the German administration on Palau’, p. 73.
well as some anthropometrical measurements.\footnote{See Krämer’s list of phonographic recordings in Volume V, Forschungsreise S.M.S. Planet 1906/07, pp. 123-125. In Hambruch’s article in the same volume it becomes apparent that Krämer also conducted anthropometrical measurements, p. 48 ff.} This time the brief duration of their stay was of no concern to Krämer. He wanted to pay Palau, as he later expressed, just ‘a brief visit for his orientation’.\footnote{Ibid. In his introduction, Krämer argues that he wanted to make a ‘kürzeren orientirenden Besuch [in Palau], der mich in den Stand setzen würde, mit Hilfe der Ortskenntnis eine kleine Monographie zu schreiben.’, p. vii. Schleip points out that, although it appears Krämer had the plan in advance, his travels indicate that it was rather a last minute decision, p. 77. Johann Stanislaus Kubary (1846-1896) was a German Polish ethnologist. In 1866, he had fled his native Poland for political reasons, and eventually was employed by the German firm Godeffroy & Son as a collector for ethnographical artefacts for the private museum. He participated in a number of expeditions to the Pacific. He died on Ponape in October 1896. For information on Kubary, see Baumann, Klein and Apitsch, pp. 210-211, as well as Antje Helm ‘Skurrile Exoten und liebenswerte Mitmenschen. Ethnographische Anmerkungen zur kolonialen Südseeufotografie’, in Hermann Hiery, ed., Bilder aus der Deutschen Südsee, Fotografien 1884-1914, Paderborn, 2005, pp. 20-22. } Krämer eventually intended to use the material from this brief visit to understand and contextualize the works of Johann Stanislaus Kubary, a German-Polish ethnologist and collector who had worked on Palau in the 1860s, to write ‘a small monograph on the island’.\footnote{See Krämer’s Introduction in Palau, I. Teilband, p. iv.} However, it was Krämer’s research on Palau which became the major focus of his publications from this expedition.\footnote{In 1899, Yap was made the centre of the German administration in the Western Caroline Islands, housing a police force made up of German officers and Melanesian soldiers. The island also saw the establishment of one of the first post offices on 6 November 1899 (establishment on the island of Truk and Palau followed in 1905 and 1907 respectively). In 1905, Yap became a cable station, run by the Deutsch-Niederländischen Telegraphengesellschaft (DNTG), which had been founded in Cologne in June 1904. For more information on the DNTG, see Reinhard Klein-Arendt’s article ‘Die Nachrichtenübermittlung in den Deutschen Südseekolonien’, pp. 177-195 and Gerd Harlach’s article ‘Die deutsche Herrschaft in Mikronesien’, pp. 508-531, both in Hermann Hiery ed. Die deutsche Südsee 1884-1914: Ein Handbuch, Ferdinand Schöningh, Paderborn, 2001. See also Krämer ‘Studienreise nach den Zentral- und Westkarolinen’, pp. 175-177, as well as Schleip, p. 74.} With the returning Seestern, the Krämers travelled on to the island of Yap, where they arrived on 20 December 1906. The European influence on Yap was very strong and there was a well organised colonial infrastructure. Apart from having been made the centre of the Verwaltungsdistrikt der Westkarolinen (the administrative district of the Western Caroline Islands) in the late 1890s, the island possessed two hospitals, a Catholic mission station, a post station, a German-Dutch operated cable station, and an old Spanish fortress, which housed the German-Melanesian police force.\footnote{O’Keefe had set up business in Yap in the early 1870s. He eventually created a monopoly for copra trade on the island. For information on O’Keefe, see Francis X. Hezel ‘A Yankee Trader in Yap: Crayton Philo Holcomb’, in Deryck Scarr ed. More Pacific Islands Portraits, Australian National University Press, Canberra, 1978, pp. 59-74.} The island also accommodated a warehouse and coaling station run by the famous Irish businessman David Dean O’Keefe.\footnote{O’Keefe had set up business in Yap in the early 1870s. He eventually created a monopoly for copra trade on the island. For information on O’Keefe, see Francis X. Hezel ‘A Yankee Trader in Yap: Crayton Philo Holcomb’, in Deryck Scarr ed. More Pacific Islands Portraits, Australian National University Press, Canberra, 1978, pp. 59-74.}
On their arrival, as Krämer’s diaries reveal, the Krämers visited O’Keefe, leaving with him 11 boxes which had to be posted back to Germany. Krämer and his wife were invited to a Christmas dinner by the *Deutsch-Niederländischen Telegraphengesellschaft A.G.* Apart from these social activities the couple used their stay on Yap to engage in ethnological work,

---

493 Ibid. On 21 December 1906 Krämer noted: ‘11 Kisten zu O’Keefe. Kisten für Berlin usw’. Again Krämer fails to list the contents of these boxes. However, it can be assumed that they contained his recordings, photo-plates and collected artefacts.

494 Ibid. Krämer’s diary contains an invitation, which states: ‘Der Vorsteher und die Beamten der „Deutsch-Niederländischen Telegraphengesellschaft A. G.ˮ geben sich die Ehre, Herrn Professor Dr. Kraemer nebst Gemahlin am 1. Weihnachtstage (25/12), um 7 Uhr zum Abendessen ergebenst einzuladen. Um Antwort wird höflichst gebeten!’, (translation by the author).
which saw them focus on social structures and phonographic recordings. They developed a kind of ‘work sharing agreement’, which was to become a dominant feature of their further research. 495 This arrangement saw Elisabeth, apart from her sketching, focus on weaving, binding and women’s questions (Frauenfragen), whereas Krämer worked on geography, geology, political and social organisation, jewellery, tools, language, botanic, medicine and mythology. 496

![Image](image.png)

**FIG. 4.8** ‘At work’
*(Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow *Bei kunstsinngigen Kannibalen der Südsee*, p. 197)*

During their three weeks stay on Yap, the Krämers’ work was constrained by two factors. One was the bad and rainy weather, which allowed them to conduct only brief excursions. 497 The other factor was that the inhabitants of Yap themselves who ‘in their less communicative way’, as Krämer later expressed, ‘never or only occasionally followed my repeated invitation to visit me’. 498 However, as he acknowledged, ‘their seclusion … disappears quickly, once trust, and the feeling that one will do them no harm and respect their customs has been established’. 499

495 See Horst Köhler, p. 50; Anna Pytlik, p. 18 and p. 23; Schleip, pp.74ff.
496 Ibid. See also Augustin Krämer *Palau 1. Teiband; Ergebnisse der Südsee-Expedition 1908-1910*, Hamburg, 1917, where Krämer explicitly describes her main areas of focus as: ‘the research of women’s life, their work, economy, cooking and so on’, translation by the author, p. viii.
497 In his diaries, Krämer complained about the many ‘Regentage’ (‘rainy days’). Diaries held at the Linden Museum. See also Schleip, p. 74.
498 See Krämer’s article ‘Studienreise nach den Zentral- und Westkarolinen’, p. 177, translation by the author.
499 Ibid., p. 178, translation by the author.
In late January the Krämers travelled to the island of Truk (Chuuk), where they arrived on 23 January 1907.\textsuperscript{500} There they aimed to continue their ethnological research and, because of this, they decided to move to an ‘untouched’ area of the atoll.\textsuperscript{501} During their 2½ months stay on Truk, Krämer and his wife participated in a number of excursions.\textsuperscript{502} It has been pointed out that during their stay on Truk they had only little contact with fellow Europeans living there.\textsuperscript{503}

Map 4.4  Map of Truk (Chuuk)

(Hermann Hiery, ed. Die deutsche Südsee 1884-1914: Ein Handbuch, p. 87)

\textsuperscript{500} They travelled to Truk on board the Germania, a ‘Kobradampfer’ (‘copra steamer’) of the Jaluit Company, see Schleip, p. 73, 75. For the date of their arrival, see also Krämer’s diaries, Linden Museum.

\textsuperscript{501} On Truk, Krämer was looking for a ‘unberührte Gegend’ to conduct his research, see ‘Studienreise nach den Zentral- und Westkarolinen’, p. 168.

\textsuperscript{502} Their stay lasted from 23 January to 6 April 1907. See Krämer’s book Truk, Ergebnisse der Hamburger Südsee-Expedition 1908-1910, edited by Dr. G. Thilenius, Hamburg, 1932, which contains detailed information about the dates and destinations of their excursions and their stay on the atoll, pp. 17-24.

\textsuperscript{503} See Schleip, who argues that the little contact Krämer had with other Europeans was ‘auffällig’ (‘remarkable’), p. 76. Krämer mentions contact with fellow Europeans on just two occasions: shortly after their arrival, on 27 January when they visited a German trader on Wela and a few days before their departure, on 1 April, when they stayed with an American Missionary. See Krämer’s diaries, Linden Museum.
On their arrival they travelled to the small island of Uman (south of the main island of Wola), where they moved into ‘a miserable, at least rain protecting, corrugated-iron hut’.\(^{504}\) The hut was rented to them by the widow of a German trader who had built it before his death in 1898.\(^{505}\)

In early February 1907 they moved over to the larger island of Wola, where they stayed at a deserted mission station, before eventually moving to the island of Eten in late March.\(^{506}\) In their ethnological research, which again saw them employ their ‘work sharing approach’, the couple was helped by a young Truk islander named Addi, who worked as their translator. Krämer, who described him as ‘excellent’, later remarked that Addi had learned pidgin from American Missionaries.\(^{507}\)

---

504 In his article ‘Studienreise nach den Zentral- und Westkarolinen’, Krämer described their new domicile: ‘eine, zwar elende, aber wenigstens vor dem Regen Schutz bietende Wellblechbude’, p. 169, translation by the author.
505 Ibid., p. 169
506 See Krämer’s diaries from 4 February. He fails, however, to note who had been the previous owner of the ‘verlassenen Missionsstation’. Diary held at the Linden Museum. See also Schleip, p. 76.
507 See Krämer’s book Truk, Ergebnisse der Hamburger Südsee-Expedition 1908-1910, p. 1. It might well be the case that Addi is pictured with the couple in front of their house in Uman (see Fig. 4.9).
With Addi’s help as translator and due to his local knowledge, Krämer expanded his research, adding botanical and medical observations as well as furthering his knowledge of the myths and songs of the islands. The collection (and preservation) of myths and songs became a special interest of Krämer’s. In his later publication he acknowledged:

Unfortunately the knowledge of these songs is only available by a few older folks across the different islands, which is why I had to engage in time consuming boat travel and [multiple] expeditions, to find these people often with little success. However, I was able to save some [information].

This remark, as well as the fact that his monograph on Truk was published only in 1932, illustrates that Krämer indeed saw his primary goal as ‘salvage anthropology’, a fact which had already become obvious in regard to his work on Samoa. The importance was to secure the knowledge before it was lost, however the publication of the collected material could then take years.

Apart from this ethnological research Krämer also continued to collect ethnographical artefacts, as his letter to Count Linden illustrates:

How hard it feels to collect out here and not be able to send the things to Stuttgart, you can imagine. However, under the given circumstances, it can not be changed. I can not misuse the trust of my patron [presumably referring to Luschan]. But be convinced that from my private collection, which I am legally entitled to establish for scholarly purposes, there will be enough to satisfy your wide heart.

The extent and nature of the collected artefacts, however, as Dietrich Schleip acknowledges, remains unknown as neither Berlin nor Stuttgart have a complete collection. However,

---

508 For Krämer’s expanded research interests, see his article ‘Studienreise nach den Zentral- und Westkarolinen’, pp. 169-184. This new research focus is also expressed in Krämer’s later publication on Truk in connection with the Ergebnisse der Hamburger Südsee-Expedition 1908-1910. However, in their research, Addi’s knowledge of the language and area proved of immense importance. In the preface of his book on Truk, Krämer acknowledges that ‘I received some of the texts from Addi’, who also did most of the translation, p. x.

509 See Krämer’s article ‘Studienreise nach den Zentral- und Westkarolinen’, p. 172, translation by the author.

510 See Chapter Two.


512 Schleip, p. 77. Despite Berlin and Stuttgart, Schleip also mentions Tübingen as possible institutions housing Krämer’s collected material.
some of the artefacts are still part of the collections of both museums, as well as of the Schlossmuseum Hohentübingen.513

On 6 April Krämer and his wife left Truk on board the steamer Germania, bound for Palau. During a stop over at Yap, they met the Planet, whose new Commandant, Captain Kurtz, was an old friend of Krämer.514 He invited the Krämers to continue their travel to Palau on board his ship, which they accepted. Since the ship was to survey the devastation of a typhoon which had struck the area in late March 1907, the travel gave Krämer the chance to visit the small atolls of Mogemog and Wolea.515

In late April 1907 Krämer and his wife finally arrived in Palau, where they were to stay for another two months.516 During their first week they conducted a number of trips with the small Dampfboot (steam dingy) of the Planet, which was to measure the coastline. On this occasion Krämer felt the need to immortalise his wife and himself: ‘With the right, as we two were the first to explore and cartographically measure’, as he later expressed, he named the small island group south of Korror (Oreor) ‘Songél a Lise’ (‘Lise’s darling’).517

After the departure of the Planet on 28 April, the Krämers moved to the island of Babldáob. Together with their three servants (a half-caste from Yap named Johannes, who worked as their cook, and the two Palau islanders Mangelil and ‘Otto’ a Umáng), the couple took quarters in a bai near a Spanish mission station.518 Thereby ‘Otto’ a Umáng, who had learned his German from some Kapuziner (Capuchin) missionaries, worked as their translator.519

Since they had done their anthropometrical research during their previous visit to Palau, they now focused solely on ethnological research. The bai, the traditional man-house, and their

513 For the information I would like to thank Dr. Michel from the Linden Muesum in Stuttgart, Dr. Volker Harms from the Schlossmuseum Hohentübingen, as well as the direction of the Ethnologischen Museum in Berlin.

514 For details of their travels, see Krämer’s article ‘Studienreise nach den Zentral- und Westkarolinen’, pp. 169-170. As his diaries indicate, Krämer knew Korvettenkapitän (Captain) Kurtz from their common service in Kiel. Their reunion was celebrated on board the S.M.S. Planet with a dinner on 14 April 1907. Diaries held at the Linden Museum.

515 See Krämer’s article ‘Studienreise nach den Zentral- und Westkarolinen’, p. 170, where he states that this trip gave him the chance to visit these island groups. He further acknowledges that, although the typhoon of 23 March 1907 did not kill many people, it nevertheless devastated most of the houses and fruit crops.

516 The Krämers arrived on Palau on 21 April and remained on the island until their departure on 25 June 1907. For details of their arrival and stay on Palau see Krämer’s book Palau 1. Teilband; Ergebnisse der Südsee-Expedition 1908-1910, pp. 161 ff.

517 See Palau 1. Teilband; Ergebnisse der Südsee-Expedition 1908-1910, p. 191. See also Pytlík, p. 132 and Schleip, p. 77.

518 Ibid., pp. 193-195. Here Krämer describes that Johannes was the son of a German trader and a women from Yap.

519 Ibid.
ornaments thereby began to play a major role in their research, and continued to do so on their subsequent visits to Palau in 1909 and 1910.\textsuperscript{520}

---

\textbf{FIG. 4.10} Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow’s painting of a \textit{Bai} in Palau  
(Anna Pytlik \textit{Träume im Tropenlicht}, p. 138)

Elisabeth spent her time on Palau copying the carvings and ornaments on these houses while Krämer tried to collect as much information as possible about the meaning of the buildings.

\textsuperscript{520} The importance of the \textit{bai} in Krämer’s work also extends to their later visit, the \textit{Hamburg Südsee-Expedition} of 1909/10. The importance of these \textit{baís}, is not only illustrated in his preface \textit{Palau I. Teilband; Ergebnisse der Südsee-Expedition 1908-1910}, p. ix, but also in the fact, that he dedicated much of the last volume of his five volume monograph on Palau to these houses. See Krämer’s \textit{Palau, V. Teilband}, Abteilung: IX. Zierkunst und Kulturvergleich und X. Baiverzeichnis, \textit{Ergebnisse der Hamburger Südsee-Expedition 1908-1910}, edited by Dr. G. Thilenius, Hamburg, 1929. Krämer’s work on the \textit{bai} and Palauen artwork has also been positively stressed by Earl Wesley Jernigan in his PhD thesis ‘Lochukle: A Palauan Art Tradition’, University of Arizona, 1973. Jernigan argues that Krämer ‘gives the most complete account of the traditional material culture’, p. 39.
and the stories they depicted.\textsuperscript{521} During their visits they managed to list and visit approximately 100 \textit{bai}, many of which have now been lost.\textsuperscript{522} In addition to this research, Krämer also tried to collect information and visit objects which had been described by his predecessors.\textsuperscript{523}

Apart from this ethnological research, Krämer again engaged in the collection of ethnographic objects. However, as Schleip argues, he did so with hesitation, since his collected material was bound for Berlin and not, as Krämer would have liked, for Stuttgart.\textsuperscript{524}

As he stated in a letter to Count Linden in July 1907:

> You are disappointed that my ethnographic collection is destined for Berlin. There is no need that you are, because firstly I only sent the most expensive things to Berlin and secondly my private collection is so big that I, as an artist, am able to put their history kaleidoscopically into different [undecipherable]-positions. As for the rest, it is difficult to collect in Melanesia as officials and trade collect all out. Apart from this, by giving a large sum of money to the German school in your name, I have appeased Hahl and Thiel, who have some splendid things from {New Ireland}, and will present everything to you. ... From \textit{Pelau} I have sent a big \textit{bai} to Berlin, which cost many thousand marks, two bigger female figures [from the house gables] are in it for you, they are among the last ones in existence.\textsuperscript{525}

This comment once again illustrates Krämer’s belief in ‘salvage anthropology’, but also demonstrates his wish to collect for Stuttgart, which stood in direct relation to his hope of

---

\textsuperscript{521} Ibid. For their work sharing, see \textit{Palau I. Teilband: Ergebnisse der Südsee-Expedition 1908-1910}, pp.161 ff. Many of Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow’s drawings of the ornaments, as Dr. Volker Harms reported in a conversation in November 2006, are still part of the collections at the Museum in Schloss Hohentübingen.

\textsuperscript{522} In the preface to his fourth Volume, \textit{Palau, IV. Teilband}, Abteilung: VII. Geschichten und Gesänge und VIII. Botanischer, Zoologischer und Palauwörter-Index, Ergebnisse der Hamburger Südsee-Expedition 1908-1910, edited by Dr. G. Thilenius, Hamburg, 1929, Krämer reports that many of the \textit{bais} he had visited, had been destroyed as a result of an earthquake in 1926/1927 and a typhoon in May 1927. Another \textit{bai} he had visited had been destroyed during road-works by the Japanese, p. v.

\textsuperscript{523} As mentioned previously, Krämer aimed to use Kubary’s and Semper’s work, as well as his own observations, to write a monograph of the islands. Karl Semper had visited Palau in 1873, and subsequently published a book which, in 1982, was republished in an English translation: Karl Semper \textit{The Palau Islands in the Pacific Ocean}, translated by Mark L. Berg, edited by Robert D. Craig, Micronesian Area Research Centre, University of Guam, 1982, originally published 1873. It is, as the translator acknowledges in the preface, still regarded as one of the first and very detailed descriptions of life and culture in Palau at the time before it was taken over by Krämer’s five volume publication, pp. 1-2.

\textsuperscript{524} See Schleip, pp. 78-79.

\textsuperscript{525} In his letter to Count Linden, Krämer writes: ‘Sie waren etwas resigniert wegen meiner Ethnographika für Berlin. Es ist nicht nötig, dass Sie es sind, denn erstens habe ich in der Hauptsache nur die kostspieligen Sachen nach Berlin geschickt und zweitens ist meine Privatsammlung so groß, dass ich als Künstler instand bin, ihre Geschichte kaleidoskopartig in verschiedene [unlesbar]-stellungen zu versetzen. Im übrigen ist in Melanesien schwierig zu sammeln, da Beamte und Kaufleute um die Wette sammeln. Im übrigen habe ich aber Hahl durch ein größeres Geldgeschenk an die Deutsche Schule erneut im Hinweis auf Sie gültig gestimmt, und Thiel, der prachtvolle Sachen aus Neu-Mek [Neu Irland] hat, will alles Ihnen schenken ... Von \textit{Pelau} habe ich nur noch ein großes Bai nach Berlin beordert, das viele Tausend Mark kostet, zwei größere weibliche Figuren (Giebel) sind dabei für Sie, die letzten die es überhaupt noch gibt,’ (translation by the author). The letter, which is held at the Linden Museum, was written on board the \textit{Prinz Waldemar} and sent in July 1907. The name \textit{Pelau} is highlighted by Krämer, who argues that this spelling is the only correct one. See ‘Studienreise nach den Zentral-und Westkarolinen’, p. 179.
gaining a directorial position with an eventual established ethnological museum in Stuttgart.\textsuperscript{526}

The ‘sudden’ appearance of the Seestern on 25 June 1907, as Krämer later stated, ‘snatched us from our work’.\textsuperscript{527} With the ship, the couple returned to Matupi via Námutrek and Sétowanhad.\textsuperscript{528} In early July, Krämer and wife bade farewell to Governor Hahl and Max Thiel.\textsuperscript{529} Station Officer Winkler was asked to undertake the payment for, and sending of the \textit{bai} Krämer had ordered for the Museum in Berlin.\textsuperscript{530} On 11 July 1907 their expedition to the Pacific finally came to an end when the Krämers left Matupi on board the passenger steamer \textit{Sigismund}.\textsuperscript{531}

\section*{The End of Krämer’s Third Expedition to the Pacific: Homecoming and Evaluation}

Travelling via Hong Kong, Tokyo, Vladivostok and Moscow, the Krämers finally arrived back in Kiel on 17 September 1907.\textsuperscript{532} From there they first travelled to Berlin, where Krämer met von Luschan, and on to Stuttgart.\textsuperscript{533} Although Krämer resumed his position as Navy Surgeon in Kiel on 6 October, he continued, as his diaries illustrate, his frequent visits to Berlin.\textsuperscript{534} On these visits Krämer helped to organise and arrange his collected

\begin{thebibliography}{10}
\bibitem{526} See Chapter Seven.
\bibitem{527} Krämer ‘Studienreise nach den Zentral- und Westkarolinen’, p. 170.
\bibitem{528} Ibid., p. 170.
\bibitem{529} In his diary, Krämer notes that on 7 July that they had dinner with Hahl. A day later Thiel arrived on the same ship; the ship on which the Krämers were about to leave. Krämer’s diaries held at the Linden Museum.
\bibitem{530} For this purpose, Winkler, as Krämer’s diary reveals was given ‘1000 M (50 £) und … \textit{Addressen von Speditionen’}. The \textit{bai} was the same one he had mentioned in his letter to Count Linden from July 1907. He had ordered the house to be built, as his diaries reveal, in early May by the builder Golageril, stating that the house was: \textit{6 Klafterbreiten} long and 2 wide. As an aside, the house is still on exhibit at the Ethnological Museum in Berlin-Dahlem.
\bibitem{531} For the exact date of their departure and the name of the ship, see Krämer’s diary. The diary is held at the Linden Museum.
\bibitem{532} For their return travel, see Krämer’s diaries. He dedicates just two and a half pages to their return travel in which they went: from Hong Kong to Yokohama; Kobe; Kyoto; Tokyo; Nikko; Vladivostok; Irkusk; Moscow; St. Petersburg; Stockholm; Copenhagen and Kiel. On their arrival in Kiel on the morning of 17 September, Krämer noted: ‘\textit{Mittags nach Berlin’} (‘Midday to Berlin’). Diaries held at the Linden Museum.
\bibitem{533} See Krämer’s diaries held at the Linden Museum. He met Luschan in Dahlem. On 29 September Krämer travelled ‘alone’ to Stuttgart, where he met with Count Linden.
\bibitem{534} Krämer’s diaries reveal that he resumed work on 6 October in Kiel, where he also returned to his former residence at Molkestr. Nr 70. During this time he also continued to frequently travelled to Berlin, where he visited his parents-in-law and Luschan. On 22 December he received 14 days holiday, which he also spent in Berlin.
\end{thebibliography}
ethnographical materials, which were presented in a special exhibition by the Imperial Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin in March 1908.\textsuperscript{535} The \textit{bai} from Palau, which had arrived in the meantime, provided the central piece of this exhibition, which, as Pytlik points out, also contained a number of pictures and paintings by Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow.\textsuperscript{536} However, the exhibition was only of a brief duration, and the objects soon ‘disappeared into the overcrowded warehouses of the museum’.\textsuperscript{537} The short duration of the exhibition can also be seen as symbolic of Krämer’s brief stay in Germany, as later that year Krämer and his wife again left for the Pacific.\textsuperscript{538} This might be the reason why Krämer failed to publish any larger work about his third expedition. He only published a number of smaller articles on their travels which, like his article ‘Studienreise nach den Zentral- und Westkarolinen’, included a few ethnological observations, as well as some details of their travels.\textsuperscript{539}

The Imperial Naval Office on the other hand ‘tolerated no delay’.\textsuperscript{540} It had planned to publish the results and findings of the travels of the \textit{Planet} in five volumes under the title \textit{Forschungsreise S.M.S. Planet, 1906-7}.\textsuperscript{541} Krämer gave his anthropometrical material to Dr. Paul Hambruch, an ethnologist working at the Museum für Völkerkunde in Hamburg, and his phonographic recordings to Dr. Erich von Hornbostel, a psychologist and musicologist at the University of Berlin, for publication.\textsuperscript{542} He himself, as previously mentioned, contributed a small report on his travels through South Africa, as well as a monograph on the Hermit

\textsuperscript{535} See Pytlik, p. 18. In the process of the exhibition, as Pytlik argues, Johannes Kahlbaum, the main patron of the expedition was given the medal of the Red Eagle for his services to art and science.

\textsuperscript{536} Ibid. Pytlik reports that Elisabeth exhibited approximately 56 smaller aquarelles and pictures, which today seem to be lost, p. 18. The \textit{bai}, as an article in the \textit{Norddeutschen Zeitung} from 12 March 1908 illustrates, was the most impressive object of the exhibition.

\textsuperscript{537} Ibid., p. 18. Pytlik reports that the exhibition lasted only three weeks before the objects were removed and stored, ‘verschwanden in den Magazinen des schon übervollen Völkerkundemuseums’. The only exception, as mentioned, was the \textit{bai}, which has remained on display until the present day.

\textsuperscript{538} In July 1908 Krämer was approached by Luschan to take over the Reichs-Marine Expedition. See Chapter Five.


\textsuperscript{540} Schleip, p. 82.

\textsuperscript{541} The publication \textit{Forschungsreise S.M.S. Planet, 1906-7}, was edited and published by the Reichs Marine Amt in 1909: Vol. I was titled \textit{Reisebeschreibung} (travel report), Vol. II \textit{Aerologie}, Vol. III \textit{Oceanographie}, Vol. IV \textit{Biologie} and Vol. V \textit{Anthropologie und Ethnologie}.

\textsuperscript{542} See Krämer’s preface in Vol. V, pp. ix-x.
Islands. Some of Krämer’s notes, probably those from his official dairy (which he and other members of the expedition had to keep and which became property of the Navy) were also used in the publication. The publication of Krämer’s ethnological research and collected material on the Caroline Islands was to follow years later, in the publication *Ergebnisse der Hamburg Südsee-Expedition 1908-1910* (‘Results of the Hamburg South seas Expedition’).

Despite the fact that this expedition was originally not crowned by a large publication, as were his earlier research trips in Samoa, the expedition nevertheless had an important impact on Krämer’s development as an ethnologist, and on his research methods, as well as on his knowledge of Pacific peoples and their cultures. Firstly, it saw anthropometrical research become an integral part of Krämer’s enquiries. Although Krämer had engaged in ‘bone hunting’ activity during his previous expedition, the collection of anthropometrical data was now a significant component of his repertoire as an ethnologist. Secondly, this expedition saw Krämer employ a more structured and systematic approach to his ethnological research than on his previous travels. He also demonstrated a greater appreciation for longer visits and more *Tiefenarbeit* (stationary work), a fact which became a dominant feature of his later research in the Pacific. Thirdly, Krämer was able to use this expedition to make a number of contacts with colonial administrators and other European residents, which would be of great importance in his later work. Finally, Krämer’s research partnership with his wife had proved very fruitful, as she was not only a dedicated artist but also an able researcher in her own right, contributing much knowledge which otherwise would not have been accessible to Krämer. It is hardly surprising that their research partnership was to become a dominant feature of Krämer’s further ethnological research in the Pacific.

---

544 See Schleip, p. 82. Schleip’s assumption is supported by a comment of Captain Hans Lübbert, who had been in charge of the publication, that some descriptions ‘are based the notes of Navy Surgeon Prof. Dr. Krämer’, see Vol. I, *Forschungsreise S.M.S. Planet, 1906-7*, p. xvi.
545 In particular, this refers to the five volumes on Palau, which were published between 1917 and 1929, as well as Krämer’s Monograph on Truk, which was published in 1932.
Krämer’s Fourth Voyage to the Pacific:

The Deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09

In late October 1908, only 14 months after returning from their previous expedition, Augustin and Elisabeth were back in the Pacific. Krämer had been asked to lead the Deutsche Marine-Expedition (German Naval Expedition) from 1907 to 1909 after the sudden death of its previous leader, Navy Surgeon Dr. Emil Stephan. He accepted, but only on condition that his wife was allowed to accompany him. Elisabeth later published an account of their travel titled Bei kunstsinnigen Kannibalen der Südsee: Wanderungen auf Neu-Mecklenburg, 1908-1916 which remained the most detailed account of the second year of the Expedition. The Krämers eventually travelled over 1000 km through New Mecklenburg (New Ireland). Their arrival in New Mecklenburg had a profound impact on the course of this Expedition, as well as on Krämer’s further career as ethnologist, collector and fieldworker. The Expedition saw not only an increased cooperation between the Krämers, but also a redefined understanding and approach of his ethnological ‘fieldwork’. Both these aspects were again to play an important part during the future Hamburg Südsee-Expedition, which followed the Deutsche Marine-Expedition in smooth transition. However, Krämer’s eventual leadership of the Expedition was not without tension, which would contribute to his decision to retire from the Navy. Although the Expedition succeeded in collecting numerous ethnographic artefacts and much ethnological data, it was marked by the lack of a comprehensive publication. 


547 In his article ‘Deutsche wissenschaftliche Expeditionen und Forschungen in der Südsee bis 1914’, in Hermann Hiery ed. Die deutsche Südsee 1884-1914: Ein Handbuch, Ferdinand Schöningh, Paderborn, 2001, Markus Schindlbeck acknowledges: ’Leider ist nie eine geschlossene Publikation der Marine-Expedition erschienen’ (‘unfortunately there has never been a cohesive publication on the Navy Expedition’). Indeed, whereas many of the collected artefacts are still part of the collection (and present exhibition) of the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin Dahlem, the expedition is characterized by a lack of publication. Exceptions are the article ‘Die deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09’ in Reichs Marine Amt, ed. Sonder-Abruck aus der Marine Rundschau, Berlin 1910, pp. 1067-1069, which provides a brief report on the organisation and research focus of the Expedition, and the numerous (smaller) publications by Dr. Otto Schlaginhaufen: ‘Ein Besuch auf den
The Deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09

The Deutsche Marine-Expedition was a conjoint project between the Museum für Völkerkunde of Berlin and the German Navy. Planned over the course of two years, the Expedition was an expression of the close cooperation that had been developing between the two institutions. On the one hand, from the early twentieth century onwards naval officers functioned as collectors, contributing much to the growing ethnographical collection in Berlin and elsewhere. Eventually they even received some ethnological training to enhance their activity and quality of objects. On the other hand, the Navy also provided the means for ethnologists and scientists to get into the field. 548

Even though Krämer can be seen as part of this development, he was not involved in the arrangements. Instead the Expedition was the brainchild of Felix von Luschan, director of the Ethnological Museum in Berlin. Using the logistical resources of the Navy, Luschan's aim for the Expedition was the compilation of a complete collection of ethnographic artefacts for the Museum, as well as the comprehensive investigation of a region in German New Guinea,

---

the exact itinerary of which, however, was to be determined by the leader of the Expedition in cooperation with the local German colonial administration. Although the Navy officially took control of the Expedition in March 1907, it was the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin, namely Luschan himself, who remained in the driver’s seat.

This arrangement seems obvious given the scientific focus and the funding of the expedition. Of the estimated cost of 60.000 Marks (US$ 15.000), the Ministerium für Geistliche-, Medizial- und Unterrichtsangelegenheiten (“Prussian Ministry for Cultural Affairs”), which was also the main supporter of the Museum in Berlin, provided the lion’s share of 50.000 Marks (US$ 12.500). Apart from covering the cost of ethnographical purchases and equipment for the Expedition, the money was used to pay the salaries of the three civilian members, two scientists and a photographer.

See letter from the Staatssekretär des Reichsmarine Amt (Secretary of the Imperial Navy Office), W. Bode, to the Colonial Office of the Foreign Ministry from 29 April 1907, in which it is stated that: ‘The aim of the Expedition is to add to the scientific investigation of the German South Seas territories and, if possible, to support the practical aspects of colonial policy by investigating the lesser or completely unknown territories in regard to the character and life of the indigenous people, population density, possibility of labour recruitment, fertility, mineral resources, nature of the coast for ship traffic. In regard to the national character of the endeavour I will advise the survey ship “Planet” to support the aim of the expedition and kindly ask your excellency support the expedition …’. Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, R 1001/2370, translation by the author. See also Zimmerman, Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany, who states that ‘Luschan later explained that the “peculiar conditions in our protectorates and our previous experiences” made it preferable to keep such expeditions under the command of the navy’, p. 220. For the aim of the expedition, see Schade’s article ‘Fotografieren und ethnografisches Arbeiten: die “Deutsche Marine-Expedition (1907-1909)” nach Neuirland (Papua-Neuguinea)’, pp. 118-120. She also mentions that logistic resources of the Navy were of a financial and practical nature, and transport became affordable and the Expedition also received protection. The localisation of the expedition, however, was not fixed.

Historians agree that the taking of the command of the expedition by the Navy in March 1907 was rather a formality. Schleip argues that ‘faktisch führte aber das Berliner Museum für Völkerkunde (d. h. Luschan selbst) Regie’, p. 88. See also Schade, pp. 120-122; Zimmerman, Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany, pp. 220-226; and Buschmann, ‘Colonizing Anthropology: Albert Hahl and the Ethnographic Frontier in German New Guinea’, p.247.

For the funding of the Expedition, see Reichs Marine Amt, ed. ‘Die deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09’, pp. 1067-1068, which argues that the outstanding difference was paid by ‘other funds’. Further see Schade, pp. 119-120; Rainer Buschmann’s article ‘Franz Boluminski and the Wonderland of Carvings: Towards an Ethnography of Collection Activity’, in Baessler-Archiv, Neue Folge, Band XLIV (1996), pp. 195-196; Schleip, p. 88; and Anna Pytlik Träume im Tropenlicht; Forscherinnen auf Reisen, Coyote Verlag, Reutlingen, 1997, p. 20.

In her article, Annette Schade points out, that the photographic equipment of the Expedition alone cost 6.000 Marks (US$ 1.500), ‘a substantial part of the overall budget’. She also provides details of the equipment, pp. 126-127. In regard to the description of the members of the Expedition, see Reichs Marine Amt, ed. ‘Die deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09’, p. 1068; Augustin Krämer ‘Der Verlauf der Deutschen Marine-Expedition 1907 – 1909’, p. 14; Schindlbeck, p. 146; and Zimmerman Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany, pp.227-231. For their financial arrangements, see Schleip, p. 88 as well as Krämer’s preface in Elisabeth Bannow-Krämer’s book, pp. iv-v.
Edgar Walden (?-1914) was a geographer who, since 1901, had worked as a scientific assistant at the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin.\textsuperscript{553} The Swiss born Dr. Otto Schlaginhaufen (1879-1973) was the only trained anthropologist on the Expedition. He had worked at the Museum in Berlin before becoming an assistant to the anthropological collection at the Anthropologischen Museum in Dresden in 1906.\textsuperscript{554} Both of these men represented the scientific part of the Expedition.\textsuperscript{555} Richard Schilling (1883-1926), a former Gefreiter (private 1\textsuperscript{st} class), was employed as photographer and eventually came ‘to oversee the practical affairs of the expedition’.\textsuperscript{556} The salary of Navy Surgeon Dr. Emil Stephan, the leader and only (active) military member of the Expedition, who ‘would become an important liaison between the Navy and the Berlin Museum’, was covered by the Navy.\textsuperscript{557}

\textsuperscript{553} Closer details about Edgar Walden, who died on the Western Front during World War I, are scarce. Annette Schade reports that Walden, who became assistant to Luschan in 1901, had studied Geography at the University of Berlin, although without obtaining a degree, pp. 122-124. In his book Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany Zimmerman argues that ‘Walden did not get along well with Stephan or with German officials in charge’, he also had problems living ‘among the indigenous population, whom he considered hostile’, pp. 228-229. For further information on Walden and his problems with local German officials, see Rainer Buschmann’s article ‘Franz Boluminski and the Wonderland of Carvings: Towards an Ethnography of Collection Activity’, pp. 200-202.

\textsuperscript{554} In 1905, Schlaginhaufen had come to Berlin, where he worked with Virchow’s famous collection of skulls. In 1906, he eventually received the position in Dresden, from where he was granted leave to join the expedition. For information on Dr. Schlaginhaufen, see Christoph Keller Der Schädelvermesser. Otto Schlaginhaufen – Anthropologe und Rassenhygieniker. Eine biographische Reportage, Zürich, 1995 and Annette Schade, p. 122.

\textsuperscript{555} In his book Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany, Zimmerman reports that both Walden and Schlaginhaufen were chosen by Luschan. However he acknowledges that they both were not Luschan’s first choice, but a ‘zooligist, who had originally agreed to serve as a physical anthropologist …, backed out, explaining that he had a large collection of butterflies to arrange’, pp. 227-228. Based on Zimmerman’s footnote, p. 321, it can be presumed that this zoologist was Dr. Kurt Lampert, Krämer’s former patron and friend. For more information regarding Lampert, see Chapter Two.

\textsuperscript{556} Similarly to Edgar Walden, details about Richard Schilling remain scanty. For his impact on the expedition, see Zimmerman Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany, p. 228. For more details, see Annette Schade’s article, in which she argues that Luschan doubted Schilling’s ability as a photographer, pp. 127-128, although Schlaginhaufen referred to him as a Berufsfotografen (professional photographer), see Schlaginhaufen’s book Muliama. Zwei Jahre unter Südsee-Insulanern, p. 51.

\textsuperscript{557} See Zimmerman Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany, p. 221, see also Schade, p. 120 and Schleip, p. 88
FIG. 5.1 The members of the *Deutsche Marine-Expedition* 1907/09. Standing, left to right, Emil Stephan and Otto Schlaginhaufen. Seated, left to right, Edgar Walden and Richard Schilling.


Emil Stephan (1872-1908) had been chosen by Luschan, who, as Andrew Zimmerman argues, ‘preferred to entrust the navy with anthropological collecting, rather than turning it over to non-military professional anthropologists’. Like his predecessors, Stephan had

---

558 See Zimmerman *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany*, p. 220. See also Zimmerman’s article ‘Selin, Pore, and Emil Stephan in the Bismarck Archipelago: A “Fresh and Joyful Tale” of the Origins of Fieldwork’, where he evaluates Luschan’s reasoning in entrusting the Navy with collecting, pp. 70-71. Zimmerman argues that ‘Luschan was pleased when Stephan’s tour on the *Seagull* ended’, he eventually even ‘persuaded the Imperial Navy Office to give Stephan a medal and support the publication of his book’, p. 226 and p. 321. Schleip argues that Luschan purposely organized the Expedition to enable ‘Emil Stephan to engage in intensive fieldwork’, p. 88. Indeed, it has been suggested that the relationship between Stephan and Luschan was characterized by mutual respect. As Navy Surgeon, Stephan had served in China during the Boxer Rebellion before eventually being deployed in the Pacific. He became ‘the principle anthropologist in the German Navy’, see Zimmerman *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany*, pp. 226-228. For further biographical details on Emil Stephan, see also Karl Baumann, Dieter Klein, Wolfgang Apitzsch *Biographisches Handbuch Deutsch-Neuguinea, 1882-1922: Kurzlebensläufe ehemaliger Kolonisten, Forscher*,
received instructions ‘in anthropological observation, photography, measurements, and collecting’ at the ethnological museum in Berlin. During his deployment between 1905 and 1907 on board the S.M.S. Möwe in the Bismarck Archipelago, Stephan not only gaining his ‘Südsee Erfahrungen’ (‘South Seas Experience’), but he also proved himself to be an able ethnological observer and collector.

Believing in the ‘salvage’ doctrine, Stephan also shared Luschan’s belief that the collection of ethnographical artefacts was not just a mere ‘trophy’ hunt, but required systematic ethnological investigation. Stephan’s position is illustrated in his book Südseekunst; Beiträge zur Kunst des Bismarck-Archipels und zur Geschichte der Kunst überhaupt, in which he stated:

The primitive people go quickly towards their doom, and even before the physical death of their race, their old skills and knowledge wilt, once our iron culture breathed on them like a poisoned breath. … Out there life is still in full swing, but to salvage, we are not allowed to limit ourselves to buy ethnographical objects from somewhere and to fill our museum’s cupboards. Instead of ‘collecting’, ‘observation’ should be the new password. … Scholars have to go out on the spot to raise the treasures, which there, and especially in our protectorates, still exist in their richest abundance.

It was comments like this, as Annette Schade argues, ‘which made him the first choice of the Museum in Berlin’. However, whereas Stephan was Luschan’s first choice as leader of the Expedition, Krämer was certainly his second. In his position as Navy Surgeon, as well as due

---


See Zimmerman, Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany, who argues that ‘like his predecessors, Stephan was sent to Berlin Museum just before shipping out, to be instructed in anthropological observation, photography, measurements, and collecting’, p. 221. Schleip reports that Stephan was a pupil of Luschan, p. 88. See also Zimmerman’s article, pp. 70-72.

See Zimmerman Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany, p. 221, who argues that ‘he (Stephan) proved to be an enthusiastic and skilled collector, soon filling all the space available for artefacts on his ship’, an interest he had developed in correspondence with Luschan. A fact which is also mentioned by Schleip, pp. 88-89, Buschmann’s article’s articles ‘Colonizing Anthropology: Albert Hahl and the Ethnographic Frontier in German New Guinea’, p. 247, as well as Schade’s article, p. 122.

Luschan was dissatisfied with the collected artefacts he received from the commercial traders, company owners and visiting officers. See Rainer Buschmann’s article ‘Oceanic Carvings and Germanic Cravings: German Ethnographic Frontiers and Imperial Visions in the Pacific, 1870-1914’, pp. 308-310 and Zimmerman Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany, pp. 219-220.


Schade, p. 121, translation by the author.
to his experiences as ethnologist and collector, Krämer eventually became the obvious choice to replace Stephan at the helm of the Expedition, after the latter’s sudden death in the field.\footnote{In regard to Stephan’s death ‘im Felde’, see an obituary on Stephan, which is contained with Krämer’s diaries, held at the Linden Museum in Stuttgart.}

The first year of the Deutsche Marine-Expedition or ‘What happened previously’

In order to understand Krämer’s involvement in and his subsequent mark on the second year of the Deutsche Marine-Expedition, it is important to investigate the first year. It was during this time that fundamental decisions about the research focus, locality and organisation of the Expedition were made, all of which eventually formed Krämer’s ‘legacy’. On 3 November 1907 Dr. Stephan and the other members of the Expedition arrived in German New Guinea.\footnote{For details of the arrival, see Deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09. 1. Bericht, held at the Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, R 1001/2370, which indicates that the members arrived via passenger ship.} ‘On arrival at Herbertshöhe’, as Krämer later reported, ‘the field of work was to be chosen. The governor preferred to have the large island of New-Mecklenburg included in the scoop of investigation and thus Stephan agreed to go there.’\footnote{For quote, see Krämer ‘Der Verlauf der Deutschen Marine-Expedition 1907 – 1909’, p. 15, translation by the author.}

The reality behind Krämer’s words about the beginning of the Expedition, however, was characterised by a conflict between the Navy and the Colonial Office in Berlin, based on the decision about the location of the Expedition. The extent of the conflict becomes apparent when Luschan, in a letter to Stephan of 28 January 1908, stated:

In the Imperial Colonial Office the opinion about your expedition is, as always, absolutely bad; they are obviously jealous of the cooperation of the Navy.\footnote{Luschan quoted by Zimmerman Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany, pp. 220-221, p. 221. See also Schade’s article, p. 120.}

Bernard Dernburg, a reforming liberal who headed the newly established Colonial Office, feared an increased Navy influence in colonial affairs, arguing that the Expedition ‘would only burden local administrators and risking provoking further colonial scandals if they were
So, as the historian Andrew Zimmerman concludes, Dernburg ‘was probably right: the Expedition was for Tirpitz [Admiral Alfred von Tirpitz (1848-1930) was Commander-in-Chief of the German Navy] a way of meddling in colonial affairs and increasing the popular profile of the Navy at the expense of the Colonial Office’.

However, since ‘the success on the endeavour depended on the support from the Colonial Office’, a compromise had to be found. Eventually it was agreed that ‘closer decisions about the field or fields of research of the Expedition were to be determined on the spot on approval of the Imperial Governor of German New Guinea Dr. Hahl’.

FIG. 5.2 Dr. Albert Hahl
(Hermann Hiery ed. Die deutsche Südsee 1884-1914, platte 34)

See Zimmerman Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany, pp. 220-221. For further information on Dernburg and his policy, see Charles Stephenson Germany’s Asia-Pacific Empire: Colonialism and Naval Policy 1885-1914, Boydell Press, Rochester N. Y., 2009, pp. 60-62.

Ibid., p. 221.

See letter from Secretary of the Imperial Navy Office, K. Bode, to the Colonial Office of the Foreign Ministry dated 29 April 1907 in which he argues: ‘A complete success of the endeavour, which is of great importance for the Royal Museums, however is only guaranteed, if also the Colonial Office provides every application. It would be welcomed if, for the duration of the Expedition in the South Seas, 8-10 indigenous members of the police force could be deployed, the expenses of which the colonial office would cover’, Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, R 1001/2370, translation by the author. Indeed, the Expedition was reliant on the local colonial administration for security and re-supply, especially since the Expedition, as Rainer Buschmann argues, ‘was not a particular mobile affair’, p. 247.

See Reichs Marine Amt, ed. ‘Die Deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09’, p. 1068, where it is stated that the ‘place and localization of the Expedition would be decided by the Imperial Governor Dr. Hahl’, translation by the author.
Dr. Albert Hahl (1868-1945) had served as Imperial Judge and Vice Governor in the Caroline Islands before becoming Governor of German New Guinea in 1902. During his assignments in the Pacific, Hahl had developed a keen interest in ethnological and ethno graphical research, which he thought able to provide useful knowledge for effective colonial government. He emphasized especially the importance of knowledge of local languages. From his pragmatic view of ethnology Hahl was suspicious of Stephan’s ‘abstract’ research focus. This was evident in Hahl’s comment about Stephan’s monograph *Südseekunst*:

I had trouble keeping awake reading your booklet, since I have no intention to interrogate the latest art theories. In the book about [New Ireland], I have underlined many questionable passages where the Pidgin English has fooled you in your translation process. Beware of this main enemy of research that prevents clear communications with the natives … The number of misunderstandings in my field are

---


573 Hahl’s belief in the usefulness of ethnological knowledge, a thorough understanding of the social structure and language, was certainly based on his experiences as administrator and judge. Due to the long distances and slow communication, he had only a small indigenous police force to implement his will and thus came to rely on a good relationship with his ‘indigenous subjects’. Hahl was able to increase his status, as well as the political and economic advancement of Germany, in the region. It is remarked that ‘Hahl’s “invented” System [of the *luluai*] was so exemplary, that it was taken over by the Australians who ruled from 1914 and was kept until independence’, Klein, p. 261. See also Hermann Hiery *Das Deutsche Reich in der Südsee (1900-1921)*, Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1995, pp. 115-114 and ‘Die deutsche Verwaltung Neuguineas 1884-1914’, in Hermann Hiery ed. *Die deutsche Südsee 1884-1914: Ein Handbuch*, Ferdinand Schöningh, Paderborn, 2001, pp. 299-303. In regard to Hahl’s relationship with ethnology, see Albert Hahl *Governeursjahre in Neuguinea*, which provides many examples of Hahl’s reliance on good communications with his indigenous subjects, see also Peter Sack’s foreword, Rainer Buschmann, ‘Oceanic Carvings and Germanic Cravings: German Ethnographic Frontiers and Imperial Visions in the Pacific, 1870-1914’, pp. 312-314 and ‘Colonizing Anthropology: Albert Hahl and the Ethnographic Frontier in German New Guinea’, pp. 299-315. Apart from using ethnological knowledge, Hahl was also a great collector himself, collecting for various museums, among them Stuttgart, Munich and Berlin. See Dieter Klein’s article, pp. 260-268, as well as Count Linden’s correspondence with Hahl, held at the Linden Museum.
legion. For instance, how can we establish a language of legality if we are lacking even the most basic concepts?\textsuperscript{574}

Despite his dislike of Stephan’s research and the customary collection of artefacts among the Expedition members, Hahl nevertheless saw the utility of the \textit{Deutsche Marine-Expedition}. His aim for this Expedition, as well as for others, was, as Rainer Buschmann argues, to ‘provide careful census data of the area, most notable the ratio of males to females among the indigenous population’ and ‘to replace pidgin English with more “meaningful” vernaculars’.\textsuperscript{575} With Hahl’s encouragement, it was decided to make the ‘relatively uncolonized south-eastern half of New Mecklenburg’ the main focus of the Expedition.\textsuperscript{576}


\textsuperscript{575} See Buschmann’s article ‘Colonizing Anthropology: Albert Hahl and the Ethnographic Frontier in German New Guinea’, p. 246. Apart from the \textit{Deutsche Marine-Expedition}, Hahl had to accommodate the \textit{Hamburg Südsee-Expedition} (1908-1910) and the \textit{Sapper-Friederici Expedition} (Geographical Commission Expedition) (1908), which also researched on New Ireland, as well as the research travels of Richard Thurnwald (1906-1909). For details of these expeditions, see Schindlbeck, pp. 144-150.

\textsuperscript{576} In his article ‘Der Verlauf der Deutschen Marine-Expedition 1907-1909’, Krämer describes that, by 1908, New Mecklenburg had 2 administrative posts (in Käwieng and Namatanai), and 4 mission stations (2 Catholic and 2 Methodist), p. 15. Although the scientific aim of the Expedition was focused on New Britain, Hahl thought New Ireland of greater importance for his further (economic) plans in the colony. See Buschmann ‘Colonizing Anthropology: Albert Hahl and the Ethnographic Frontier in German New Guinea’, pp. 240-250, who argues that Hahl ‘invested considerable energy in redirecting the Expedition to New Ireland, arguing that the harsh climate and difficult access to the originally targeted area would threaten the safety of the Expedition’, p. 248. See also Schleip, pp. 91-94.
On 28 November 1907 the members of the Expedition left Matupi aboard the Planet to travel to their designated fields of research. In Käwieng, the north-western part of the island, Edgar Walden left the ship, while the remaining members travelled further to Muliama, near the southern tip of New Mecklenburg.
On midday of 29 November, Stephan, Schlaginhaufen and Schilling finally arrived at their destination of Muliama Harbour. The harbour, as described in the 2nd official report of the Expedition, was ‘a nearly round, against all winds protected, piece of land, which however provided place for only one larger ship’. The locality of Muliama as research headquarters for the Expedition was also described as ‘favourable’:

The working area will extend itself among the coast, from Likikiki (approximately 120 km) to the south to Namatanai (around 100 km) to the north. … Despite the fact that the area has been pacified for only 2 years, it even today offers enough security to facilitate thorough ethnological research, on the other hand it is still untouched enough, that the customs and practises of the people can be studied in all their originality.

---

579 See Deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09. 2. Bericht, p. 2, held at the Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, R 1001/2370, highlighted in original text, translation by the author. In regard to the size and suitability of the harbour, Captain Kurtz of the Planet remarked on a renewed entrance of the small harbour, that ‘never ever will I enter this hole’. See Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, p. 6, translation by the author.

580 Ibid., p. 2, translation by the author.
With the help of the crew of the *Planet* which had entered the harbour, and of Dr. Hahl, who arrived with the *Seestern* a few days later, the Expedition set up camp.\(^{581}\)

The camp consists of a few huts at the beach, which had been built by 2 Chinese a few years ago. Since both owners died without heirs, their property fell to the government. On a coral step of approximately 15 metres height are 3 tents and a little further up are some houses built from the native’s materials. All of this is embedded in a coconut plantation, which borders a village to the east, the jungle to the south and west, and the open sea to the north, whose breakers break their power on offshore reefs. The water is delivered by a cool mountain stream, which breaks over many coral terraces and which eventually forms a waterfall just before entering the sea. Navy surgeon Dr. Stephan, Dr. Schlaginhaufen and photographer Schilling represented the white; the Chinese cook, 9 police soldiers and 11 workers the coloured crew.\(^{582}\)

The house of the former Chinese traders served as the main workplace and became known as ‘*Schloss Muliama*’ (‘Castle Muliama’).\(^{583}\) It was here that the members of the Expedition

---

\(^{581}\) Ibid., p.1. The report mentions that Dr. Hahl arrived in Muliama on 4 December to help with the set-up of the camp. See further Krämer’s article ‘Der Verlauf der Deutschen Marine Expedition 1907-1909’, where he acknowledged the help from the crew from the *Planet*, p. 16.

\(^{582}\) See Deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09. 2. Bericht, p. 3, held at the Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, R 1001/2370, translation by the author. For a further description on the set-up of the camp, see Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, pp. 8-12; Krämer’s article ‘Der Verlauf der Deutschen Marine Expedition 1907-1909’, p. 16; and Schlaginhaufen *Muliama. Zwei Jahre unter Südsee-Insulanern*, pp. 39-49.

\(^{583}\) See Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, pp. 10-11, whose drawing even depicts a sign on the door stating ‘Schloß Muliama’. Also see Zimmerman, *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany*, p. 231 and his article
wrote their journals and diaries. Although Stephan had led the Expedition ‘off the deck of a ship into a relatively uncontrolled area, he did everything he could to reproduce navy discipline within his camp’. This included the setting up of a strict regime for the members of the Expedition. A blast from his whistle before sunrise started the working day. A second blast at 11:00 am indicated lunch break. From then the members of the Expedition worked until dark, before retiring to their quarters at around 9:00 pm; ‘alcohol was strictly forbidden’. Schilling, apart from his function as photographer, was placed in charge of overseeing the workers and police soldiers. Schlaginhaufen became responsible for physical anthropological measurements and the collection of ethnographic artefacts, whereas Stephan himself ‘devoted his time to studying the mental culture and society of the local inhabitants’.

Given the researchers’ focus, the establishment of good relations with the local inhabitants became crucial for a successful expedition. It has been argued that, despite a slow start, Stephan eventually proved quite successful in establishing these sorts of contact, by frequently meeting with members of different surrounding villages. Apart from learning the local dialects, Stephan did so, as Andrew Zimmerman argues, ‘by assuming three colonial roles: merchant, doctor, and colonial administrator’. Stephan held ‘daily polyclinics’, where he treated local villagers, who frequently suffered from ‘unbelievable neglected wounds’. He even, as Zimmerman points out, performed some dental work, keeping ‘the pulled teeth for his collection’.

---

584 See Zimmerman, Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany, who argues that ‘Stephan and Schlaginhaufen used the merchants’ house as a headquarters to write the journals that the expedition contract required them to keep (and which provide an important source for [his] chapter)’, p. 231.

585 Ibid., p. 232. Zimmerman argues that this organization was not an expression of Stephan’s insecurity in regard to a unknown environment, but rather an attempt ‘to model his land-based work on the naval practices that had previously given him such success’. See also Zimmerman’s article ‘Selin, Pore, and Emil Stephan in the Bismarck Archipelago: A “Fresh and Joyful Tale” of the Origins of Fieldwork’, p. 78.

586 For a detailed description of the daily routine in the camp, see Zimmerman, Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany, p. 232. Also see Zimmerman’s article ‘Selin, Pore, and Emil Stephan in the Bismarck Archipelago: A “Fresh and Joyful Tale” of the Origins of Fieldwork’, pp. 77-78.


588 See Krämer’s preface in Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow’s book, p. v; see also Zimmerman’s book, pp. 233-234, and article, pp. 78-79, as well as Schleip, pp. 94-95.


590 Emil Stephan quoted by Zimmerman, Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany, p. 233.

591 Ibid., pp. 233-234.
certainly one method which helped Stephan to establish contact, one which Krämer himself had used successfully during his own research.\(^{592}\)

![FIG. 5.4](image)

**FIG. 5.4** Stephan, seated, administers medical attention to local residents near the camp. Schlaginhaufen looks on.

(Andrew Zimmerman *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany*, p. 234)

Apart from his role as doctor, Stephan also ‘played the unauthorized role of colonial judge to interact with the local population’.\(^{593}\) He acted as the ‘top judicial authority in the area, both within the camp and in the area surrounding it’, becoming increasingly involved in local affairs.\(^{594}\) It is, however, debatable whether he actively sought this role or if it was presented to him by the local population in an area which lacked colonial representation of any kind. The latter situation certainly applied to Krämer, who, as his wife later mentioned, was approached by ‘some natives with demands and wishes for his judgement’.\(^{595}\) In establishing his contacts, Stephan was also helped by ‘the enormous amount of trade goods the expedition

---

\(^{592}\) See Chapter Two. There it is already indicated that Krämer used his medical expertise to gain information from the Samoans.

\(^{593}\) See Zimmerman, *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany*, p. 233. See also Zimmerman’s article, pp. 78-79.

\(^{594}\) Ibid. In his book, Zimmerman presents the example that Stephan was approached to judge the fate of a man who was accused of being a sorcerer, pp. 233-234.

\(^{595}\) See Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow’s book, where she states that ‘Verschiedentlich kamen Eingeborene zu Krämer mit Klagen und dem Wunsch seines Urteilsspruches’, p. 47, translation by the author.
had brought’, which eventually made the locals ‘eager assistants’. The camp developed itself into a ‘trade hub’, with people coming from near and far to sell ethnographical artefacts to Stephan, Schilling and Schlaginhaufen. While this helped Schlaginhaufen in his collecting, it ‘also gave Stephan a way to contact informants’. Eventually, as Zimmerman concludes, ‘the camp was so economically enticing to the locals that the Expedition members began to feel overwhelmed by the amount of artefacts, phonographic recordings on wax cylinders, and observations that they had catalogued’.

Because of the wide variety of people and artefacts arriving in the camp, Stephan, Schlaginhaufen and Schilling decided to go on an excursion to investigate the wider catchments area. On 7 May they left Mulima and made their way south, on what was to be Stephan’s last trip. Shortly after departure he fell ill with blackwater fever, a deadly complication of malaria. Apparently, as Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow later reported, he had refused to take quinine. On the morning of 25 May 1908, on his way to the hospital at Herbertshöhe, Stephan died in Namatanai. He was buried later that day in the presence of ‘the members of the Expedition Dr. Schlaginhaufen and Schilling, the Catholic mission and all administrative staff and settlers in the area’.

---

597 Ibid. Zimmerman mentions that this trade was also helped by a few Chinese merchants who had traded along the coast for a long time and who provided transport for people and artefacts to come to Mulima, p. 78. See also Zimmerman’s book, p. 233.
598 Ibid., p. 78.
599 Zimmerman, Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany, p. 233.
601 See Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, who argues that Stephan ignored the early on-set of his illness, believing it to be stomach problems, pp. 3-5. Also see Zimmerman Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany, p. 235.
602 See the report by Amtsmann (Colonial Official) Wilhelm Wostack to the Imperial Governor of German New Guinea from 25 May 1908. In the report, Wostack provides the exact date of Stephan’s death to be 25 May at 4.15 am. The report is held at the Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, R 1001/2370. For further information surrounding Stephan’s death and burial, see also Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, pp. 3-4 and p. 246.
FIG. 5.5  Telegram to the Colonial Office in Berlin, reporting on
Stephan’s death.
(Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde., R 1001/2370)

Stephan’s death was a decisive blow to the Deutsche Marine-Expedition. While the
Expedition paused, Schlaginhaufen and Schilling going to Herbertshöhe to settle the
formalities and to have a few weeks rest, the notification of his death created great concern in
Berlin. A replacement had to be found quickly in order to guarantee the continuation of the
Expedition.

605 Ibid. The report by Wostack mentions that Schlaginhaufen and Schilling planned to travel on to
Herbertshöhe, where they wanted to rest before eventually returning to Muliama later that year. Zimmerman
notes in his article ‘Selin, Pore, and Emil Stephan in the Bismarck Archipelago: A “Fresh and Joyful Tale” of
the Origins of Fieldwork’ that, whereas ‘there is no record of how Richard Schilling … spent the expedition’s
interregnum’, Schlaginhaufen spent some time in Herbertshöhe, ‘likely enjoying the hospitality of Max Thiel’,
p. 80. Schlaginhaufen also conducted brief trips to the nearby islands of Tangga and Feni-Anir. See Krämer’s
Luschan was quick in picking Krämer as replacement for Stephan. His decision, as Dietrich Schleip points out, was as much based on Krämer’s experience as on his professional relationship with the Navy. Because, as Schleip states, ‘only a member of the Navy, if possible of the medical corps’, could take Stephan’s place, otherwise ‘the whole finance concept of the expedition was to be thrown into turmoil’. Krämer himself certainly saw this decision coming. In his preface to Elisabeth’s book *Bei kunstsinnigen Kannibalen der Südsee*, he stated:

> When the terrible news arrived in Germany, I began to fear that I was to be appointed to finish the expedition. … The fear soon became reality, as shortly afterwards I was asked if I would be prepared to take over Stephan’s succession. I accepted, but only under the condition that my wife was to accompany me as my assistant and for the study of women’s life, which especially in Melanesia is hard to do by men.

Eventually his demands were met. Having Krämer’s wife accompany him, as Annette Schade points out, ‘proved no problem to Luschan’. Thus, in August 1908, Krämer was officially declared Stephan’s successor as leader of the *Deutsche Marine-Expedition* and, in September of that year, he and his wife left again for the Pacific.

The second year of the *Deutsche Marine-Expedition*, or ‘The year Krämer takes over’.

In early November 1908, ‘five and half months [after Stephan’s death]’, as Krämer later reported, ‘my wife and I arrived in Muliama, sent as replacement by the Imperial Navy’. With Krämer’s arrival, the *Deutsche Marine-Expedition* not only had a new leader but also entered its official second year. However, this second ‘year’ was to consist of only seven

---

606 For Luschan’s decision to pick Krämer as replacement for Stephan, see Schade’s article, p. 122; Zimmerman, *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany*, p. 235 and Schleip, pp. 89-90.
607 Schleip, pp. 89-90, translation by the author.
609 See Annette Schade’s article, p. 122. She adds, however, that ‘her travel expenses had to be paid by private means’. In this regard, Anna Pytlik argues, Krämer was later able to receive a refund for the travel expenses of his wife from the Navy, p. 20.
610 See letter from the Secretary of the Imperial Naval Office to the Colonial Office from 11 August 1908, held at the Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, R 1001/2370, informing that Krämer has been determined to succeed Stephan. See also Krämer’s preface in Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow’s book, pp. iv-vi.
611 See Krämer ‘Der Verlauf der Deutschen Marine-Expedition 1907-1909’, p 17, translation by the author. Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow stated that they arrived in Muliama on 7 November at 5 am, p. 5. Krämer’s diaries, which are held at the Linden Museum in Stuttgart, reveal that they travelled via Genoa, Colombo and Australia (Adelaide, Melbourne and Sydney) to New Guinea, where they arrived on 28 October 1908.
months due to the Krämers’ agreed participation in the *Hamburg Südsee-Expedition* in June 1909.612 This time pressure, as well as Krämer’s focus on the collection of ethnographic artefacts, had important influence on his leadership of the *Deutsche Marine-Expedition*. ‘Rather than stability’, as the historian Rainer Buschmann argues, ‘Krämer’s dispatch triggered a wave of protest by the other expedition members, who wished to operate independently’; a protest, which was as much based on professional as on personal differences.613

Schlaginhaufen, for example, saw ‘the appointment of a second collector as a “vote of no confidence” in his own collecting abilities’.614 Krämer’s participation, with his newly introduced methods and his style of leadership, not only contributed to a growing conflict between him, the other members of the Expedition and the involved institutions, namely the Museum in Berlin and the Navy, but also to a change in the research work of the Expedition. Both aspects were to have an important impact on the outcome of the Expedition, as well as on Krämer’s further career as an ethnologist.

![Image](image_url)

**FIG. 5.6 ‘Harbour of Muliana’**

*(Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow *Bei kunstsinigen Kannibalen der Südsee*, p. 6)*

---

612 See Krämer’s preface in Elisabeth Krämer’s book, where he stated that already in early 1908 he had agreed to takeover the scientific leadership of the *Hamburg Südsee-Expedition*, pp. v-vi. See also Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, p. 243. For more information on Krämer’s involvement and planning of the *Hamburg Südsee-Expedition*, see Chapter Six.


On their arrival in Muliama the Krämers were greeted by Dr. Schlaginaufen and Schilling, ‘who appeared welcoming on the shore’, as well as by ‘a larger number of black boys’, who helped to bring their luggage to camp.\textsuperscript{615} Krämer and his wife were to move into Stephan’s former living quarters, one of the small huts in the camp.\textsuperscript{616} That evening, their arrival was celebrated with an opulent dinner which, as Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow argues, ‘had more to do with the canning factory than with the abilities of the Chinese cook’, before pointing out that ‘our limited supplies however did not allow any recurrence’.\textsuperscript{617} In fact, it was in regard to the supplies that Krämer’s presence as the new leader of the Expedition was first felt.

The food supply of the Expedition and all its members was indeed problematic since the surrounding villages had hardly any surplus foodstuffs and were only seldom willing to sell the few resources they had.\textsuperscript{618} Additionally, it has to be pointed out that re-supply by ship was also unreliable, since there was no regular contact system, nor did the Expedition have a ship at its own disposal.\textsuperscript{619} Thus, shortly after his arrival Krämer decided to send twenty servants back to their home villages in order to save on food.\textsuperscript{620}

He and his wife also conducted a survey of the Expedition’s inventory, which gave rise to more criticism. Elisabeth reported that, ‘in the first few days, there was much to be arranged, supplies had to be surveyed and their use had to be determined’.\textsuperscript{621} The lack of some supplies on the one hand and the ‘exaggerated purchase of useless things’ on the other hand, ‘hurt [her] Hausfrauenherz (‘housewifely heart’):

Neither cutlery nor serviettes were to be found, hardly any crockery, no bucket not even a teapot. Oh these men folk! – Worse however was the fact that the rice became scare.\textsuperscript{622}

\textsuperscript{615} Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, p. 6, translation by the author.

\textsuperscript{616} Ibid., p. 8. Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow reports that the hut was rather small and ‘for the largest part filled with our own built bedstead … The wonky floor was more of a concern, as the small floorboards were laid on a small frame, supported only by one crossbeam. When the weighty figure of my husband entered, the house begun to groan and sway’, translation by the author.

\textsuperscript{617} Ibid., pp. 7-8. Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow states that the Expedition had the luxury of a Chinese cook, whose name was Ah Tun. She states that, once he depended on his own abilities rather than European canned food, he developed into ‘an inventive genie’.

\textsuperscript{618} Schleip, p. 98.

\textsuperscript{619} The lack of an expedition-boat, which, as Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow argues, was caused by insufficient finances, was perceived as ‘hindering’, to the Expedition’s progress, p. 11.

\textsuperscript{620} Ibid., p. 12. She reports that the lack of rice was a matter of concern: ‘a large number of our servants use a lot (of it)’. In her book, Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow dedicates quite a lot of time towards food supplies and the lack thereof. She became a keen gardener in order to supplement the food resources.

\textsuperscript{621} Ibid., p. 11.

\textsuperscript{622} Ibid., pp. 11-12, translation by the author.
Elisabeth’s rather general and public account about the domestic supplies, or rather their lack, hid Krämer’s review of the equipment and work processes of the Expedition. His criticism was certainly much more personal, and as such was kept private due to the commonly held assumption that ‘one was duty-bound to protect one’s fellow human beings and, in particular, one’s subordinates’. However, this is not to say that there was not such criticism. With regard to Luschan for example, Rainer Buschmann notes, that he re-edited Hahl’s correspondence to him due to the number of critical remarks he had made about the Expedition and its members. It can be assumed that Krämer was not exempted from criticism.

Thus it can further be assumed that the reality of the conditions of the Expedition certainly looked different than those which were portrayed. Dietrich Schleip reports that the photographer Schilling ‘received Belehrungen (‘directions’) on how he had to set up his darkroom’, which Krämer himself used to develop his own photographs. Although the nature of Krämer’s assessment of Schlaginhaufen remains unknown, it can be alleged that it regarded the processes of the Expedition’s research. That becomes evident when, not long after Krämer’s arrival, Schlaginhaufen was sent for four weeks to the island of Lir (Lihir). The reason for this was that the ‘exploration of this island [in contrast to the islands of Tangga and Feni-Anir, which Schlaginhaufen had visited earlier] was still missing’. Even the late Stephan was not spared from criticism. A fact which becomes obvious, when Elisabeth argued:

623 See Peter Sack’s preface in Albert Hahl’s Governeursjahre in Neuguinea, edited by Wilfried Wagner, Hamburg, 1997, p. xx. Sack also mentions that some topics, like sex, were not seen as suitable for a wider audience. Although Sack’s comments are made with particular connection to Hahl’s work, his argument can be generalized, since it seems that most temporary reports and accounts which were consulted for the present thesis follow the same pattern. Krämer’s published material on the Expedition, for example, contains no open critique on any member or organization involved.

624 See Buschmann’s article ‘Colonizing Anthropology: Albert Hahl and the Ethnographic Frontier in German New Guinea’, pp. 251-253.

625 See Schleip, p. 99. In regard to Krämer’s own use of the darkroom, see Annette Schade, pp. 130-139, who claims that in contrast to Schlaginhaufen and Stephan, who both let Schilling take most of the photographs, Krämer himself was an engaged photographer. As Anna Pytlik stresses, this also applied to Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, who took and developed photographs herself, pp. 55-59.

626 See Krämer’s article ‘Der Verlauf der deutschen Marine-Expedition 1907-1909’, p. 17, in which he stated Schlaginhaufen had researched the two islands, but not Lir; ‘shortly after my arrival a Chinese boat passed, so I sent him [Schlaginhaufen] there, I gave order to the captain to pick him up after four weeks and to bring him to middle New Mecklenburg’, translation by the author.
Unfortunately, during the first year one had missed the opportunity to train a translator in German. Stephan had let only himself learn the Muliana-language, and this ability died with [him].  

The lack of a trained translator and the subsequent communication problems proved an important obstacle for Krämer and his intended research, especially if, as Schleip adds, ‘he was not to rely on Schlaginhaufen for assistance’. In order to overcome this lack, the Krämers began their work with the training of a translator. Their choice fell to ‘the 15 year old Tondo, who had shown himself as clever and interested’. Tondo’s training, as Elisabeth later reported, had to happen in two steps. First he had to improve his Pidgin-English, which was essential for immediate communication. Secondly, he was instructed in the German language, in which, as she later stressed, ‘he accomplished a lot, as he accompanied us on our further travels’.

---

627 Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, p. 20.
628 See Schleip, p. 99. However, it has to be stressed that the problem was not just a personal one, as Krämer, through his own previous experiences, was well aware of the importance of a translator.
629 See Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, pp. 20-21. Tondo had been a servant in the camp.
630 Ibid, pp. 20-21. Eventually Tondo accompanied the Krämers on their following travels through Palau, p. 263. For further information on Tondo and his improvement in regard to his language abilities, see Krämer’s article ‘Redet Deutsch in unseren Kolonien!’, in Deutsche Kolonialzeitung, 30, no. 24, 1913, pp. 406-407.
Apart from training Tondo and organising and rearranging the Expedition and its equipment and supplies, the Krämers used their time in Muliama to investigate the local area and to make small excursions into the hinterland.  

However, in their attempts to engage with the local population, they generally found the villages deserted, ‘apart from a few old men and women’. It has been suggested that this was a reaction to increased visits of the labour recruiting vessel *Senta* in early December 1908. When the ship left, the surrounding villages complained that a number of their young

---

631 See ibid., pp. 26-50. These excursions normally lasted one to two days and, apart from the Krämers, were accompanied by Tondo, a few police soldiers and a few porters. See also Schleip, pp. 99-100.
632 On their visits to the different villages, the Krämers normally found the villages empty, with the inhabitants hiding in the bushes. See Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, p. 20, 29 and 41. However, she acknowledged that in the villages closer to Muliama this, ‘typical Melanesian behaviour’ had already vanished, p. 20.
633 See Schleip, pp. 99-100. For details of the visit of the *Senta*, see Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, pp. 45-47. For additional information on the *Senta*, see Dieter Klein’s article ‘Befrag die Meere aller Zonen: Der Fliegende Holländer in der Südsee?’, in *Bayreuther Festspiele-Zeitschrift*, 2008, pp. 10-12.
men and women were missing.\textsuperscript{634} As Dietrich Schleip points out, since the crew of the \textit{Senta} had been welcomed and hosted by the Krämers during the vessel’s brief stay in the harbour, the local population was to assume that the Krämers had cooperated in the event.\textsuperscript{635} Eventually it was, as Elisabeth reported, ‘only with great difficulty and much effort, that Krämer succeeded in penetrating the \textit{Geistesleben} (spiritual life) of the natives’.\textsuperscript{636} In doing so he was certainly helped by his wife and her rather gentle approach:

Painting and sketching remained my main activity during the early time [of the Expedition]. This was most suitable to approach the shy and reserved people. Since I had to return to the village more than once, where I sat down quietly to finish my pictures, the people began to get used to me, even the women, who in particular are very shy. In the end there was always something like a dialogue.\textsuperscript{637}

This was an approach which would be important for the further course of Krämer’s research in Melanesia. However, the process was slow, which was of great concern given the limited time. This contributed to Krämer’s decision to shift the camp (and field of research) from Muliama to the village of Lamasong, approximately 200 km distant to the north of New Mecklenburg.\textsuperscript{638} In his later published report ‘\textit{Der Verlauf der Deutschen Marine-Expedition 1907-1909}’ he stated:

I had decided to move camp from Muliama to the formerly mentioned Lamasong, in order to enable me to use my remaining 5 months for research in middle New Mecklenburg, whereas Schlaginhaufen kept the southern, and Walden the northern part. Only this was possible, given the advanced timeframe and the size of the area, to allow reasonable monographic work. \textsuperscript{639}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{634} See ibid., p. 47, Klein argues: ‘When the “\textit{Senta}” left the next morning, Toelilian complained and whined that his village of Piglinbui was missing its strongest and best youths, the pillars of the chief in all big works and celebrations. … Even in other villages people, girls, women and men, and nearly the full bloom of their society was missing’, translation by the author.

\textsuperscript{635} Schleip, pp. 99-100.

\textsuperscript{636} Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, p. 20, translation by the author.

\textsuperscript{637} Ibid., pp. 34-36, translation by the author.

\textsuperscript{638} There are variations in interpretations of the distance between Muliama and Lamasong. Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow stated that the distance was 250 km, p. 51, whereas Krämer argues in his article Der \textit{Verlauf der Deutschen Marine-Expedition 1907-1909}, that it was ‘200km as the crow flies’, p. 17.

\textsuperscript{639} See Krämer ‘Der \textit{Verlauf der Deutschen Marine-Expedition 1907-1909}’, p. 17, translation by the author.
\end{footnotesize}
However, it is likely that his decision was even more influenced by his interest in ethnographical objects (or the lack thereof) in Muliana. This is intimated in a letter from December 1908 to Count Linden, when Krämer writes:

In regard to ethnographical objects, Muliana is one of the most miserable places in the world. There is, apart from a few poorly and run out dance masks and head decorations, nothing. Even mountain villages are miserable piled-up places of grass huts with people.

---

in them. Everything one is able to investigate is spiritual, and since the mind [around here] is rather poor, I will escape to the north.\textsuperscript{641}

In particular, it was the ritual carvings of *ulí* and *malangan*, which aroused Krämer’s ethnographical interest and thus contributed to his moving camp.\textsuperscript{642}

\textbf{FIG. 5.8} ‘A large Ulí- figure’

*(Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow \textit{Bei kunstsinnigen Kannibalen der Südsee}, p. 184)*

The move itself seemed well planned. From the date of his arrival in German New Guinea, as Krämer later stated, he had ‘made an agreement with one of the Lloyd representatives that in early December the steamer, which was bound for Käwieng, was to make stopovers in

\textsuperscript{641} Krämer’s letter to Count Linden dated 10 December 1908, held at the Linden Museum, translation by the author.

\textsuperscript{642} See Krämer’s letter to Count Linden dated 10 December 1908, in which he offers to ‘find out more about these Ulí figures’, letter held at the Linden Museum. For Krämer’s research focus on these objects, see Schade, pp. 130-135 and Schleip, p. 102. The latter reports show that Krämer ‘even had the Museum in Berlin send him some photos of their collected malangan’. Eventually, Krämer’s interest in the *malangan* was illustrated by the creation of his work \textit{Die Mälanggane von Tóbbara}, München, 1925. For more information on *malangan*, see Thomas Klockmann ‘Malanggan – Bruchstücke einer grossen Tradition’, in Volker Harms, ed. “Südseebilder”; \textit{Materialien zu einer Ausstellung}, Völkerkundliches Institute Tübingen, Tübingen, 1992, pp. 87-94. For Krämer’s research on the *ulí*, see Krämer ‘Anmerkungen über Neu-Mecklenburg (Tómbara)’ in Elisabeth Krämer Bannow’s book, pp. 275-278. For more information on the *ulí*, as well as for an example of more recent anthropological investigation on these figures, see Gerd Koch \textit{Inlet, Geister in Stein}, Museum für Völkerkunde, Berlin, 1982.
Muliam and Lamasong’ in order to provide transport for the Expedition. Further, by letter, Krämer had instructed Walden, the only member of the Expedition whom he had not met, ‘to prepare for a camp and to train one of the locals as translator’. However, in reality the situation was again quite different.

From early December onwards Krämer and his wife waited ‘in vain’ for the arrival of the steamer Langeoog. ‘After more than 14 days had passed, and the rainy season was due’, the Krämers decided to travel to Lamasong by foot, whereas Schilling was to remain in Muliam until the arrival of the steamer in order to organise and supervise the closing down of the camp. Schlaginhaufen, who had left earlier, was to follow once he had returned from his stay on the island of Lir (Lihir). On the morning of 15 December, Krämer and his wife, accompanied by eight boys and police soldiers, finally left Muliam for Lamasong. During their 10 day trip the Krämers covered almost 250 km among the eastern coast of New Mecklenburg. On their trip they spent their nights not only at mission stations and administrative outposts, but also in different villages. The 11th report of the Deutsche Marine-Expedition stated that this trip ‘mainly served the promotion of the ethnographical knowledge of settlements’. Indeed, as Elisabeth’s account indicates, she and her husband used the trip and stopovers to engage in geographical surveys, even to determining possible harbours, as well as to investigate the population density of the area. A similar focus also remained on their following trips along the west coast and throughout New Mecklenburg, as illustrated by Augustin Krämer’s detailed and comprehensive map of the area:

---

644 See Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, p. 51. It was on their arrival in Lamasong, as she later states, that they were ‘finally to meet Mr. Walden’, p. 86. However, both she and Krämer acknowledge Walden’s preparations, in particular his training of some local translators; see Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, pp. 87-89, as well as Krämer’s article ‘Der Verlauf der Deutschen Marine-Expedition 1907-1909’, p. 20.
645 See Krämer ‘Der Verlauf der Deutschen Marine-Expedition 1907-1909’, p. 17; Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, p. 51; as well as Krämer’s correspondence with Count Linden, held at the Linden Museum, Stuttgart.
646 Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, pp. 51-52.
647 Ibid., pp. 51-53. She reports that they left the camp at around 5 am ‘equipped with only the essentials: rice, a few cans, pots, sleeping bags and mosquito nets’ translation by the author.
648 See Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, pp. 51-86. See also Schleip, p 103, who summarises that four nights were spent at mission stations or plantations, the remaining five were spent in villages. However, as Schleip points out, ‘only under guard’.
650 See Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow’s report on the trip in her book, pp. 51-86. Two pages, pp. 58-59, are dedicated to the description of a natural harbour near the village of Porpop. In each village the Krämers made a stop to investigate the position and population. See further Krämer ‘Anmerkungen über Neu-Mecklenburg (Tombara)’ in Elisabeth Krämer Bannow’s book, pp. 271-274.
On 25 December 1908, Krämer and his wife finally arrived in Lamasong. There they were greeted by Schilling and their Chinese cook, who had arrived by boat a few days earlier. Due to fear about the Krämers’ fate, Schilling had even made an attempt to search for them. The Krämers were also welcomed by Edgar Walden who, as Elisabeth reported, had prepared a ‘lovely tea’ with ‘all sorts confectionaries and cake’, because after all ‘it was Christmas day.

651 See Augustin Krämer’s article ‘Der Verlauf der Deutschen Marine-Expedition 1907-1909’, p. 20; the 11. Bericht of the Deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09, pp. 2-3, held at the Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, R 1001/2370; as well as Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, p. 88, who argues that the Langeoog had arrived just after they had left Muliana on 18 December.
when we arrived’. Apart from this welcome, Walden had also prepared the camp, as instructed by Krämer. In addition to a pre-existing guesthouse, which was to become the Krämers’ domicile during their time in Lamasong, Walden had constructed six further huts, which were to form the heart of the new base camp.

Walden, as Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow reported:

Had trained two translators, named Bambis and Usau, very well in Pidgin-English; he now had daily meetings with Krämer and gave him his scientific material and it was agreed that the whole middle part of New Mecklenburg … was to be researched by Krämer; Walden received the long northern part, including Neu Hannover (Lavongai).\(^{654}\)

\(^{652}\) Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, p. 88.
\(^{653}\) For a detailed description of the new camp at Lamasong, see Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, pp. 87-91.
\(^{654}\) Ibid., p. 95, translation by the author.
This agreement, as Dietrich Schleip suggests, hid a growing conflict between Walden and Krämer, as ‘Krämer laid claim on the monopoly of the research regarding the uli figures’. That suggestion may help explain Walden’s sudden departure for the island of Tabar in early January 1909, despite the worsening weather. His departure, as Schleip adds, ‘was even more curious, as Tabar was outside his allocated research area’. Eventually, as Krämer reported, Walden ‘returned on the same vessel to Fesóa, where he had his main camp for the research of the area [and] where he remained for the whole year of 1909’. This statement indicates that Krämer’s contact with Walden remained distant and limited.

For the Krämers, however, the first few weeks in the camp were characterised by food shortages, health problems and the rainy season. ‘Carelessness from the supply master’ or even ‘theft’ had left them with a reduced rice supply, which ‘created a rather difficult position’, since the supply from nearby plantations, trade posts and government stations was, similarly to their position in Muliama earlier, limited and unreliable. Eventually Krämer was able to buy taro from local chiefs who, as Elisabeth recalls, ‘only after some resistance and difficulties provided the first delivery … for 25 pound one paid 50 Pfennige (12 US cents)’. Eventually, as she reports, the rainy season helped lessen their food shortages as it increased the availability of crops. On the other hand, it was the rainy season which hindered the Expedition preventing them from engaging in any longer excursions and even ‘led to all sorts of illnesses’.

Indeed during this time, members of the Expedition suffered a number of health problems: the cook and a few of the ‘boys’ had fallen ill with fever, Krämer himself suffered from toothache and wounds to his legs, Schilling fell sick with malaria and even Schlaginhaufen,
who had returned to the camp on 21 January, suffered from dysentery.\textsuperscript{662} However, with the care and help of Elisabeth who, it seems, was the only one to remain in good health and with Krämer’s medical advice the patients began to improve.\textsuperscript{663} With the recovery of the Expedition staff, the ethnological research again became paramount and the different research tasks were divided anew. Whereas Schilling, who was still weak, remained responsible for the control of the camp, Schlaginhaufen was given the task of conducting the anthropometrical measurements. This task, as Elisabeth reports, caused him great difficulties:

Whereas the local men folk could eventually be persuaded to wear the measurement apparatuses [a metal frame one had to wear on one’s head], it caused panic and fear among the women folk, and it was only under great energy and effort that some of them could be persuaded to stand still.\textsuperscript{664}

In early February Schlaginhaufen travelled to the north, where he conducted ‘hundreds of anthropometrical measurements’.\textsuperscript{665} Krämer himself focused on the language, on social and political organisation, on mythology and on the \textit{ulí} figures. In a letter to Count Linden he stated:

I am here in the area of the Ulí-figures, whose research creates some difficulties. [Nevertheless] it will be possible to determine their places of origin and their names. It seems I am on the right track. There should be some left around here, although it seems that most of them have been ransacked.\textsuperscript{666}

Elisabeth’s efforts remained focused on drawing and illustrating as well as the investigation of ‘women questions’. In the latter she was helped by a local woman named Bariu, who functioned as her translator and informant, and who helped her to gain much insight into the

\textsuperscript{662}For the illnesses of the members of the expedition, see Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, pp. 98-108 and the 11. Bericht of the Deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09, p. 4, held at the Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, R 1001/2370.
\textsuperscript{663}See Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, p. 108, who argues that in regard to Schilling’s illness, ‘the medical physician Krämer managed to cure him by giving high but carefully applied quantities of quinine’.
\textsuperscript{664}See Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, p. 108, translation by the author. By her own account, she was angry about the behaviour of the women before realising that their reaction were actually ‘demanded by the men’, pp. 108-109.
\textsuperscript{665}See the 12. Bericht of the Deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09, p. 4, held at the Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, R 1001/2370. See also Schleip, p. 105.
\textsuperscript{666}Augustin Krämer in a letter to Count Linden dated 10 January 1909, held at the Linden Museum, translation by the author.
women’s lives. 667 On 17 February, with the end of the rainy season, the Krämers decided to move their field of research to the village of Hamba, which was 10 km away, where Krämer hoped to learn more about the origins of the uli figures. 668 While Schilling remained in control of the camp in Lamasong, the Krämers set up a separate camp in Hamba, where they not only gained much information regarding the carvings but also witnessed some local festivities. 669

FIG. 5.10 The Krämers and two helpers in front of their hut in Hamba
(Anna Pytlík Träume im Tropenlicht, p. 139)

667 See Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, pp. 109-140, for a description of Bariu and the information she provided about women’s life and in particular about local contraception and abortion methods. Elisabeth stressed the importance of a female translator as opposed to Tondo, their male translator, whose involvement was often greeted by silence. See also Pytlík, pp. 29-30.
669 Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, pp. 140-150. Among the festivities they observed was a dance and show fight between the people masked as snakes and others masked as rhinoceros birds. She also added that, in order to report on the festivities, they had Schilling come to take photos.
In late February, after two weeks in Hamba, the Krämers’ work was interrupted by a note from Governor Hahl, inviting them to accompany the *Seestern* on its brief trip to Simpsonhafen (Rabaul) before returning to Namatanai. The offer was happily accepted, especially since, as Elisabeth added, ‘one could not count on help from the SMS *Planet*’. Thus on 27 February the Krämers left for Simpsonhafen, where they arrived the following day. During their 24 hour stay Krämer met with a representative of Lloyd to arrange for the *Langeoog* to pick them up in Lamasong on 1 May 1909, when he hoped to finish his stay as leader of the *Deutsche Marine-Expedition*. After spending the night at the Thiel residence at Matupi, the Krämers returned on board the *Seestern* to Namatanai, where they met Governor Hahl.

From Namatanai, they planned to return to Lamasong travelling along the west coast of New Mecklenburg. On 1 March they embarked on their trip despite Hahl’s warning not to do so, since ‘he had heard only bad things about the area’. Indeed, it seems that their travel along the coast was marked by bad weather and other problems, which ranged from a near boat accident and rat infested camps to their inability to get much needed porters in the villages. These experiences certainly helped shape Elisabeth’s perception of the area, which she described as having: ‘Many missionaries, many Chinese, much driftwood and much rain’.

Similarly to their prior travel along the east coast, Krämer wanted to use the trip to gain a broad overview on the area. This focus on research work was illustrated by Elisabeth, when she stated:

---

670 For Hahl’s offer, see Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, pp. 150-151, as well as the 12th Bericht of the Deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09, p. 1, held at the Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, R 1001/2370. Hahl had been staying in Namatanai and was to be picked up by the *Seestern* on its return from Simpsonhafen. Elisabeth further reported that the Captain of the ship, Captain Meinken, was an ‘old friend’.

671 Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, p. 151. She also mentioned that Schilling remained to look after the camp.

672 For Krämer’s plans, see Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, p. 154. She also added that Mr. Ritter was the name of the Lloyds’s representative. See also Schleip, pp. 105-106.

673 For the Krämers’ stay in Simpsonhafen, see Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, pp. 154-157, who adds that they enjoyed Thiel’s hospitality although he was overseas at the time. For more information on Thiel, see Chapter Four.

674 See Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, who argues ‘we wanted to get to know this coast for every price’, p. 158, translation by the author. Further see Schleip, p. 106.

675 For details, as well as information about their problems during their travels, see Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, pp. 158-196, as well as the 12. Bericht of the Deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09, pp. 2-4, held at the Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, R 1001/2370.

676 Ibid., p. 162, translation by the author.
In nearly every village, he [Krämer] took down the different names; every river, bay, headland, mountain etc. was defined and noted even under the most difficult situations, where all willpower was necessary. Drawings and photos were not to be missed.\textsuperscript{677}

The latter two tasks certainly fell into her scope of work, even more so since the cameras had a tendency to malfunction.\textsuperscript{678} Given Krämer’s focus, it seems not surprising that their stopovers in the different villages were generally rather short but intense. Elisabeth’s remark on their visit to the village of Ugana on 9 March 1909: ‘Here too, everything worth knowing was noted within an hour’.\textsuperscript{679} An exception, however, was their visit in the village of Komálabu, where they remained for a whole day.\textsuperscript{680} Apart from their comfortable accommodation, their prolonged stay was also aided ‘by the very obliging [and] communicative occupants, to whom Krämer owes quite a number of important notes in his notebooks’.\textsuperscript{681} The nature of these notes is illustrated, by Elisabeth’s remark:

The nicest result of this stay came from the spiritual culture; much information about the \textit{Wurzeltische} (root tables) and legends could be noted. … The, until now unknown meaning of the picture works \textit{[\textit{ulí}-figures]} became a step clearer for the researcher, although it could not be completely explained. Additionally, Krämer heard much about the political organisation of these villages, as well as much about the social life of the natives.\textsuperscript{682}

\textsuperscript{677} Ibid., pp. 172-173, translation by the author.
\textsuperscript{678} See Schade’s article, pp. 136-141, as well as Pytlik, pp. 64-68.
\textsuperscript{679} Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, p. 183, translation by the author.
\textsuperscript{680} For details on the Krämers stay in Komálabu, see Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, pp. 174-178.
\textsuperscript{681} Ibid., p. 174, translation by the author.
\textsuperscript{682} Ibid., pp. 177-178, translation by the author.
With the Krämers’ arrival in Lamasong on 12 March, their eleven day trip along the west coast of New Mecklenburg finally came to an end. They continued with their stationary work in and around the camp. For a while Krämer travelled daily to the village of Panagundu, which was 2 hours away, ‘where he had just found interesting research work’ and some communicative informants.\textsuperscript{683} While Krämer focused on the social organisation, rituals and languages of the areas, Elisabeth concentrated on women questions and drawings.\textsuperscript{684} She also acted as nurse to Schlaginhaufen, who had returned from his travels to the north, and Schilling, who had both fallen ill with malaria.\textsuperscript{685} At this stage, the work of the Expedition was very much influenced by Krämer’s expectation of bringing the Expedition to a close. In early April 1909 Schlaginhaufen returned to Muliana, where he was supposed ‘to bring his

\textsuperscript{683} Ibid., p.197. In relation to Krämer’s daily travels to Panagundu, Elisabeth remarked that, every day, she was relieved by his return, since the village ‘had until recently been a centre of various murderous deeds and cannibalism’. Nevertheless, the village was to serve the Krämers as a base for some of their later excursions in the area, a fact which was also aided by the presence of the American Missionary couple Mr. and Mrs. Pearson, see pp. 228-231.

\textsuperscript{684} See the 12. Bericht of the Deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09, pp. 2-4, held at the \textit{Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde}, R 1001/2370. In relation to her drawings, Elisabeth argued in her book that she begun to focus on drawing plants and flowers, pp. 196-197. She also made close contact with some local women, named Márambas and Galaureng, who helped her in gaining insight into women’s life in the area. See pp. 247-249.

\textsuperscript{685} Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, p. 196. Whereas Schlaginhaufen eventually was able to continue his research work, Schilling’s illness was much more severe. According to the 13. Bericht of the Deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09, p. 1, held at the \textit{Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde}, R 1001/2370, ‘only high doses of quinine helped to prevent the worst’ suffering.
previous works to an end”. His departure, however, coincided with the end of the Krämers’ work in Lamasong. Elisabeth recorded:

The last phase of this expedition was marked by travel. Since with the slowly easing rainy season a number of festivities were to begin in the different villages, which always provide much information on the character and culture of the people, we began a vagrant life which, also full of uncomfortableness, but was even richer in experiences.

On 3 April the Krämers left Lamasong to travel to the south, ‘since we received knowledge of festivities in (the village) of Kánabu’. In observing these festivities, the Krämers, for the first time, used the method of hidden observation. In the official report it is stated that, ‘separated by a wall of rock, it was possible to observe all proceedings over a number of days despite obvious concealment’ by the native participants. The highlight of these activities was a painted malangan in bright colours which represented the sun. Faced with this unique malangan, Krämer was no longer able to conceal himself. ‘The people were very agitated’, as he later stated, ‘when we pushed ahead onto their secret ceremonial place’. This action of Krämer demonstrates a lack of ethical and moral values, which today would be unacceptable.

It can be assumed that Krämer’s uninvited and unwelcome appearance played an important part in preventing him from acquiring the malangan for the Völkerkunde Museum in Berlin. Despite ‘high and higher money offers’, the malangan was burned before his eyes. However, the official report stated that ‘Mrs. Krämer … did some aquarelles and drawings of

---

686 Ibid., p. 198.
687 Ibid., p. 198, translation by the author. See also the 13. Bericht of the Deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09, pp. 1-4, held at the Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, R 1001/2370, which also states that in order to investigate the different festivities, ‘the Expedition moved up and down the coast’.
688 Ibid., p. 198. The village of Kánabu is approximately 70 km distant from Lamasong.
690 For details of the sun-malanga, which was taboo for women, see the 13th official report of the Deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09, pp. 2-4, held at the Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, R 1001/2370; Krämer’s article ‘Der Verlauf der Deutschen Marine-Expedition 1907-1909’, p. 21; Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, pp. 207-211; as well as Krämer’s ‘Anmerkungen über Neu-Mecklenburg (Tombara)’ in Elisabeth Krämer Bannow’s book, pp. 279-280.
692 Indeed, it seems that Krämer was determined to acquire the malangan, but failed as it was eventually destroyed. See Krämer’s ‘Anmerkungen über Neu-Mecklenburg (Tombara)’ in Elisabeth Krämer Bannow’s book, pp. 279-280; Krämer’s article ‘Verlauf der Deutschen Marine-Expedition 1907-1909’, p. 21; the 13th official report of the Deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09, p. 3, held at the Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, R 1001/2370; as well as Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, p. 211.
the named sun [malangan] which, at least in a picture, allows to show this creation of the native art and fantasy'. 693

FIG. 5.12  ‘Sun-Malangan’

(ElisabethKrämer-BannowBeikunstsinnigenKannibalenderSüdsee, p. 207)

On 11 April 1909, after the festivities in Kánabu had come to an end, the Krämers prepared for their return trip to Lamason. En route they came across the village of Buá and, since they found evidence of some planned festivities, they decided to stay for a few days:

For the first time did we live more than a day in a large, untouched village in the interior and could observe life in a different light, as opposed to our occasional travels. 694

693 See the 13. Bericht of the Deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09, p. 4, held at the Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, R 1001/2370, translation by the author. However, Elisabeth’s pictures of the malangan, as with a number of her other works, seem to have been lost, apart from the depicted small sketch, which was published in her book.
694 Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, pp. 215-216, translation by the author.
After having rested in a new ‘and thus clean hut’, as well as having witnessed the initiation of a few young women in the so-called agónin-celebration, the Krämers left the village to continue their trip to Lamasong, where they arrived a few days later.695

FIG. 5.13  ‘The village of Buä in the interior’

(Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow Bei kunstsinnigen Kannibalen der Südsee, p. 215)

After their return, they spent time on local excursions and in visiting festivities in the local vicinity of Lamasong.696 However, as Elisabeth observed, ‘since time was pushing on’ their visits were rather short.697 During their last visit to the village of Hamba, they received notice that a festivity was to take place in Lamasong. But, following Elisabeth’s account, it seems that the people of Lamasong did not want Krämer to be present.698 This reservation about their presence was increased by an event which had happened just a few days earlier, and which was to overshadow their last few days in Lamasong:

One of our boys [had] shot one of the village pigs which on a nightly basis undermined our corn and uprooted our taro. If he just tried to scare it off and hit it, remains unknown, however, the pig was dead. Now the animal was an extremely strong and fat pig, which belonged to the chief Padong, who certainly had his own plans with it which were now foiled. We paid him handsomely for one half and sent him the other half of

695 See ibid., pp. 215-218 for details of the Krämers’ stay in Buä and the festivities. Elisabeth indicated that they left the village on Thursday, 15 April and arrived in Lamasong on Sunday, p. 220.
696 They visited a number of small villages, for details see ibid., pp. 220-225.
697 Ibid., p. 225, translation by the author.
698 Ibid., pp. 226-227. She argued that they were actively lied to and it was only from a trusted informant that they received word that the festivity was indeed to take place.
the pig, but he was very angry, did not want to accept the money nor the meat and if he could have, he would have certainly taken revenge on us. … It is lucky that the 120 km long road, which we called the finger of the government, reached up to here. Otherwise our time in Lamasong would not have been ended that peacefully.699

It was decided that Schilling was to observe and photograph the festivities, as well as to prepare the camp for departure, while the Krämers left for a final trip into the highlands.700

On 23 April they began their climb into the Schleinitz mountains (today known as the Lelet Mountains). They aimed to return by the beginning of May to catch the Langeoog, which was to take them to Simpsonhafen. However, the reality was to prove otherwise. While the Krämers were busily engaged in ethnological investigations, geographical observations and mountaineering, the ship arrived prematurely.701 Instead of arriving at the beginning of May, as Krämer had wished, the Langeoog arrived on 28 April. A note from Schilling, urging the Krämers to return, was wrongly sent to Namatanai. Thus, when they returned, they found the camp empty and the houses locked.702 ‘So we had no choice’, as Krämer later stated, ‘than to pack our things … and to travel the road 150 km to the north to Käwieng, since there were more frequent connections to Simpsonhafen’.703

On 14 May they embarked on their trip to Käwieng, leaving the bulk of their equipment behind, to be picked up later by an administrative vessel.704 Their final trip on New Mecklenburg was characterised by a lack of ethnological research and collection of ethnographical objects. Instead, it was marked by the Krämers’ urgency to reach Käwieng as swiftly as possible to get a connection to Simpsonhafen in order to get to Palau, where

699 Ibid., p. 227, translation by the author.
700 Ibid., pp. 227-228. Based on Elisabeth’s description, it seems that the anger was only directed against Krämer and not against any other members of the Expedition.
701 For the Krämers’ trip into the Schleinitzgebirge (Schleinitz mountains), where they visited a number of villages, see Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, pp. 228-243; the 13. Bericht of the Deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09, pp. 4-8, held at the Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, R 1001/2370 and Krämer’s article ‘Verlauf der Deutschen Marine-Expedition 1907-1909’, p. 2. During their trip, they received some important information about rituals from the inhabitants of the highlands. Elisabeth also stated that Augustin Krämer was the first white person to climb the highest peak of New Mecklenburg.
702 For details on the premature arrival of the Langeoog, the wrongly sent note and the Krämers’ return to an empty camp, see the 13th Bericht of the Deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09, pp. 7-8, held at the Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, R 1001/2370; Krämer’s article ‘Verlauf der Deutschen Marine-Expedition 1907-1909’, p. 22 and Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, pp. 243-245, who argued that the premature arrival and subsequent departure of the Langeoog left them ‘guttered’.
704 See Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, pp. 247-249. She noted that they received a promise from the deputy Stationsvorsteher (administrator), Mr. Zwanzger, that their luggage would be brought to Käwieng by an administrative vessel.
Krämer was to meet the Hamburg Südsee-Expedition. To make their travel quicker, as well as to take care of Elisabeth, who had fallen ill with a sore throat, they rented a cart and horse.

Eventually, on 20 May they arrived in Käwieng. They spent the time until their departure for Simpsonhafen with the next available ship at the residence of the local administrator, the Stationsvorsteher Franz Boluminski, who was on holiday in Germany at the time. Since the ship was not to be expected before early June, they had some time to get to know the north of New Mecklenburg. But, as Elisabeth remarked:

Of course it could only be done in shorter excursions, as we could not allow ourselves to go too far. [Additionally] Krämer fell ill with malaria and tropica (?) for the first time on this travel and had to rest for a few days.

With the arrival of the steamer Siar in Käwieng on the morning of 2 June and its subsequent travel to Simpsonhafen/Rabaul on the next day, the Krämers’ participation on the Deutsche Marine-Expedition had finally come to an end.

The End and Aftermath of the Deutsche Marine-Expedition

The departure of Krämer and his wife in early June 1909 marked the end of the second and final year of the Deutsche Marine-Expedition. The last sentence of the final official report of the Expedition, which Krämer wrote in Käwieng on 31 May, read:

706 See Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, pp. 251-256. She reported that she suffered from a sore throat and even dizziness. Since she never before mentioned anything like it, it can be presumed that her illness was indeed rather critical. Thus, in order to take care of her, as well as to speed up the travel, they borrowed/rented a horse and cart from the planters Mr. Miesterfeld and Mr. Macco, whose names are also mentioned in the 13th Bericht of the Deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09, p. 8, held at the Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, R 1001/2370, as well as in Krämer’s article ‘Verlauf der Deutschen Marine-Expedition 1907-1909’, p. 22.
707 See Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, pp. 256-259. The Krämers and Boluminski (1863-1913) knew each other from former meetings. See Boluminski’s correspondence with Count Linden, held at the Linden Museum. Boluminski was also a great collector of malangan, which he sold and gifted to various museums in Germany. For more details on Boluminski and his activities as collector and patron, see Karl Baumann, Dieter Klein, Wolfgang Apitzsch, p. 42; Rainer Buschmann’s article ‘Franz Boluminski and the Wonderland of Carvings: Towards an Ethnography of Collection Activity’, in Baessler-Archiv, Neue Folge, Band XLIV (1996), pp. 185-210; and Dieter Klein’s article ‘Beamte, Kapitäne und Kaufleute – Sammeln zu Kaiser Wilhelms Zeiten für das Königliche Ethnographische Museum in München’, pp. 269-274.
708 Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, p. 258, translation by the author.
709 Ibid., p. 260.
Walden, Dr. Schlaginhaufen and Schilling are busy with concluding their work, in order to return to Germany, at the appointed time of September of this year.  

This rather oblique sentence hid the fact that the Expedition had fallen apart. While the Krämers left for the Caroline Islands to participate in the Hamburg Südsee-Expedition, the remaining members of the Expedition left on their own terms. The photographer Schilling returned to Germany in August 1909, never to be heard of again. Edgar Walden continued his research in New Hanover (Lavongai) until the end of the year, before returning to Germany. He died in World War I. Schlaginhaufen remained in German New Guinea, where he collected zoological specimens along the Sepik River for the Museum in Dresden, to which he eventually returned as curator. It was probably in the nature of the Expedition’s end that meant it failed to produce any larger publications on its research work. Although Krämer officially described the Expedition as ‘a complete success’, he was deeply dissatisfied with its outcome. This disappointment, which was to have an important influence on his career, is recounted in a letter to Count Linden of 17 June 1909:

To be exact I have handed in my resignation with the same mail; the Marine-Expedition has been my grave. Not that there have been no successes; I think they are exceptional. Not that the endeavour is bankrupt; I have prevented the ship from sinking, otherwise it would be broke! But one has let me down, without recommendation and ship support. … That’s why I grab the chance to get out of the situation nicely, and to dedicate myself completely to Völkerkunde.

---

710 See 13th Bericht of the Deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09, p. 10, held at the Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, R 1001/2370, translation by the author. The report is also titled ‘Schluss’ (‘end’).

711 A similar idea about the ending of the Expedition is also to be found in Krämer’s report to the Imperial Government at Herbertshöhe from 13 June 1909, held at the Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, R 1001/2370.

712 See Schleip, p. 111. Apart from this information, however, Schilling’s later life remains a mystery. Anette Schade’s article gives ground to the assumption that on his return he briefly cooperated with the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin to help with the filing and labelling the photographic collection of the Expedition.

713 For information on Walden’s remaining stay, see the 13th Bericht of the Deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09, pp. 8-9, held at the Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, R 1001/2370. See also Schleip, p. 111, who argues that Walden returned to Germany at the end of the year. Similarly to Schilling, Walden’s fate remains unknown. His ethnological work however was cut short by his death on the Western Front during the war. See Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, p. 252.

714 In June 1909 Schlaginhaufen took up on the offer by the Museum to collect zoological specimens. On his travels among the Sepik River he was accompanied by the German colonial administrators Dr. Benno Scholz and Georg Heine. On his return he briefly worked for the Museum in Dresden before returning to Switzerland. See Schleip, p. 111; Zimmerman’s book Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany, p. 228 and 321; as well as Baumann, Klein and Apitzsch, p. 402. For a photograph and information about Schlaginhaufen’s zoological expedition, see Hermann Hiery, ed. Bilder aus der Deutschen Südsee. Fotografien 1884-1914, Ferdinand Schöningh, Paderborn, 2005, p. 109.

715 For Krämer’s official evaluation of the Expedition, see the 13th Bericht of the Deutsche Marine-Expedition 1907/09, p. 10, held at the Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, R 1001/2370. However, despite this positive description, the reality as discussed was less positive.

716 See Krämer’s letter to Count Linden written on board the Prinz Siegesmund and dated 17 June 1909, held at the Linden Museum Stuttgart, translation by the author.
Krämer’s break with the German Navy, however, was not a panicked reaction. Instead, it had been a long time in the making, as already on his previous travels to the Pacific he had perceived his duty as an officer to be counter productive to his ethnological research.\footnote{See Chapters Two and Four, both of which provide examples of Krämer’s previous conflicts with the Navy and his perception that his position with, and his reliance on, the Navy was to have a limiting impact on his ethnological research work.} It has to be pointed out that Krämer submitted his resignation only after he had received confirmation from Linden about further cooperation in regard to the extension of the ethnographic collection in Stuttgart.\footnote{In his letter to Linden, Krämer frequently stresses ‘zukünftige Zusammenarbeit’ (‘future cooperation’), which Linden must have mentioned in his letters to Krämer earlier and which had to do with Krämer’s further involvement with the to-be established Museum in Stuttgart. See also Schleip, p. 113.} Furthermore, as Dietrich Schleip reports, Krämer’s resignation was well timed, as just a month earlier he had celebrated his 20th service anniversary, which gave him the right to a pension.\footnote{See Schleip, p. 113.}

Apart from his break with the Navy, the Deutsche Marine-Expedition also cast a shadow over Krämer’s relationship with the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin and in particular with Dr. Luschan. In his later published work Die Málanggane von Tómbara, Krämer complained that the Museum refused him access to the late Walden’s notes.\footnote{See Krämer Die Málanggane von Tómbara, p. 88.} This development was certainly fuelled by Krämer’s participation in the Hamburg Südsee-Expedition, which Luschan perceived to be an affront to the dominant position of the Museum in Berlin.\footnote{For Luschan’s perception of the Hamburg Südsee-Expedition, see his Denkschrift (memorandum) to the General Administration of the Imperial Museums Berlin from 8 May 1906, held at the Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, R 1001/2372. Luschan’s critical position towards this Expedition was also shaped by his dislike of Georg Thilenius who, as director of the Völkerkunde Museum in Hamburg, had criticised the dominant position of the Museum in Berlin in regard to gaining access to ethnographical collections. For more details, see Wolfgang Lustig “Ausser ein paar zerbrochenen Pfeilen nichts zu verteilen…”- Ethnographische Sammlungen aus den deutschen Kolonien und ihre Verteilung an Museen 1889 bis 1914.’, in Mitteilungen aus dem Museum für Völkerkunde Hamburg, 1988, N. F., Bd. XIIIX, pp. 157-178.} Thus, their contact became less frequent and more reserved.\footnote{Indeed, research suggests that until early October 1910, when Krämer and Luschan met again in Berlin during the 3rd Colonial congress, they had only little contact. This certainly stands in stark contrast to their previous rather close relationship.}

Despite these career changing implications, Krämer’s participation in the Deutsche Marine-Expedition also had an important impact on his ethnological work and methods. Firstly, his travels throughout New Mecklenburg helped to strengthen his research partnership with his wife. Secondly, Krämer’s participation also helped to redefine his notion of fieldwork, as becomes evident in his article ‘Gouvernementale Übergriffe in ethnographische Arbeitsgebiete und Mittel zur Abhilfe’. There, Krämer proposed four goals for ethnological fieldwork: ‘(1) drawing exact maps of settlements of an area, (2) conducting a genealogical...
censo of the population, (3) determining the location of important public buildings, and (4) collecting information on marriage and other family rules’. These objectives were to have a significant impact on further course and results of the Hamburg Südsee-Expedition, whose leadership Krämer took over in August 1909.

---

723 See Krämer’s article ‘Gouvernementale Übergriffe in ethnographische Arbeitsgebiete und Mittel zur Abhilfe’, in Globus, Bd. 96, (1909), pp. 264-266. For the summary of Krämer’s proposed research objectives, see Zimmerman Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany, p. 236.
Chapter Six.

**The Hamburg Südsee-Expedition:**
Krämer’s last Expedition to the Pacific

In August 1909 Augustin Krämer took over leadership of the 2nd year of the Hamburg Südsee-Expedition (Hamburg South Seas Expedition). In doing so he was accompanied by his wife who became an official member of the Expedition. The Hamburg Südsee-Expedition was the largest ethnographical and ethnological Expedition to the Pacific region of its time.

Krämer’s leadership and the participation of him and his wife were to have major impacts on the course and research focus of the Expedition, bringing a fundamental change from its first year. This change was strongly related to Krämer’s ethnological approach of *Tiefenarbeit* (‘in-depth research’), which he had developed during his previous travels to the Pacific.

Although his impact was not without conflict, it contributed to the successful outcome of the Expedition. This success is reflected in the resulting publications from the Expedition. Whereas the first year was crowned by four volumes, the second year eventually produced twenty-five volumes, many of which are still referred to as major ethnological works.\(^{724}\)

This acknowledgment was not only of great significance for Krämer’s legacy as an ethnological expert on Oceania, but also for his career as an ethnologist. It is in the latter aspect that the Hamburg Südsee-Expedition was of importance to Krämer, as it was his fifth

---

and last expedition to the Pacific region, but the first, after having left the Navy, which saw him employed as a full time ethnologist.

The Hamburg Südsee-Expedition, An Overview

The Hamburg Südsee-Expedition, which lasted from 1908 to 1910 and visited German New Guinea during its first year and the Caroline and Marshall Islands during its second year, was one of the largest and best-sponsored ethnological endeavours of Germany. Its budget of over 600,000 Marks (US$ 150,000) allowed not only for the hire of a large steamer, crew and scientific personal, but also for the subsequent publication of its scientific results.

The Expedition was initiated by Dr. Georg Thilenius (1868-1937), a physician and natural scientist, who had become director of the Museum für Völkerkunde in Hamburg in 1904.

---

726 See Fischer, pp. 22-24; Buschmann, pp. 246-247; Zwernemann. In his article, Schindlbeck states that, in all, the costs of the Expedition amounted to 605.730 Mark, which probably excludes the financing of the subsequent publications, p. 149.
727 For information on Georg Thilenius, see Chapter Two. Also see Fischer, pp. 26-28; Jürgen Zwernemann, pp. 63-65; and Hans Nevermann’s obituary on Thilenius in Dr. Augustin Krämer and Dr. Hans Nevermann Ratik-Ratak (Marshall-Inseln) Bd. 11, Ergebnisse der Hamburger Südsee-Expedition 1908-1910, edited by Dr. G. Thilenius, Hamburg, 1938.
It has been argued that, similarly to Krämer, Thilenius developed his idea for a renewed ethnological expedition to the Pacific after returning from his own research and travels to the area in 1899.\textsuperscript{728} His experience thereby had a profound impact on the composition of the Expedition, which is evident in Thilenius’s letter to the publisher and Völkerkundler (ethnologist) Richard Andree of January 1908, when he argued:

I have returned from the South Seas with the conviction that a rational exploration of Oceania is only possible by means of a hired ship and through a number of scientific

\textsuperscript{728} See Katja Geisenhainer, p. 60; Säuerlich, pp. 18-19; Schindlbek, p. 149; Zwernemann, p. 85 and Fischer, pp. 26-27.
workers. This project I have, over the last ten years, thought through and changed in all possible directions.729

Apart from his strong held belief in ‘salvage anthropology’, Thilenius was convinced that the reputation of the Museum für Völkerkunde in Hamburg was dependent on sending its own expedition.730 In his Memorandum, Denkschrift über eine hamburgische Expedition nach der Südsee, he argued:

It is important to choose a people which, on the one hand are presently experiencing European influence but have maintained all important elements of their culture, on the other hand however who are that far europeanised that a revival of the old culture is impossible. In this case, the expedition will essentially be able to bring home a complete picture of this culture, without having to fear that a later expedition by another museum into the same area will produce the same results.731

For these reasons Thilenius envisioned a four year long expedition to the Pacific region, in particular to Melanesia, which he thought of as a worthwhile field of research.732 He further intended the Expedition to be ship based, which would, he argued, not only allow for great mobility and space for ethnographical and ethnological collections but also provide protection from possible attacks.733 The planned Expedition was to be accompanied by a number of scientists, in particular linguists, ethnologists, anthropologists, a medical doctor, a photographer and a technician.734 However, since the Museum in Hamburg did not possess

729 Thilenius in a letter to Richard Andree dated 14 January 1908, quoted in Fischer, p. 27. For more information on Richard Andree (1835-1912), who was the publisher of the Globus, see Chapter Three.
730 It has been pointed out that Thilenius urgency to send out the Expedition for the Museum was influenced by the closure of the Godeffroy Museum and subsequent loss of its collection, which was sold to the Museum in Leipzig. See Zwernemann, pp. 83-84 and Schindlbeck, p. 149. For ‘Thilenius belief in salvage anthropology’, see Fischer, pp. 115-119. Although Fischer stresses that Thilenius thought the collection of artefacts to be of second importance, he nevertheless saw an urgency to collect data associated with the cultural and spiritual life of the islanders. For more information on the collection of the Godeffroy Museum, see Rainer Buschmann 'Exploring Tensions in Material Culture: Commercialising Ethnography in German New Guinea, 1870-1904’, in Michael O’Hanlon and Robert L. Welsch eds. Hunting the Gatherers: Ethnographic Collectors, Agents and Agency in Melanesia, 1870s-1930s, New York, 2000, pp. 55-80.
732 For more information on Thilenius’ decision to make Melanesia the centre and focus of the expedition, see Fischer, pp. 30-33.
733 For Thilenius idea and planning of a ship based expedition, see Fischer, pp. 26-37 and p. 90ff., Zwernemann, pp. 84-85 and Schindlbeck, p. 149.
734 Ibid.
that many skilled workers, as Thilenius pointed out, they should be invited from other German museums and institutions to participate.\(^{735}\)

Eventually, in 1907, Thilenius’s plan for such an Expedition was approved by the board of trustees of the *Hamburgerischen Wissenschaftlichen Stiftung* (Hamburg’s Scientific Foundation), in particular by its founding member Senator Werner von Melle, who saw purposeful advantages in the expedition for Hamburg.\(^{736}\) Although the foundation reduced the planned duration of the Expedition from four to two years, as well as demanded the inclusion of the German protectorates of the Caroline and Marshall Islands, it nevertheless agreed to cover the costs.\(^{737}\) This included the rental and purposeful rebuilding of the steamer *Peiho* which, under the command of Captain Richard Vahsel, was to become the core centre of the Expedition.\(^{738}\)

---

\(^{735}\) See Georg Thilenius in his memorandum: *Leitsätze für die Expedition der Hamburgischen Wissenschaftlichen Stiftung in die deutsche Südsee*, 1907, p. 9, quoted by Fischer, p. 92. See also Zwernemann, p. 84.

\(^{736}\) It has been stated that Senator Werner von Melle was among the greatest supporters of the Museum and this expedition, since he envisioned it to help increase Hamburg’s prestige as a leading scientific metropolis in Germany. See Eckart, p. 454; Fischer, pp. 26-37 and p. 49; as well as Johanna E. Becker Die Gründung des Deutschen Kolonialinstituts in Hamburg. Zur Vorgeschichte der Hamburgischen Universität”, MA Thesis, University of Hamburg, 2005, pp. 46-50. It has to be argued that Melle’s vision eventually became true as the Museum and its new found collection were an essential stepping stones for the foundation of the University of Hamburg. See Jürgen Zwernemann, pp. 63-106 and Glenn Penny *Objects of culture: ethnology and ethnographic museums in Imperial Germany*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003, pp. 159ff.

\(^{737}\) Fischer argues that Thilenius had no reservations about the recommendations of the foundation, pp. 34-37, 49. Also see Schindlbeck, p. 149 and Zwernemann, pp. 84-86.

\(^{738}\) The *Peiho* was a steamer of 756 BRT, which was rented to the Expedition by the German transport firm HAPAG (Hamburg America Line) at cost price. In Hong Kong, the ship had been purposely remodelled to fit the Expedition. For more information on the *Peiho* and its furnishings, see Zwernemann, p. 86; Fischer, pp. 55-57; and Anna Pytlik *Träume im Tropenlicht; Forscherinnen auf Reisen*, Coyote Verlag, Reutlingen, 1997, pp. 20-21.
The first year of the Hamburg Südsee-Expedition, which saw the Peiho travelling around the coast of German New Guinea and up the Sepik River, took place under the leadership of Professor Dr. Friedrich Fülleborn (1866-1933), a physician and ethnologist. The Expedition was further accompanied by the ethnologist Dr. Otto Reche from the Museum für Völkerkunde in Hamburg, the linguist Dr. Wilhelm Müller-Wismar from the Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin, the commercial administrator and collector Franz E. Hellwig, the

739 For more information on Fülleborn, who later became director of the Hamburger Institutes für Schiffs- und Tropenmedizin (Institute for Naval- and Tropical Diseases Hamburg), see Fischer, pp. 64-65 and Karl Baumann, Dieter Klein, Wolfgang Apitzsch, Biographisches Handbuch Deutsch-Neuguinea, 1882-1922; Kurzlebensläufe ehemaliger Kolonisten, Forscher, Missionare und Reisender, 2nd edition, Berlin, 2002, p. 107. For an overview of stations and research during the 1st year of the Hamburg Südsee-Expedition, see Fischer, pp. 50-51, as well as Zwernemann, pp. 86-88.

740 For more details on Otto Reche (1879-1966), see Fischer, pp. 70-71; Baumann, Klein and Apitzsch, p. 375; as well as Geisenheimer’s biography on his life.

741 For more information on Wilhelm Müller-Wismar (1881-1916), see Fischer, pp. 68-70, as well as the obituary on Müller by Georg Thilenius, in Wilhelm Müller Yaph. I. Halbband, Ergebnisse der Hamburger Südsee-Expedition 1908-1910, edited by Dr. G. Thilenius, Hamburg 1917.

742 Franz Emil Hellwig (1854-1929) was the only member of the Expedition who had already spent time in the Pacific, where he had collected ethnographical artefacts, which he had sold to various museums throughout Germany. See Rainer Buschmann’s article ‘Exploring Tensions in Material Culture: Commercialising Ethnography in German New Guinea, 1870-1904’, pp. 70-73. Hellwig later became an employee of the Museum in Hamburg. For details on his life, see Fischer, pp. 71-72 and Baumann, Klein and Apitzsch, pp. 138-139. For a
artist, photographer and illustrator Hans Vogel\textsuperscript{743} and the zoologist Dr. Georg Duncker from Naturhistorischen Museum in Hamburg.\textsuperscript{744}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image}
\caption{Members of the 1\textsuperscript{st} year of the Hamburg Südsee-Expedition. 2. from left F. E. Hellwig, 3. Captain Vashel, 4. Prof. Fülleborn, 5. Müller-Wismar, 6. Reche, 7. 1\textsuperscript{st} Officer Hefele, 8. Duncker, 9. Vogel, 10. 2\textsuperscript{nd} Officer Schirlitz.}
\end{figure}

(Wulf Köpke and Bernd Schmelz eds. \textit{Die ersten 112 Jahre; das Museum für Völkerkunde Hamburg}, p. 87)

\textsuperscript{743} For information on Hans Vogel (1885-1953), who was the only member to publish a popular report on the Expedition, titled \textit{Eine Forschungsreise im Bismarck-Archipel}, Hamburg, 1911, see Fischer, pp. 73-74.

\textsuperscript{744} For more details on Georg Duncker (1870-1953), see Fischer, pp. 75-77 and Baumann, Klein and Apitzsch, p. 82.
In the second year of the Expedition, which was under the leadership of Augustin Krämer, the Peiho travelled throughout Micronesia, visiting various islands in the Caroline and Marshall Island groups. 745 Apart from Krämer, the scientific crew consisted of Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, who was employed as an illustrator, the ethnologist Dr. Paul Hambruch from the Museum für Völkerkunde in Hamburg 746 and the ethnologist Dr. Ernst Sarfert from the Museum für Völkerkunde in Leipzig. 747 The Expedition was further accompanied by Franz E. Hellwig and Dr. Wilhelm Müller, who both stayed on for the second year, as well as Richard Vahsel, who remained in his function as Captain of the Peiho.

745 For an overview of the travels of the Peiho during the second year of the Expedition, see Fischer, pp. 51-52, as well as Zwernemann, pp. 88-89.
746 For more details on Paul Hambruch (1882-1933), see Fischer, pp. 72-73; Baumann, Klein and Apitzsch, p. 129; as well as the obituary on Hambruch by Anneliese Eilers in Paul Hambruch Ponape, III. Teilband, Die Ruinen, Ponapegeschichten, Ergebnisse der Hamburger Südsee-Expedition 1908-1910, edited by Dr. G. Thilenius, Hamburg, 1936. For details and a critique of Hambruch’s work, see also Glenn Petersen’s article, pp. 317-330.
747 For information on Dr. Ernst Georg Sarfert, see Fischer, p.73, who argues that he was born in 1882, as well as Baumann, Klein and Apitzsch, p. 395, who argue that he was born in 1861. After his participation, Sarfert continued his research in the Pacific on a number of occasions before returning into industry (as he was a trained commercial administrator). He died in 1937.
FIG. 6.4 Members of the 2nd year of the Hamburg Südsee-Expedition.

Centre Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow and Dr. Krämer

(Anna Pytlik Träume im Tropenlicht, p. 19)

On 15 April 1910 the Hamburg Südsee-Expedition came to an end and on 24 March 1911 the members of both years were greeted by the Hamburgischen Wissenschaftliche Stiftung and honoured with a commemorative coin.748

The diaries of the Expedition members, as well as their photographs, notes, linguistic observations and ethnographic collections, were handed over to the Museum für Völkerkunde

748 See Zwernemann, p. 89.
During the two years, the Expedition had succeeded in collecting over 17,000 ethnographical artefacts and objects, of which 9,400 had been collected in Melanesia and 8,366 in Micronesia. As early as June 1912, some of these objects were displayed in an exhibition in the Museum. Between 1911 and 1954, the research results of the Expedition were published in 29 volumes in the series Ergebnisse der Hamburg Südsee-Expedition (results of the Hamburg South Seas Expedition), with the financial support from the Hamburgischen Wissenschaftlichen Stiftung. However, whereas the collected ethnographical objects were largely destroyed during the Second World War, the notes and diaries, as well as scientific publications are still available and form a central source for ethnological inquiry of Micronesia.

Krämer’s involvement

Although Krämer was not directly involved in the planning of the Hamburg Südsee-Expedition, he played an essential part in its development and subsequent course. In his influential book Die Hamburger Südsee Expedition, the historian and ethnologist Hans Fischer argues that ‘Augustin Krämer, apart from Georg Thilenius, has been the one who had the greatest influence on the composition of the Expedition and who, above all, coined the successes of the 2nd year of the Expedition’. However, research suggests that Krämer’s involvement in the Expedition started earlier, even if it was more of an indirect nature.

---

749 See Schindlbeck, p. 149. See further Fischer’s preface and introduction, in which he acknowledges the use of these documents and notes. Although Fischer highlights the availability of the sources, they were unavailable during the present research, due to extensive renovation being carried out in the Museum für Völkerkunde between 2004-2008.
750 See Zwernemann, p. 89 and Schindlbeck, p. 149.
753 Although the South Sea Collection had been evacuated to a depot in Lautenthal in the Harz region to prevent it from possible damage, it was this depot which became a victim to Allied air attacks on 12 April 1945. See Schindlbeck, p. 150, as well as Jürgen Zwernemann’s article ‘Unwiederbringliche Verluste: Das Museum im Zweiten Weltkrieg (1939-1945)’ in Köpke and Schmelz eds., Die Ersten 112 Jahre; Das Museum für Völkerkunde Hamburg, pp. 131-137, who argues that an exact survey of the losses has and probably will never be conducted.
754 Fischer, p. 68, translation by the author.
Krämer’s diaries reveal that, on a visit to Kiel on 7 August 1905, Thilenius already discussed with him the plans for an expedition to the Pacific region. This was again brought up on Krämer’s return visit to Hamburg in October that year. It is not surprising that they discussed Thilenius’s plans, given the fact that during their earlier travels through Hawaii and Samoa they had shared transport and accommodation.

Two years later, as Krämer’s diaries illustrate, their conversation became much more concrete:

In October 07 Thilenius briefly came from Hamburg and informed me about the plans for his new expedition and asked me to take over the leadership of its 1st year, whereas Fülleborn was to take over the 2nd. I asked for time for consideration until Christmas, when I was travelling to Berlin.

Count Linden certainly encouraged him to take up the offer. That becomes obvious in Linden’s letter to Krämer in November, when he stated:

Thilenius is a wonderful man, he seems to know how to stomp out mammon from the earth; I congratulate you to his offer, you can not be serious to wait just one moment.

However, despite this encouragement it seems that Krämer was reluctant to accept. Although the exact reasons for his hesitation remain unknown, it can be assumed that his decision was influenced by his superiors in Berlin, who were not keen on his renewed return to the Pacific. In his diaries Krämer quotes his superior, Generalstabstarzt Schmidt, as saying that: ‘Sie wollen ja schon wieder hinaus, ... Ich sage nicht einen Moment’ (‘You want to get out yet again, ... I say not one moment’), adding: ‘Damit ist die Sache abgemacht’ (‘So the decision has been made’).

---

755 On his visit, as Krämer noted, Thilenius was accompanied by his wife. Krämer’s entry from 7 August 1905 also reveals that they talked about an extension of the Museum für Völkerkunde in Hamburg and its eventual costs of over 1 million Marks (US$ 250.000). Diary held at the Linden Museum Stuttgart.

756 Ibid.

757 For more details, see Chapter Two.

758 See Krämer’s diaries held at the Linden Museum, Stuttgart. Krämer’s entry has been translated by the author, the highlighting has been retained from the original.

759 See letter from Count Linden to Krämer dated 25 November 1907, held at the Linden Museum Stuttgart, translation by the author.

760 See Krämer’s diaries, held at the Linden Museum, for the quotation of Generalstabstarzt Dr. Schmidt, translation by the author. Dr. Schmidt was the chief of the Navy Medical Corps.
Nevertheless, the opportunity to lead an expedition to the Pacific with its own ship was too good to be missed. It seems that, despite the resistance of the Navy, Krämer had made an agreement with Thilenius which saw him take over the 2nd year of the Hamburg Südsee-Expedition. The exact details, however, remain unknown.\cite{note1} The company of his wife was certainly one of Krämer’s demands, as he argued for the company of ‘a trained European [woman], since the aspects of local female life can only inequitably be investigated by male researchers’.\cite{note2}

A few months later the situation changed again, as with Dr Emil Stephan’s death Krämer was asked by his superiors to take over the leadership of the Deutsche Marine-Expedition. This was a request he could not turn down.\cite{note3} With the prospect of returning to the Pacific once more, Krämer’s interest in Thilenius’s offer had taken another blow. In a letter to Linden, dated 23 July 1907, he wrote:

If I have to get out for the Navy once again, I would like to get out of the Hamburg expedition.\cite{note4}

However, by now there was no return. In September, on their trip to German New Guinea, Krämer received a telegram from Thilenius, finalising his position as leader. In his diary Krämer noted:

In Aden received telegram from Thilenius, agreed to all conditions! So the Hamburg Expedition lies ahead!\cite{note5}

The agreement also included Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, who became a paid member of the Hamburg Südsee-Expedition, responsible for the research of women’s life, ‘as well as photographic, drawing and other works’.\cite{note6} With this decision made, the Krämers

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{761} Neither Krämer’s diaries nor his correspondence with Count Linden reveal any details about Krämer’s early arrangements with Thilenius regarding his participation on the Expedition.\textsuperscript{762} Krämer quoted by Pytlik, p. 20.\textsuperscript{763} For more details on the Deutsche Marine-Expedition and Krämer’s involvement, see Chapter Five.\textsuperscript{764} Krämer in a letter to Count Linden dated 23 July 1908, held at the Linden Museum, translation by the author.\textsuperscript{765} See Krämer’s diary, held at the Linden Museum, where he states: ‘In Aden Telegram von Thilenius mit den Bedingungen einverstanden! Also steht die Hamburger Expedition bevor!’, translation by the author, highlighted by Krämer.\textsuperscript{766} Part of Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow’s contract with the Hamburger Wissenschaftlichen Stiftung, quoted by Pytlik, p. 20, translation by the author. In her book, Pytlik stresses that Krämer’s demands and justification for the company of his wife were greeted by Thilenius, who advocated the company of female researchers, p. 20.
\end{flushright}
participation on the *Hamburg Südsee-Expedition* was to follow their participation in the *Deutsche Marine-Expedition* in quick transition.

**Krämer’s leadership of the *Hamburg Südsee-Expedition***

In early August 1909, Krämer officially took over the leadership of the *Hamburg Südsee-Expedition*, when he and his wife were picked up by the *Peiho* in Palau. They were no strangers to the ship. Already on 18 June 1909 Krämer and his wife had met the *Peiho* during its stay on the island of Yap. There they had convinced its then leader, Dr. F. Fülleborn, to drop them off on Palau, where they wanted to engage in ethnographical collecting and ethnological research before officially joining the Expedition a few weeks later.

Krämer’s take over of the leadership, as already mentioned earlier, had a profound impact on the course and outcome of the Expedition. That was foreshadowed in a letter to Linden of 17 June 1909, when Krämer wrote:

Tomorrow I will arrive on Yap to slowly start working for the *Peiho*. I hope through good tactics to make this expedition more efficient and shorter than in its previous year, as under Fülleborn the ship just hurried around without achieving anything of importance. At least in regard to ethnological *Tiefenarbeit* (‘in-depth research’). Not even something sensational has been found in N.Pom [Neu-Pommern/today: New Britain] and among the Kaiserin-Augusta-Fluss [Sepik River]. However they dragged away a lot.

---

767 See Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow’s official diary of the *Hamburg Südsee-Expedition*, copy held at the *Ethnologisches Institut* of the University of Tübingen. The original copy is held at the *Museum für Völkerkunde* in Hamburg. On 3 August 1909, Elisabeth noted that they were visited by Safert and Hambruch, before packing their belongings to settle on board the *Peiho* a day later.

768 For Krämer’s meeting of the *Peiho* in June 1909, see Krämer’s correspondence with Count Linden. See also Schleip, pp. 116-117.

769 For more details of the circumstances regarding their transport to Palau, see Schleip, pp. 116-118. He refers to Fülleborn’s diaries, who argued that the transport was only agreed upon since Krämer promised to pay Duncker, Reche and Vogel salaries for the additional month from the budget of the second year of the Expedition, p. 117. The exact whereabouts and content of Krämer’s six weeks research on Palau, however, remain unknown.

770 See Augustin Krämer’s letter to Count Linden, dated 17 June 1909, held at the Linden Museum, Stuttgart, translation by the author.
Under Krämer’s leadership the Expedition became ‘more efficient and shorter’. Its second year only lasted 8 ½ months, while the increased efficiency is reflected in the publications; twenty-five compared to four from its previous year.\textsuperscript{771}

This development was facilitated by Krämer’s organisational skills and his strict discipline (he even controlled the work of the other members on a weekly basis), as well as his belief in stationary ethnological research.\textsuperscript{772} That is stated in his official diary:

There are no days to rest any more. All in-between days, of which there are only a few anyway, are over-filled with sorting, development of photos and so on. Until now, no discordant note has come into society. That is because our fields of research are always separated and that only occasionally something is prepared for print. Double work is thereby avoided, and the pleasure in one’s own work and findings becomes reinforced. The individual monographic work, the drop off of individual members in different places will thus be used throughout the Caroline islands.\textsuperscript{773}

Although his style of leadership proved successful, Krämer’s ‘near to military precise planning’, as Fischer points out, did not increase the Arbeitsfreude (‘work pleasure’) of the other members of the Expedition.\textsuperscript{774} Krämer, for example, controlled the official diaries and findings of his fellow Expedition members on a regular basis.\textsuperscript{775} Fischer further argues that Krämer’s introduction as the new scientific leader of the Expedition was accompanied by conflict and resentment, stressing that ‘his personal way did not help him to make friends’.\textsuperscript{776}

A similar point of view is also taken by Schleip, who doubts Krämer’s judgment that there was no ‘discordant note’ among the members of the Expedition. Instead, he suggests that ‘Krämer’s ears were just incapable of hearing these notes’.\textsuperscript{777} He even concludes that ‘people like Sarfert and Hambruch preferred to work alone for a period of time, rather than to present their findings every night like ABC Schützen (primary pupils)’.\textsuperscript{778} These assessments hint at

\textsuperscript{772} See Fischer, who argues that Krämer’s take over brought a ‘fundamental change’ to the Hamburg Südsee-Expedition see Fischer, pp. 103-114.
\textsuperscript{773} Krämer in his official diary from 20 November 1909, quoted in Fischer, p. 67, translation by the author.
\textsuperscript{774} Fischer, p. 67.
\textsuperscript{775} Ibid., pp. 60-61.
\textsuperscript{776} Ibid., p. 66. Fischer describes Krämer as ‘a curious mixture of great organiser, scientist and less enjoyable person’, translation by the author.
\textsuperscript{777} Schleip, p. 120.
\textsuperscript{778} Ibid., translation by the author.
Krämer’s difficult personality which, a part from his abilities, was to characterise Krämer’s career as an ethnologist.\textsuperscript{779}

However, regardless of their motivation, it was this ‘individual monographic work’, which presented the greatest change in the course of the Hamburg Südsee-Expedition. As Fischer points out, whereas the first year consisted of brief excursions to the land from the safety and luxury of the ship, the second year ‘demonstrated first signs of stationary, intensive and long-term fieldwork’.\textsuperscript{780}

In contrast to short excursions on land, which mainly served the purpose of collecting ethnographical artefacts, these long-term stays allowed for more in-depth observations of the indigenous societies. In practise, this meant that the members remained in a location for some days or even weeks at a time.

In his work Fischer provides the following overview of the members, their field of research and the duration of time they spent there:

- Wilhelm Müller worked for approximately 10 months (June 1909 to April 1910) on the island of Yap.
- Paul Hambruch spent about six months researching on Ponape (March to September 1909) and again six weeks on Nauru (October/November 1910).
- Ernst Sarfert worked three months on Kosrae (Kusaie) in the eastern Caroline Islands. Afterwards he spent another three months investigating the Polynesian enclave of Nukumanu in Melanesia.
- Augustin Krämer and his wife worked on Palau for nine months.\textsuperscript{781}

Although this change in research method is generally attributed to Augustin Krämer, Fischer points out that the change of locality, as well as Müller’s critique on the working methods of the first year were also contributing factors.\textsuperscript{782}

Indeed, during his participation in the first year of the Expedition, Wilhelm Müller had repeatedly raised his concern about the limitations of a ship-bound ethnological endeavour.\textsuperscript{783}

\textsuperscript{779} See Chapter Seven and Chapter Eight.
\textsuperscript{780} See Fischer for more details about the difference between the first year and the second year of the Expedition, pp. 103-114.
\textsuperscript{781} Ibid., p. 108, translation by the author.
\textsuperscript{782} See ibid., pp. 103-104.
In a letter to Thilenius dated 9 October 1908 he had complained that ‘we are trying to write publications after a mere few weeks of observation’. In his view, as the historian Rainer Buschmann suggests, Müller was influenced by Edgar Walden from the Deutsche Marine-Expedition, whom he had met during his stay on New Mecklenburg. Buschmann argues that ‘both Walden and Müller had clearly come to realize the advantages of long-term studies’. That realisation was eventually also shared by the other members, since their research stays continued even after the official end of the Expedition.

However, it was only under Krämer’s leadership that this ‘long-term study’ approach to ethnological research, what he termed Tiefenarbeit, was implemented. In 1911 he explained and defended that approach which he had developed over the years, arguing ‘that it is generally agreed that ideal fieldwork requires at least a year long, if possible uninterrupted, stay of an ethnologist in one speech area language’.

Krämer published this explanation only after the Expedition, although it had been discernable in his and his wife’s ethnological research in Palau. He affirms that in the preface of his first volume monograph on Palau:

> Adding all stays together, we have not been longer in Palau than 9 months and then mainly during the rainy season between April and September. My self proclaimed demand that, for a monograph, one has to spend a full, and if possible uninterrupted, year in the area under investigation; I was not able to fulfil. To aggravate the research situation was the fact that, in contrast to my previous work in Samoa, the Palauens language was next to unknown and even more difficult than there [in Samoa]. Additionally it became obvious that I had to make a flying survey of the whole northern part of the Island group, as it was impossible for me to mark the settlements in the existing maps. It might be noticed that I know very well the limitations of a monograph. If they still have become more extensive and in many areas more detailed.

783 See ibid., pp. 68-70; Rainer Buschmann’s article ‘Colonizing Anthropology: Albert Hahl and the Ethnographic Frontier in German New Guinea’, in H. Glenn Penny and Matti Bunzl, eds Worldly Provincialism: German Anthropology in the Age of Empire, Bristol: University Presses Marketing, 2003, pp. 252-253; as well as Schleip, pp. 120-125.
784 Müller cited by Buschmann, pp. 252-253. In response, Thilenius had asked Fülleborn to explain to ‘him [Müller] the difference between extensive and intensive research work’, arguing that ‘a ship bound expedition can surely work extensively’. Thilenius quoted in Fischer, p. 69, translation by the author.
785 See Buschmann, pp. 252-253.
786 See Schleip, pp. 120-121.
787 Augustin Krämer ‘Über Museums- und Feldmonographien’, in Sonderdruck aus dem (spezial edition of) Korrespondenz-Blatt der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte, Nr. 3 (March 1911), p. 23. This article was a response by Krämer to Wilhelm Foy, the director of the Ethnological Museum in Cologne. For a more detailed discussion on Krämer’s notion of Tiefenarbeit, see Schleip, pp. 162-166.
than my Samoan ones, then it leads back to my experiences and the increased research on the spot, as well as on the, as previously mentioned, strong support of my wife.  

Indeed, during the Hamburg Südsee-Expedition, Augustin and Elisabeth spent over 200 days on Palau on two separate visits, from 21 June to 26 September 1909 and from 13 April to 27 July 1910. On these visits they frequently left the Peiho to live among the islanders, either in a tent or in rented huts or in one of the many bai, the traditional men-houses.

These living arrangements, as well as the length of their stay allowed them to form close contacts with the indigenous population, which in turn contributed much to the quality and quantity of their work. This becomes most obvious in regard to Elisabeth’s ethnological

---


889 See Schleip, p. 83. Additional to their stay on Palau, Krämer and his wife spent 55 days on Chuuk (Truk) on two occasions; from 28.10.1909 to 14.1.1910 and again from 29.3.1910 to 4.4.1910.

890 See ibid. During the first few weeks of the expedition, as Elisabeth’s diary reveals, she and Krämer stayed in the hut they had rented on Palau during their earlier stay. During their numerous excursions they also spent nights in the different bai of the islands (for example from 23 –24 September 1909 on the island of Ngliangl). For more information on the bai, as well as the Krämer’s interest in these buildings, see Chapter Four.
work, which was primarily focused on so-called ‘women questions’ (*Frauenfragen*). It seems that during their stays, she had no trouble in establishing these contacts, despite the communication problems stressed by the other members of the expedition. On the contrary, as on their previous expeditions, Elisabeth’s ability to set up contacts helped to facilitate contact between the local population and the Expedition. That becomes evident, when she states:

Early my brown friends appeared in their beautiful dresses and sailed with Krämer and me on board in their *amlain* [boat of the women]. I showed them the ship, everything caused interest. A piece of ice was dropped with great excitement, the sheep on board were looked at in amazement. Then Hellwig presented his barter goods and caused much applause, many exchanges took place. Then they left the ship.

Her ability to make contact was influenced by her approach, which saw her participating in the daily life of the indigenous population. Her diary reveals that she took part in children’s games and dances, let herself be taught in different weaving techniques, or just sat quietly in the villages painting.

![Image](image_url)

**FIG. 6.6 ‘Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow portraying Moleadjeg, an occupant of the island of Feis’**

*(Anna Pytlik *Träume im Tropenlicht*, p. 9)*

---

791 On the research focus of Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, see Krämer’s preface to his first volume on Palau, p. viii. He argues that, apart from painting, the investigation of women’s questions was her task, a fact which is certainly reflected in her official diary of the expedition.

792 Both Hambruch and Safert frequently complained that the lack of translators hindered their ethnological work. See Fischer, pp. 108-110. Fischer also demonstrates that the lack of translators had a profound impact on the expedition during its previous year, when Hellwig was the only one to speak pidgin, pp. 96-101.

793 This remark she noted on 15 August 1909 in her official diary of the expedition, copy held at the *Ethnologisches Institut* at the University of Tübingen, translation by the author.

794 See Elisabeth’s official diary, copy held at the *Ethnologisches Institut* at the University of Tübingen, in which she describes her different activities.
All of these actions brought her in closer contact with the islanders, and in particular the island women. She remarks that the local women ‘are often then very affectionate and loving, especially if one was to joke, dance and laugh with them’. Eventually Elisabeth even became part of the indigenous society, when she was adopted by the Palauan woman Diraiingeáol from Goréor. This event, as Anna Pytlik comments, ‘enabled her even more access to female specific information’.

---

FIG. 6.7 ‘Two women from the Palau Islands: on the left Mrs. Diraiingeáol from Goréor, the adoptive mother of Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, right the young Mrs. Kélebil from Melekéiok. Watercolour by Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow’ (Anna Pytlik Träume im Tropenlicht, p. 34)

---

795 See ibid. Her remark was made on 1 September 1909, translation by the author.
796 In her diaries she often referred to her ‘mother’. For example, on 17 August 1909 she noted that, after having made some observations about Palauen games, ‘I went with the old lady D., my mother, to her taro field’. See Elisabeth’s diary, copy held at the Ethnologisches Institut at the University of Tübingen, translation by the author. Further see Pytlik, pp. 34-35.
797 Pytlik, p. 35.
However, apart from gaining access to female related issues, like abortion and childbirth, Elisabeth’s close contacts with local women guaranteed that they became more than just anonymous informants. Instead, as Pytlik points out, Elisabeth provided their names and occasionally provided a photo or sketch of her informants, thus letting them appear ‘as independent persons with individual abilities’.  

A similar aspect is also to be found in regard to her husband who, in his later publications, frequently stressed the help and support of his former guide and translator William Gibbon, a Caribbean-Micronesian half-cast. Indeed the dates of his publication suggest that their contact lasted well over 20 years. Thereby Krämer and Gibbon shared a close working relationship, which also contributed much to Krämer’s work. This becomes obvious, when Krämer acknowledges in the preface to his third monograph on Palau, published in 1926, that he had ‘finally received news from my translator William Gibbon, who had sent a big work on the constitutions on Palau, which were published in Volume II, and also reported much new information of what has happened in-between’. This form of personal contact was also experienced by the other members of the Expedition. Paul Hambruch, for example, established a close working relationship with a chief from Ponape, called Lae, who gave him ‘practical lessons in seafaring’. Undeniably, these contacts were an integral part of Krämer’s approach of Tiefenarbeit. Hans Fischer comments that this change of approach lead to a change in collected data, as the second year of the Expedition produced more information on the spiritual life of the islands than the first year. However, despite its obvious advantages for ethnological research, the approach also had a profound impact on the members of the Expedition and in particular on their health. It seems

798 Ibid., p. 36. For illustrations and examples of Elisabeth’s informants, see pp. 35-36.
799 See Krämer’s prefaces to Palau, I. Teilband, p. xi; Palau, III. Teilband, Abteilung: V. Stoffliches und VI. geistige Kultur, Hamburg, 1926, p. v; Palau, IV. Teilband, Abteilung: VII. Geschichten und Gesänge und VIII. Botanischer, Zoologischer und Palauwörter-Index, Hamburg, 1929, pp. v-vi, as well as his preface to his 1932 published monograph: Truk, Hamburg, 1932, p. x, all published in regard to the Ergebnisse der Hamburger Südsee-Expedition 1908-1910, edited by Dr. G. Thilenius. In his work, Krämer stresses the information and help he received from Gibbon, as well as the updated information required for his publications. For more information on William Gibbon see ‘Charlie Gibbons: Master of Palau’, online available at: http://kaglecollection.com/about_charlie.html, visited on 31 July 2008.
800 In the preface to his monograph on Truk, which was published in 1932, Krämer mentions to have received a letter from Gibbon in 1930. This would prove that they know and kept in contact for over 20 years, as the Hamburg Südsee-Expedition was in 1909/1910.
801 See Krämer’s preface in Palau, III. Teilband, p. v, translation by the author. Unfortunately, it seems that Krämer’s correspondence with Gibbon has been lost, as it is not preserved among the notes held at the Ethnologisches Institut at the University of Tübingen nor at the Linden Museum.
802 Hambruch quoted in Fischer, p. 112. Hambruch also talked about the islanders as ‘friends’.
803 See Fischer, pp. 112-113.
that the living conditions on these islands, cut off from the luxury and supplies of the ship, were often far from ideal. That is illustrated by Hambruch, when he remarks in his diary:

Waiting for the *Peiho*, which does not arrive, tour around the island. Geographic studies. Become completely soaked. The number of mosquitoes extends each evening, thus I will be happy to leave the island behind me.\textsuperscript{804}

Elisabeth’s diary reveals that, in March 1910, she felt ‘rather sick’, remaining in bed for three days.\textsuperscript{805} A similar fate was also shared by Ernst Safert who, in early 1910, suffered from pneumonia and had to stay on board the *Peiho*.\textsuperscript{806} Thus, with the health situation deteriorating, Krämer decided to bring the Expedition to an end:

\begin{quote}
It is time that this *Wanderarbeit* (migrant work) comes to an end, as the constant change in the research fields eventually demands too much from the individual [researcher]. If one would to continue, one had to stay even longer in one place.\textsuperscript{807}
\end{quote}

Although this decision, according to Schleip, must have sounded like a ‘liberation’ to the other members, it also bought to an end the most extensive and successful ethnological work that was conducted during the *Hamburg Südsee-Expedition*.\textsuperscript{808} Consequently, Elisabeth’s final remark in her diary can be interpreted either way, when she states on 13 April 1910:

\begin{quote}
Arrival Palau. We now leave the Peiho and the expedition, for which we have worked with pleasure.\textsuperscript{809}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{804} Hambruch’s notes from 13 December 1909, quoted in Fischer, p. 59, translation by the author.\textsuperscript{805} See Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow’s official diary, copy held at the *Ethnologisches Institut* at the University of Tübingen. On 12 March 1910 she notes that she ‘felt quite ill’ and returned to bed, where, as her diary further reveals, she remained until 15 March 1910.\textsuperscript{806} See Krämer’s private diaries held at the Linden Museum. In April 1910 Krämer noted that Safert was suffering from pneumonia for which he had to stay on board. This remark was among the last ones in Krämer’s private diaries, as from May onwards he was just using his official diary, which contained fewer details about illnesses of the members.\textsuperscript{807} See Augustin Krämer’s remark in his official diary from 7 October 1910, quoted by Schleip, p. 125.\textsuperscript{808} See Schleip, p. 126, who argues that Krämer’s decision must have sounded like a ‘Befreiungschlag’ to the other members of the expedition.\textsuperscript{809} See Elisabeth’s remark on 13 April 1910 in her official diary, copy held at the *Ethnologisches Institut* at the University of Tübingen.
The Aftermath of the *Hamburg Südsee-Expedition* and its importance on Krämer’s further career

With their departure from Palau on the *Peiho* in mid-April 1910, Krämer and his wife’s active participation in the Expedition came to a close. After a brief stay on Palau, during which they complemented and ordered their ethnological work, they left for Germany, where they arrived in the summer of 1910.\(^8\)\(^1\)\(^0\) Their return not only marked the official end of the Krämer’s leadership of the Expedition, his last visit to the Pacific, but also his attempt to make ethnology his profession.

However, as illustrated earlier, Krämer still had problems with the organizers of the Expedition, and in particular the *Hamburger Wissenschaftlichen Stiftung* (Hamburg’s Scientific Foundation). Already in December 1909, in a letter to Senator von Melle, Krämer had expressed an ‘un-Hamburgerischen Bedürfnis nach Ehre und Ruhm’ (‘untypical desire for a person from Hamburg for honours and fame’).\(^8\)\(^1\)\(^1\) The relationship became even more tainted when Krämer later asked for an additional payment. In a letter dated 23 October 1910 to the Foundation Krämer demanded a bonus payment of 10.000 Marks (US$ 2500) for his expertise and services as leader and medical doctor during the Expedition. He had, as he complained, ‘received the same salary as even the youngest member [of the Expedition], despite my broad experiences and my preparatory work’.\(^8\)\(^1\)\(^2\)

On both occasions, as Fischer notes, it was up to Thilenius to mediate between ‘the wishes of the individual members and the greater aims of the Expedition’.\(^8\)\(^1\)\(^3\) On the first view, it seems that Thilenius’s mediation proved successful, as Krämer’s financial demands evaporated and he even agreed to publish his whole collected ethnological material in conjunction with the *Ergebnisse der Hamburger Südsee-Expedition* (Results of the Hamburg South Seas...
Expedition). On the second view however, it seems that Krämer’s decision to drop his demands and to prepare his collected material, which also included material from his previous travels to Micronesia, for publication was more practically motivated. As Schleip points out, Krämer was well aware that the financing of such extensive monographs as he envisioned ‘would be impossible outside this endeavour’.

Although the publication process of the Ergebnisse der Hamburger Südsee-Expedition progressed rather slowly for a number of reasons, including a World War and the loss of Germany’s colonies as well as a global economic crisis, Krämer eventually contributed nine volumes to the series.

These included a monograph on Truk (1932), as well as one on its surrounding islands (1935), a monograph on the central Caroline Islands (1937), as well as a work on Ralik-Ratak in the Marshall Islands (1938), which he co-wrote with Hans Nevermann. But it was the publication of his five volume monograph on Palau, which he published between 1917 and 1929, that presents Krämer’s most important and extensive publication in this series.

Indeed, the size of these five volumes alone was bigger than the overall size of the four publications regarding the first year of the Expedition. However, it was not its size but rather the quality and quantity of its content which made this monograph outstanding. His work on Palau has been identified as a work of passion. This was indicated in 1913, when Krämer even travelled to Spain to research the Archives of San Sebastian, Simancas, Madrid and Seville for material on the history of discovery of the Caroline Islands.

———

814 Indeed, within the available material, it seems that Krämer dropped his financial demands. There is no further mentioning in his correspondence about any demands of a financial nature.
815 Schleip, p. 127.
816 Indeed, the publications in conjunction with the Ergebnisse der Hamburger Südsee-Expedition certainly took longer than expected, with the last volume being published in 1954, nearly 45 years after the expedition, see Otto Reche Nova Britannia Abteilung: II., aus Ergebnisse der Hamburger Südsee-Expedition 1908-1910, Hamburg, 1954. The reasons for this delay are certainly found in political and economic developments, like two World Wars. For further details see Schleip, pp. 127-128.
817 Krämer’s first volume on Palau was published in 1917, with the last two being published in 1929. See ‘Publications by Dr. Augustin Krämer’ in Appendix V for more details.
818 Fischer, p. 107. He argues that Krämer’s five volumes on Palau contained 1513 (Arabic numbered pages) as opposed to the 1288 combined pages that were published in four volumes during the first year of the Expedition.
819 In a personal conversation in November 2006, Dr. Volker Harms, the former director of the Ethnologisches Institut at the University of Tübingen, acknowledged that this work of Krämer’s was his ‘Herzblut’ (‘lifeblood’).
820 Krämer’s trip to Spain took place between September 1913 and December that year. On his travels he was accompanied by his wife, who assisted him in copying material. For more details, see Krämer’s diaries, held at the Linden Museum. See also Schleip, p. 133.
Thus, it seems not surprising that ‘his writings’, as Mandy Etpison, the director of the Etpison Museum in Koror /Palau argued, ‘are still of immense importance for Palau. Without them part of our history would have been forgotten.’ As such, Krämer’s work on Palau, like his earlier work on Samoa, not only contributed to his standing as an expert on Oceania, but also provides witness to his ongoing interest in *Völkerkunde*, which now became the centre of his professional career.

Chapter Seven.

‘The End of Travelling’, Krämer’s ethnological career in Germany

Krämer’s participation in the *Hamburg Südsee-Expedition* marked his last expedition to the Pacific. His return to Germany in mid-1910 marked the beginning of his institutional career in *Völkerkunde* (Ethnology), which lasted until his retirement in 1933. In the course of this career he became the Scientific Director of the Linden Museum in Stuttgart and, eventually, a lecturer in *Völkerkunde* and curator of the ethnological collection of the University of Tübingen. Krämer’s career in ethnology, therefore, was in line with his interest in ethnographic collections and his conviction of the value of ethnological research, both of which he had developed during his extensive travels in the Pacific. However, as with his previous expeditions, Krämer’s career in Germany was not without conflict. After just a few years, his position at the Linden Museum ended with controversy. Following World War I, in which Krämer re-enlisted as a medical doctor, he began to establish contacts with the University of Tübingen. This relationship was also tainted by conflict. Nevertheless, Krämer remained with the University until his retirement. In doing so he succeeded in founding an ethnological institute and establishing *Völkerkunde* as an integrated part of university teaching in Germany. Apart from his professional interests, it seems Krämer’s career was also influenced by his strong bond with his home town of Stuttgart. Because his previous life had been characterized by his travels, his later life was much more settled and he remained in Stuttgart for the rest of his professional life.

**Krämer and the Linden Museum, 1910-1915**

In late November 1910, only a few months after his return to Germany after the *Hamburg Südsee-Expedition*, Krämer travelled from Berlin to Stuttgart. 823 There, he was appointed to a

---

823 After their arrival in Germany in summer 1910, Augustin and Elisabeth travelled to Berlin, where Krämer participated on the 3rd *Colonialcongress* in early October; followed by a meeting with the members of the *Deutsche Marine-Expedition* on 31 October. In late November he travelled to Stuttgart without his wife, who had fallen sick. See Krämer’s diaries, held at the Linden Museum.
leading position with the soon to be opened Linden Museum. A local newspaper on 9 December 1910 stated: ‘As we heard Navy Surgeon, retired, professor Dr. Krämer will move here next spring for the new opening of the Linden Museum.’ \(^{824}\) Despite this public announcement, knowledge about the exact circumstances surrounding Krämer’s appointment as *Wissenschaftlicher Direktor* (Scientific Director) at the Linden Museum are, as Dietrich Schleip notes, ‘rather scant’ and ‘obscure’. \(^{825}\) This situation also applies to Krämer’s subsequent work at the Museum in general. \(^{826}\)

---

824 See the newspaper clipping in Krämer’s diaries, held at the Linden Museum: ‘Wie wir hören, wird Marine-Generalobersarzt a. D. Professor Dr. Krämer zur Einrichtung des neuen Lindenmuseums im Frühjahr des nächsten Jahres hierher übersiedeln’, translation by the author. The clipping contains a date, ‘Freitag, der 9. Dezember 1910’, but not the name of the paper. However, it can be assumed that it was a local paper from Stuttgart. The publication, therefore, took place just a few days after Krämer’s arrival on 28 November 1910.

825 See Schleip, who notes that information about Krämer’s association with the Linden Museum is ‘recht mager’ and ‘undurchsichtig’, p. 129. Schleip further noted that some files are still closed to the public, a fact which was confirmed during the research for this thesis. In his history of the Museum, ‘Linden-Museum Stuttgart, Staatliches Museum für Völkerkunde. Rückblick, Umschau, Ausblick’, in TRIBUS (Sonderdruck), Nr. 24 (November 1975), the former Director of the Linden Museum, Dr. Friedrich Kussmaul mentions only that Krämer was appointed Scientific Director, p. 30.

826 Indeed, similar to the events surrounding his appointment, Krämer’s later career at the Museum is also rather sketchy, as there is hardly any mention in Krämer’s correspondence about his actual activities during his time at the Museum. Schleip assumes that this lack of information is due to the fact that Krämer, as well as other persons involved, chose to keep silence due to Krämer’s later disputes with the Museum’s Board, p. 128.
Krämer’s correspondence reveals that he had indeed longed for a position at the Museum for quite some time. Already, by late 1905, Krämer had approached Count von Linden, the President of the Württembergischen Vereins für Handelsgeographie und Förderung deutscher Interessen im Auslande (The Society for Trade Geography in Württemberg and the Promotion of German Interests Aboard) and the Chairperson of the Museum’s Board, for possible positions within the planned ethnological museum.\(^\text{827}\) In a letter of 14 October 1905, referring to Linden’s work on the planned museum, Krämer stated:

I just thought, that sooner or later the wish for more support and a scientific treatment of the constantly growing collection might arise, therefore I did not want to miss the opportunity, to bring myself back into your memory, if my person would suit you. … I have, so to speak, grown up with the collection and I have seen it coming into being. … Even before my first expedition to the South Seas, the collection [then held at the Naturalien Cabinet], had influenced me and created my wish to collect even more [artefacts], for Stuttgart and [my wish] to help establish an ethnographical museum.\(^\text{828}\)

Although Linden disputed Krämer’s claim about the idea for the creation of the Museum, stating that ‘I take full credit for the idea of founding the ethnographic museum’, he certainly appreciated Krämer’s involvement and expertise.\(^\text{829}\) In his correspondence throughout the coming years, Linden kept Krämer up to date with the planning and construction of the Museum in Stuttgart, even asking for his advice.\(^\text{830}\) It seems that during their long relationship Linden perceived Krämer to be his possible successor and replacement.\(^\text{831}\) This was illustrated in a letter to Krämer on 28 September 1905, when Linden argued that: ‘I could not wish for a more suited and active collaborator and successor than you, whom I have always regarded as my born successor’.\(^\text{832}\)

\(^{827}\) See Krämer’s correspondence with Count Linden, held at the Linden Museum. From late 1905 Krämer and Linden begun to discuss Krämer’s possible positions at the Museum. In particular, see Krämer’s letters to Linden dated 14 October 1905, and Linden’s letters dated 28 September, 21 October and 27 October 1905, which all make mention of Krämer’s wish for a position at the Museum. For details on Linden, who was the driving force behind the Museum, see Chapter 3, as well as Appendix I. For more details about the Museum and its history, see Friedrich Kussmaul, pp. 17-65, as well as Linden-Museum ed. Museum, Linden-Museum Stuttgart, Staatliches Museum für Völkerkunde, Magazin Presse, 1987, pp. 10-11.

\(^{828}\) See Krämer’s letter to Count Linden dated 14 October 1905, held at the Linden Museum, translation by the author.

\(^{829}\) For quote, see Linden’s letter to Krämer dated 28 September 1905. In this letter he takes a position against Krämer’s claims. The letter is held at the Linden Museum, translation by the author.

\(^{830}\) See Linden’s correspondence with Krämer, held at the Linden Museum. In a letter titled ‘streng vertraulich’ (‘top secret’) dated 11 April 1908, Linden informed Krämer of the final decision on the building site. Over the course of time he kept Krämer informed about the process and planning of the Museum in all stages, even discussing with Krämer the size of the exhibition facilities and the number of offices for the director. See his letters dated 31 March and 18 October 1908.

\(^{831}\) Krämer’s and Linden’s professional relationship began in relation to Krämer’s travels to Samoa. See Chapter Two.

\(^{832}\) See Linden’s letter to Krämer dated 28 September 1905, held at the Linden Museum, translation by the author.
However, despite this endorsement, a possible position for Krämer was still a matter for further discussion. Firstly, the Board had to agree and support his appointment and, secondly, the financial arrangements for such a position were still undecided. Linden pointed this out in his letter, in which he argued that ‘up to now the society does not have the means [to pay a salary]’. This put a damper on Krämer’s vocational plans, and he acknowledged:

Working [at the museum] without any salary or reimbursement would, for a number of reasons, prove to be rather difficult for me. … The assurance that you think of me worthy enough to contribute to your work, however, is quite enough for the time being.

Nonetheless, Krämer’s interest was not broken. In the closing words of his letter, he asked that, ‘despite the fact that your promise is certainly sufficient, I would be most grateful if you could by any chance inform me about the views held by [the other members of] the committee’. It seems that Linden was also eager to clarify the matter. On 3 November 1905 he notified Krämer:

[That] in regard to museum’s matters, during the last meeting of the board I presented your wish and asked for it to be kept secret. However, I have great pleasure to tell you, I have been granted permission to inform you that until now, none of the gentlemen on the board have thought about a succession and that none of them has made any objection to your candidacy. … The road is clear for you - now as clearly as it has been in the past.

Krämer’s road was clear, perhaps even faster and more decisively than he and Linden had anticipated. A few days after the cornerstone ceremony for the new Ethnographical Museum on 10 January 1910, Count von Linden died. Although Linden’s death certainly came as a shock for the city of Stuttgart and the ethnological community, it did not hinder the further construction of the Museum. Instead, the Museum was named in his honour. In his article on the history of the Museum, Friedrich Kussmaul points out, that ‘many important final and preliminary decisions had been done by the Count prior to his death: the

---

833 Ibid.
834 See Krämer’s letter to Count von Linden dated 14 October 1905, held at the Linden Museum, translation by the author.
835 Ibid.
836 See Linden’s letter to Krämer dated 3 November 1905, held at the Linden Museum, translation by the author.
837 Count Linden died five days after the cornerstone ceremony on 15 January 1910. He had suffered from bad health for some time. For more details, see Friedrich Kussmaul’s article, pp. 24-28.
838 See Lambert’s obituary of Count Linden, quoted in Kussmaul’s article, p. 25 and p. 28.
839 In his article, Kussmaul reports that on occasion of the opening of the Museum, the Kultusminister (Minister of Culture), his Excellence von Fleischhauer, allowed the society to have a plaque of Linden displayed at the entrance and the motto ‘Ganz aus eigener Kraft’ (‘under one’s own steam’), p. 28.
construction went ahead [and] the money was sufficient’. Indeed, it seems that Krämer, who at the time was in the ‘field’ participating in the Hamburg Südsee-Expedition, was completely confident about his future position at the Museum, an assumption which, as Dietrich Schleip points out, is illustrated by the fact that, ‘despite receiving notification of Linden’s death, Krämer showed no extraverted hurry to return’. In the end he did not return until early December 1910, whereupon he was appointed Wissenschaftlicher Direktor by the Board of the Museum. Despite the fact that the circumstances surrounding Krämer’s appointment remain obscure, it seems that his appointment as Scientific Director was not quite what Krämer had expected. Schleip reports, that ‘the competencies [of this position] were strictly limited to the scientific sphere, the representational duties of the Museum to the outside, as well as the internal leadership, the actual directorial position, remained with the Committee of the Württembergischen Vereins für Handelsgeographie’, of which, he adds, ‘Krämer was not a member’. On the occasion of the great opening of the Museum on the 28 May 1911, Krämer appeared only in seventh place in the line up, behind the members of the board, who ‘stood in the limelight’.

---

840 Ibid., p. 28, translation by the author.
841 See Schleip, p. 129, who argues that Krämer was certainly notified on the event by either Lambert or the Countess, both of whom he had friendly contact with. Despite this, however, as Schleip argues, he ‘zeigte keine übertriebene Eile zurückzukehren’.
842 In his correspondence with Linden, the actual position remained undecided. As mentioned, Linden talked of Krämer as possible successor. However he did not specify in what function, as chairperson of the Committee of the Museum, president of the Württembergischen Vereins für Handelsgeographie, patron and/or collector. However, it also remains unclear which position Krämer aspired to the most.
843 See Schleip, p. 130, translation by the author.
844 For quote, see Schleip, p. 130, translation by the author. Krämer’s position on the opening is reflected in the program, of which a copy has been glued into his diaries. They are held at the Linden Museum. At the opening Krämer even gave a brief speech, which was followed by ones from members of the committee. For information on the opening of the Linden Museum, which was attended by King Wilhelm II of Württemberg, see Kussmaul, pp. 28-30 and Linden-Museum ed., pp. 10-12.
FIG. 7.2  ‘Opening of the Linden Museum on the 28 of May 1911. From left to right: Theodor G. Wanner, (obscured) Queen Charlotte, Augustin Krämer, King Wilhelm II, Duke Wilhelm von Urbach (president of the Württembergischen Vereins für Handelsgeographie from 1911-1928)’

(Linden-Museum ed. Museum, Linden-Museum Stuttgart, p. 12)

This reality was certainly a blow for Krämer who, as Schleip claims, ‘attached great importance to personal honours and public representation’. 845 Thus even the opening of the Linden Museum can be seen as another event which contributed to the deterioration of the relationship between Krämer and the Committee of the Society and the Board of the Museum. This relationship seems to have been fraught from the outset, probably because of Krämer’s difficult personality. Although in 1907 Krämer had became a chairperson of the Württembergischen Verein für Handelsgeographie, the body responsible for the election of

845 See Schleip, who argues that Krämer ‘[legte viel Wert] auf persönliche Ehrung und öffentliche Repräsentation’, p. 130, translation by the author. Krämer’s elevated self perception has also been illustrated in relation to his participation in the Hamburg Südsee-Expedition. See Chapter Six.
the Board, his *Hausmacht* (or influence) was rather limited. He seemed to have no larger involvement in the organisational elements within the Society, such as finances. Indeed, this weak position within the Society was, as Schleip points out, increased by the fact that Krämer was the only member from outside the Stuttgart area and, due to his travels and his deployment in Kiel, was seldom present at meetings.

Instead of direct involvement within the Society, Krämer relied on intermediaries, like Linden and his old friend Lampert. This fact becomes evident in Linden’s letter to Krämer from November 1905, where he argued that, with regard to Krämer’s position with the Museum:

> *Oberstudienrat* Dr. Lampert has worked on your behalf and in his final comment he argued, that the museum can regard itself lucky if it would be possible to win you for the position.

However, with Linden’s death in early 1911, this connection and influence was gone. Even Lampert, as Schleip argues, seemed unable to protect his protégée Krämer any longer. Krämer’s appointment as Scientific Director and not as Director, therefore, was an expression of his lost influence in regard to important decisions and overall affairs of the Museum. In accordance with Linden’s wishes, Krämer received a key position with the Museum, which ‘was however, without influence or prestige’. Instead, the true control and power rested with the Members of the Board: Duke Wilhelm von Urbach, who became President of the *Württembergischen Vereins für Handelsgeographie* after Linden’s death, the Deputy

---

846 Ibid., pp. 130-131.
847 Ibid., pp. 130-131.
848 Ibid., p. 131.
849 See Linden’s letter to Krämer from 3 November 1905, held at the Linden Museum, translation by the author. For more information and a portrait of Dr. Kurt Lampert, see Chapter Two.
850 See Schleip, p. 131.
851 Ibid., p. 131. Schleip argues that the position was rather of formal nature, without ‘Einfluss und Ansehen’, translation by the author.
852 For information on Duke von Urbach, see Kussmaul, p. 19, who argues that it was under his Presidency that the Society had its highest number of members, ‘more than 1800’.
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President Paul Zilling\textsuperscript{853} who organised lectures and public events, and the Schatzmeister (or Treasurer) Theodor G. Wanner.\textsuperscript{854}

In particular, Krämer ‘did not get along well with’ Wanner.\textsuperscript{855} Their disagreements were certainly caused by their strong, clashing personalities and their differing ideas for the Museum, in particular by the fact that, like Krämer, Wanner was convinced about the righteousness of his set task. In his article on the history of the Linden Museum, Kussmaul describes Wanner as ‘a patriarch, in the true sense of the word’, who established himself as

\textsuperscript{853}See ibid., p. 19 and p. 23, for information on Kommerzienrat (Councillor of Commerce) Paul Zilling, as well as a portrait. Zilling’s original contact with the Society was based on his position as Director with an export business in Stuttgart. Over the years he became involved with the Museum. Kussmaul, p.19, argues that ‘the Museum owes a lot to Zilling’, translation by the author.

\textsuperscript{854}Theodor Wanner (1875-1953) has, apart from Count Linden, been seen as the most influential founder and supporter of the Museum. A member of the Society since 1898, he had become Treasurer in 1902. Describing himself as ‘Bettler internationalen Stills’ (‘pauper of international proportions’), he helped to establish a healthy financial platform. In 1928, Wanner succeeded Duke von Urbach as President of the Society and remained at the helm of the Museum’s Board until his death in 1953. For further information on Wanner, see Linden Museum ed., p. 14 and Kussmaul, pp. 19-20 and pp. 28ff.

\textsuperscript{855}See Linden Museum ed., p. 15, where it is argued that ‘Mit Wanner scheint er es nicht gekonnt zu haben’, translation by the author. Unfortunately there are no notes or evidence in support of the statement.
the factual ruler of the Museum. Kussmaul calls the history of the Museum between 1911 to 1953 the ‘Period Wanner’, due to his importance.  

Conflict therefore seemed unavoidable, and it can be assumed that this conflict became most apparent in relation to financial matters. This assumption would explain Krämer’s slow expansion of the collection because, as Schleip points out, ‘ethnographic objects cost money and this was managed by Wanner’. Eventually, as Kussmaul reports, Krämer and Wanner’s professional relationship had cooled to the extent that, from 1914, Wanner started to look for a replacement for Krämer.

Faced with his own powerlessness in relation to Museum and collection matters, Krämer became increasingly involved in ethnological societies, including the Gesellschaft für Antropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte (German Society for Anthropology, Ethnology and Prehistory). Although Krämer had been a member of the Society since 1903, it was only in August 1911 that he became member of the Managing Committee. Along with Luschan and Thilenius, he was now one of six committee members. In the next couple of years he advanced his position, becoming the Chairperson of the Society in 1913. The main task of the Committee was focused on the publication of the Society’s journal, Korresponanz-Blatt der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte, which allowed Krämer to publish a number of essays and review papers.

Besides his involvement within this general society, Krämer also became increasingly involved in local ethnological societies, like the Württembergischen Anthropologischen Gesellschafts.

856 Kussmaul, p. 30. For his description on the period in question, see pp. 28ff.
857 Schleip, p. 132.
858 Kussmaul, p. 30.
859 For information, as well as Krämer’s involvement with this Society, see Chapter Three.
862 See Schleip, p. 132, who argues that the journal offered a wide spectrum of discussion and descriptions. This was certainly appreciated by Krämer, who used the journal to publish eight essays, numerous discussion papers and literature reviews. See ‘Publications by Dr. Augustin Krämer’ in Appendix V.
Verein (Anthropological Society of Württemberg), becoming its first Chairperson in 1916. Krämer’s involvement in these societies, as Schleip points out, was not of great significance to the development of ethnology or ethnographic museums. Nevertheless, it ‘offered Krämer the representational frame, which he lacked in his position at the Linden Museum’.

Contrary to his involvement in these societies, Krämer’s activities at the Museum are less clear. Although, in his opening speech, Krämer had described ‘preservation, addition and cataloguing’, as the main tasks of his position, his true impact on the collection remains unknown. In his position as Scientific Director, however, Krämer had spoken out in favour of creating what he termed Museumsmonographien (or Museum Monographs). He

---

863 For details of Krämer’s involvement with the Württembergischen Anthropologischen Verein, see Schleip, p. 132, who argues that this local society was not in opposition to the Württembergischen Verein für Handelsgeographie. In his notes, he points out that even Lampert was active in both societies at the same time.

864 See Schleip, pp. 132-133, translation by the author. In regard to the representational frame, Krämer’s diaries reveal that he gave a number of lectures to both societies, as well as to other societies in Germany.

865 See Krämer’s opening address, ’Rede zur Eröffnung des Linden Museums’, in Württembergischer Verein für Handelsgeographie und Förderung deutscher Interessen im Ausland, e. V., 1911, pp. 33-34, translation by the author.
envisioned these monographs as detailed descriptions of the ethnographic artefacts held in the museums’ collections. In turn, he hoped, they would serve as *Handbücher* (or handbooks) for fieldworkers and their collection efforts. However, it has to be pointed out that, despite his arguments, Krämer himself did not write one of these monographs, a fact which was probably also based on his estranged relationship with the Museum and its Board. 

Instead, in late 1913, Krämer and his wife travelled to Spain, where he undertook archival research about the European discovery of Palau and the Caroline Islands. This trip could be seen as a sign that Krämer spent much of his time working on his monograph on Palau. Indeed, it seems that Krämer’s focus was firmly put on his ethnological work on the Pacific rather than his work in the Museum. Shortly after his return from Spain in early 1914, his professional relationship with the Museum came to an end when he was dismissed from his position.

However, similarly to his appointment, the exact circumstances of his dismissal remain unknown. His departure was further overshadowed by the outbreak of the First World War. In September 1914 Krämer re-enlisted as a medical doctor to lead a military hospital. 

Ironically, as Schleip reports, this hospital was housed in the lecture theatre of the Museum. It was not until mid 1915, when Krämer’s successor as Scientific Director, Dr. Theodor Koch-Gründer, arrived, that he was transferred to lead the military hospital at Tübingen, marking the end of Krämer’s position at the Linden Museum.

**Krämer and the Great War**

The circumstances surrounding Krämer’s military service during the World War One remain sketchy. In particular, the details of his deployment, his duties and his position are unclear, as

---

867 Krämer’s research trip to Spain lasted from September to December 1913. See also Chapter Six.
868 See Schleip, p. 133.
869 Detailed information on Krämer’s dismissal remain unknown, as the files are either sealed or have been destroyed during the Second World War.
870 See Schleip., p. 133.
871 Ibid., p. 133.
872 Ibid., p.133. For details on Theodor Koch-Gründer, see Linden Museum ed., p. 15 and Kussmaul, p. 30. Kussmaul argues that Koch-Gründer was the first trained Völkerkundler (Ethnologist) at the museum. However, similarly to Krämer, his relationship with Wanner was marked by conflict. Thus, in 1924, Koch-Gründer left his position to conduct research in the Amazon, where he died during one of his expeditions.

207
many of the official Navy documents of the time have been lost or destroyed.\footnote{In a conversation with the archivists from the Military Archive in Freiburg in October 2006, it was acknowledged that the official documents regarding the Navy script have largely been lost in the events that followed the war: ‘Most of them have been deliberately destroyed during the mutiny of German sailors in Hamburg and Kiel at the eve of Germany’s capitulation. Surviving documents have found a new place as waste paper.’ Since Krämer was part of the Navy, this lack of information applies to his service as well. In a letter from the Württembergischen Ministerium des Kirchen- und Schulwesens (Württemberg Ministry of Church and School Matters) to the Academic Rector of the University of Tübingen from 8 May 1922, Krämer’s active service is stated to have lasted from 20 September 1914 to 31 December 1918. Letter held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, Sig. 126/347.} An undated letter, probably from 1915, from Krämer to Karl Weule, Director of the Ethnological Museum in Leipzig, indicates that Krämer himself arranged for his re-listing. In this letter he states:

Dear Weule! Your letter just arrived. Unfortunately I am still here and see to the wounded. The Navy is overcrowded, so I reported here and hope to be able to move out, if the war lasts, which is to be expected. … The ‘dear’ English have to pay for it!\footnote{See Krämer’s letter to Karl Weule, undated, held at the Ethnologisches Institut at the University of Tübingen, translation by the author. The fact that the letter is held at the Institute indicates that he might have received it during his deployment in the hospital at Tübingen.}

Krämer’s voluntary return to active service is certainly not out of place, given his estranged relationship with the Board of the Linden Museum, as well as his patriotic feelings. Indeed, in regard to his previous travels in the Pacific, Krämer had displayed his patriotic feelings more than once. In his article ‘Redet Deutsch in unseren Kolonien!’, which was published in Deutsche Kolonialzeitung in 1913, for example, Krämer demanded an increasing education in the German language within Germany’s South Sea colonies.\footnote{See Krämer’s article ‘Redet Deutsch in unseren Kolonien!’, in Deutsche Kolonialzeitung, 30, no. 24, 1913, pp. 406-407.}

It can be assumed that, despite his intentions, the 50 year old Krämer was soon confronted by the harsh realities of war. As a medical professional working at a military hospital, he was faced with the horrific injuries of soldiers coming from fighting in France and Italy.\footnote{Although the exact origins of the wounded soldiers remain unknown, the relative proximity of Stuttgart and Tübingen to the theatres of France and Italy leads to the assumption that most of them came from these theatres.}

Although the psychological impact of these experiences on Krämer remains unknown, a certain influence did become visible. His remaining documents and files at the Ethnologischen Institut at the University of Tübingen, for example, contain a collection of newspaper articles and cut-out excerpts from the years 1915 to 1917, which all deal with issues of ‘Heldentod’ (or ‘hero’s death’), burials and grief.\footnote{In his files, which are still held at the Institute at the University of Tübingen, there are up to 10 newspaper reports and cut out, which deal with issues of ‘Heldentod’ (‘hero’s death’) to grief, containing advice and poems. One of them is from the paper Schwäbisches Bilderblatt, 9. Jahrg. Nr. 43 Wochenbeilage zu Ausgabe B} This indicates that the issue of death and dying was indeed of special interest to Krämer during this time.
Probably to balance his wartime experiences, Krämer continued his ethnological work. This included his monograph on Palau, whose first volume, as he remarked in his preface, was finished ‘in the middle of the raging war’. He also provided the preface and scientific remarks to Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow’s book on their previous travels through New Mecklenburg, which was published in 1916. However, even in these activities, Krämer could not escape the reality of the war, which is confirmed in his preface to Elisabeth’s book:

A scientific description of the northern part of the island has been put off indefinitely [as] Dr. Walden has been treacherously murdered by the enemy on the Western Front.

Apart from this personal impact, the war also had huge implications for Krämer’s ethnological field of interest, as Germany’s South Seas colonies were the first German territories to be occupied by Allied forces. Given the fact that the colonies were unfortified, unprepared and half way around the world, as the historian Hermann Hiery states, ‘it seems not surprising that Australian, New Zealand and Japanese forces occupied the German South Seas colonies quickly between the end of August and beginning of November 1914’. This occupation, as Hiery observes, was accompanied by a kind of ‘propagandistic effort’ aimed at discrediting German colonial rule and strengthening the legitimacy of the new colonial administration. This fact is acknowledged by Krämer, when he remarks in his preface of his second volume of his Palau monograph:

\[
\text{des Stuttgarter Neuen Tagesblattes, 27. Oktober 1916, which deals with the burial of soldiers during the war. In this article Krämer underlined one poem in particular, which is named ‘Anschrift auf einem Massengrab’ (‘Address on a mass grave’):}
\]
\[
\text{Oft war unsere Liebe karg,}
\]
\[
\text{jetzt im Tode seid ihr reich:}
\]
\[
\text{unser Herz ist euer Sarg,}
\]
\[
\text{und den Fürsten seit ihr gleich.}
\]
\[
\text{Martin Lang.}
\]


880 See ibid., p. VI, when he states that ‘Dr Walden heimtückisch vom Feinde an der Westfront ermordet wurde’, translation by the author.


The following shameless suppression and condemnation of our colonial activities on the part of our enemies will not be enough to dam the German scientific inquiring mind. This new order can not be permanent. The works of the Hamburger South Seas-Expedition will bear witness of how Germany opened up its colonies. 883

However, by the time Krämer had finished his preface, which he dated ‘Stuttgart, 27. August 1919’, the loss of Germany’s South Seas colonies had already become permanent. With the signing of the Treaty of Versailles in late June that year, Germany officially lost all its former overseas colonies and protectorates. 884

It seems that, although Krämer certainly rejected this political development in regard to Germany’s overseas territories, he nevertheless accepted the new reality. This is illustrated in his article, published in late 1919, ‘Die Völkerkunde als notwendiges Lehrfach an den Universitäten’, when he states:

A new era has begun. The Germans, who during the life time of a generation have studied their protectorates better and more thoroughly than other nations in centuries, have been robbed of their home bases overseas. Now one has to use the material gained previously to retain the undisputed leadership. We had this position in regard to the practical research aboard, which is now been closed to us; so we now have to increase the theoretical use [of the information and material]. … The biggest task now is the instruction of our own population. … What Anthropology is for the medical profession, so Völkerkunde should be an exam subject for all who plan to work in foreign lands, like administrators; missionaries; consuls; diplomats and so on. 885

In this sense, the title of Krämer’s article, this could be translated as ‘Ethnology as an Essential Subject at the Universities’, became his new imperative. In particular, his conviction in the importance of Völkerkunde (Ethnology) saw him become affiliated with the University of Tübingen, where he was to follow an academic path during his later career as an ethnologist.

---

884 The Treaty of Versailles had been proposed in May 1919 and was signed by the German delegation on 28 June 1919. Along with its implication for German politics and the army, it also saw Germany renouncing all its colonial territories. For more information on the treaty and its implication, see for example Deutscher Bundestag, ed. Fragen und die deutsche Geschichte, Bonn 1987, pp. 255ff, as well as Roger Chickering, Imperial Germany and the Great War, 1914-1918, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998.
Krämer at the University of Tübingen

With the end of World War I and his dismissal from active service in late December 1918, Krämer entered a new chapter in his professional life.\textsuperscript{886} In mid-1919 he contacted the University of Tübingen regarding a part time lecturing position in \textit{Völkerkunde}.\textsuperscript{887} The exact reasons why Krämer chose the University of Tübingen to start his academic career remain unclear. Dietrich Schleip points out that there are no hints suggesting that Krämer applied for an academic position with other universities in Germany such as those in Berlin, Hamburg and Cologne, which were already teaching \textit{Völkerkunde} as part of their curriculum.\textsuperscript{888} Instead, he concludes, that ‘it fitted Krämer’s personality and self-image, to start with the foundation of his “own” \textit{Völkerkunde}-institute’.\textsuperscript{889} Additionally, one has to add, a position with the University of Tübingen would have allowed Krämer to remain in Stuttgart, the city where he felt at home and where he and his wife resided in a small house.

In his decision Krämer was supported by the geographer Professor Dr. Uhlig, who, as Schleip points out, ‘despite a number of personal attacks and hostilities [from Krämer’s side]’, still had the largesse to support Krämer’s academic involvement at the University.\textsuperscript{890} Eventually, Krämer’s application for a part-time lecturing position in \textit{Völkerkunde} was also supported by the Philosophical Faculty of the University, which possessed a small ethnographical collection and was already teaching some ‘\textit{Länder- und Völkerkunde}’ (‘Geography and Ethnology’) as part of its curriculum in Geography. In doing so, the Faculty received the backing of the Upper Senate of the University, as the following letter from 14 August 1919 to

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{886} The exact circumstances regarding Krämer’s dismissal from the active service remain unknown. Schleip reports, p.134, that after the war Krämer lived in a small house in Stuttgart and, although he was not wealthy, he received a pension from the Navy. In relation to this pension and his active service, see also a letter from the \textit{Württembergischen Ministerium des Kirchen- und Schulwesens} (Württemberg Ministry of Church and School Matters) to the Academic Rector of the University of Tübingen from 8 May 1922, in which Krämer’s pension is discussed. The letter is held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, Sig. 126/347.

\textsuperscript{887} See Krämer’s correspondence with the University and members of the Geographical Institute at the University of Tübingen. Letters held at the archive of the University, Sig. 126/347 and Sig. 117C/505.

\textsuperscript{888} See Schleip, p. 134. In regard to ethnology as part of the academic curriculum, a handwritten remark by Dr. Henning on a letter from the Upper Senate of the University of Tübingen to the \textit{Württembergischen Ministerium des Kirchen- und Schulwesens} dated 14 August 1919, indicates that by then a few universities were teaching \textit{Völkerkunde}. Apart from Berlin, Hamburg and Cologne, he mentions Vienna, Frankfurt, Munich, Leipzig, Freiburg, Heidelberg and Bern in Switzerland. The letter is held at the archive of the University Tübingen, Sig. 126/347.

\textsuperscript{889} Schleip, p. 134, translation by the author, emphasis on ‘own’ institute by Schleip.

\textsuperscript{890} Schleip, p. 141, highlights the support Krämer received from Dr. Uhlig who, despite attacks and hostilities, ‘still had the largesse to support the objective relevant issues’, translation by author. Indeed, the remaining documents at the University of Tübingen reveal that Dr. Uhlig’s support for Krämer and the foundation of his \textit{Völkerkunde} Institute remained well into the 1930s. For details, see the archive of the University of Tübingen, Sig. 117C/505, which contains a number of letters from Uhlig in which he either defends himself against Krämer or defends Krämer’s demands for an extension of his ethnological teachings to the Philosophical Faculty.
\end{footnotesize}
the Württembergischen Ministerium des Kirchen- und Schulwesens (Württemberg Ministry of Church and School Matters) illustrates:

The Philosophical Faculty applies for Marinegeneraloberarzt Professor Dr. Augustin Krämer, Stuttgart, to be granted a lecture-ship for the subject of Völkerkunde during the next winter semester, which will be paid as two hours per week during the semester. Till now Völkerkunde had been regarded as a sub-subject of [the department of] geography at the university, as the ethnographic collection belonged to the collections of the geographical institute. The high importance and increasing emancipation of the subject, however, makes it desirable that it had its own place in the curriculum of the university and that an exceptional representative be secured for the subject.

In Professor Krämer, an ethnologist of considerable reputation, someone has been found who would be willing to give lectures on Völkerkunde as part of the current university teachings. … As a Navy Surgeon, Professor Krämer has spent many years in the South Seas, where he had made a rich collection of ethnological observations and objects, which he was able to use in his important scientific works. In particular his two volume work on Samoa as well as the first volumes of his monograph on the Palau Islands, which are still in the process of being published, have received great praise among experts. … Therefore, due to his undisputed scientific services, his refraining from the normal conditions and formalities required to win the scientific opportunity on hand could be justified.891

Eventually this application was accepted by the Ministry, although with some reservations. In a letter to the Vice-Chancellor’s office from 15 September 1919 it was stated that:

[Krämer’s appointment] can only be seen on a trial basis with a temporary character; the final organization of the teaching and in regard to personal and subjective matters, remains with the Ministry.892

Despite these reservations, the acceptance by the Ministry marked the beginning of Krämer’s academic career in Ethnology at the University of Tübingen. He then began to extend and cement his position within the University; apart from giving lectures, he also took on the formal process of gaining his postdoctoral qualification. This course of action seemed important to Krämer, since his title of Professor ‘honoris causa’[rank VI], which he had been given in 1904, was only of an honorary nature.893

In late 1921 he handed in his postdoctoral thesis, titled ‘Die Entstehung der Familie vom totemistischen Standpunkt’, which investigated the ‘family’ as a social construct

891 See letter from Philosophical Faculty of the University of Tübingen to the Württemberg Ministry of Church and School Matters dated 14 August 1919, held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, Sig. 126/347, translation by the author.
892 Letter from the Württembergischen Ministerium des Kirchen- und Schulwesens dated 5 September 1919 to the akademisches Rektoramt (Vice-Chancellor’s Office). The letter is held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, Sig. 126/347, translation by the author.
893 For more details regarding the conferment of Krämer’s title, see Chapter Three. The nature of this title was a key problem in regard to Krämer’s appointment, as he possessed only a medical title and not the official qualification needed for a lecturer in the Philosophical Faculty.
between ‘Inzestvermeidung und Zuchtauswahl’ (‘Incest Avoidance and Breeding Aspects’). 894
Just a few months later, in January 1922, Krämer was awarded his qualification and officially admitted as ‘Privatdozent (Associate Professor) at the Philosophical Faculty of the University for the subject of Völkerkunde’. 895

FIG. 7.5  Krämer’s award as Privatdozent (Associate Professor) for Völkerkunde at the University of Tübingen

(Archive of the University of Tübingen, Sig. 126/347)

Shortly thereafter, in March 1922, Krämer took the next step to amplify his position within the University by asking that his teaching assignment be extended to three hours weekly. This application was again supported by the Upper Senate, despite the small number of listeners (only two per lecture). 896 However, as Schleip points out, an expansion of his teaching

895 See letter from the Württembergischen Ministerium des Kirchen- und Schulwesens (Württemberg Ministry of Church and School Matters) to the akademisches Rektoramt (Vice-Chancellor’s Office) from 11 January 1922, translation by the author. For the complete letter, see Fig. 7.5.
896 See letter from the Upper Senate to the Württembergischen Ministerium des Kirchen- und Schulwesens dated 8 March 1922. Letter held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, Sig. 126/347. In relation to the small number of listeners at Krämer’s lectures, see Krämer’s ‘Tübinger Tagebuch’ (‘Tübingen diary’), which contains titles and details of all of Krämer’s lectures given during his time at the University. The diary is held among his
assignment also would have meant that Krämer was about to receive a full salary from the
University, despite the pension he received from the Navy. But it seems, Krämer had made
misrepresentations, in particular regarding the pension he was receiving. He had not stated it
as an income, a fact which was quickly found out by the Württembergischen Ministerium des
Kirchen- und Schulwesens (Württemberg Ministry of Church and School Matters). In a letter
to the Vice-Chancellor’s Office on 8 May 1922, it therefore contended:

The Ministry assumes that, given the formerly unknown circumstances regarding its
application, the Philosophical Faculty will refrain from its application for an extension
of Professor Dr. Krämer’s lecture-ship.

Henceforth, as Schleip notes, the Faculty took Krämer’s misrepresentation badly and became
much more sceptical and reserved in regard to his further applications. Still, in July 1922,
Krämer’s renewed application for an expansion of his teaching assignment was granted,
although the payment he was to receive for it was limited to a ‘part-time salary’. This incident is just one example of Krämer’s conflict with the Faculty, the wider University
and the Ministry. Generally this conflict was related to money matters, like salary and
financial support. It was also illustrated by Krämer’s demands for travel assistance. During
his time at the University he wrote more than 18 letters asking for a reimbursement to his
travel expenses from his home in Stuttgart to Tübingen, arguing that ‘the constant travels
were putting increasing financial pressures on [his] living situation’. Although the Ministry

remaining papers at the Ethnologisches Institut at the University of Tübingen. For a list of Krämer’s lectures see
also Schleip, pp. 197-201.
897 Schleip, p. 139.
898 Letter from the Württembergischen Ministerium des Kirchen- und Schulwesens to the Vice-Chancellor’s
Office of the University dated 8 May 1922, translation by the author. The letter further provides details about
Krämer’s pension which amounted to the sum of approximately 52,000 Marks (US$ 13,000). Later, due to the
increasing inflation, it was 300,000 Marks (US$ 75,000) per annum. The letter is held at the archive of the
University of Tübingen, Sig. 126/347.
899 Schleip, p. 139.
900 For Krämer’s renewed application, which was again was supported by the Faculty, see the letter from the
Vice Chancellor’s Office to the Württemberg Ministry of Church and School Matters dated 15 July 1922.
Eventually the Ministry approved the application in a letter dated 20 July, highlighting that the increased
teaching assignment of Prof. Dr. Krämer was only to be paid as a part time position. Both letters are held at the
archive of the University of Tübingen, Sig. 126/347.
901 See Krämer’s letters to the Vice Chancellor’s Office and the Dean of the Geographical Institute at the
University of Tübingen, as well as to the Württembergischen Ministerium des Kirchen- und Schulwesens, held
at the archive of the University of Tübingen, Sig. 126/347. Krämer generally justified his application for travel
reimbursement with the fact that he was still living in Stuttgart, as the University was not able to provide him
(and his wife) with living quarters in Tübingen. In a letter from July 1922 to the Philosophical Faculty, Krämer
pointed out there had been a price increase on the railway, ‘verschlimmert [seine] finanzielle Situation
erheblich’, translation by the author.
originally granted him a reimbursement for a ticket 4th class, he had to reapply for every semester anew. This arrangement remained in place until his retirement.\footnote{See letter from the Ministry from 2 February 1924, held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, Sig. 126/347, which grants Krämer a travel reimbursement, indicating however, that he has to reapply again for the following semester. Krämer’s correspondence from June 1932 illustrates that the decision applied well into the 1930s.}

Another reason for Krämer’s constant conflict was his demand for more room within the \textit{Geographischen Institut} (Geographic Institute) at the University. This derived from the fact that Kramer used the existing allocated rooms to house his private collection among the small ethnographic collection the University already possessed. In fact Krämer’s remaining correspondence with the Geographic Institute is dominated by his demands for more room, as well as by the use of his own collection as a bargaining-tool.\footnote{See Krämer’s correspondence with the \textit{Geographischen Institut} (Geographic Institute), held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, Sig. 117C/505. The signature contains a number of letters going back to 1926, in which Krämer expresses the ‘urgent need for more room’. He also frequently points out that he would be willing to present his collection to the university, if his needs would be met.} At times, as Schleip points out, Krämer’s letters are characterized by his ‘arrogant accusations, choleric anger and personal insult, which occasionally took on paranoid tendencies’.\footnote{See Schleip, p. 140. Indeed Krämer’s correspondence reveals that Krämer believed in a conspiracy theory, as some of the rooms were lent out to the \textit{Deutschen Alpen Verein} (German Alpine Society), which had close ties with the Ministry. See Krämer’s letter dated 18 February 1927 to the Geographical Institute, held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, Sig. 117C/505.} Indeed, these personality traits of Krämer had already been obvious during his earlier expeditions, like the \textit{Hamburg Südsee-Expedition}.\footnote{See Chapter Six. In his work \textit{Die Hamburg Südsee-Expedition}, Frankfurt am Main, 1981, p. 65, the Ethnologist Hans Fischer even describes Krämer as ‘a strange mixture of great organiser and scientist and a less friendly person’, translation by the author.} This time, the conflict escalated to the point that the Vice-Chancellor of the University had to intervene as a mediator.\footnote{In June 1930, Krämer’s demands for more room hit the wall, ‘forcing’ him, as he acknowledged in a letter from 3 June 1930, ‘to forward the matter to the \textit{Rektor} (Vice Chancellor)’. The actual outcome of the Vice-Chancellor’s involvement however, remains unknown. For his letter, see the archive of the University of Tübingen, 117C/505.}

Despite these conflicts, Krämer had an important influence on the development of \textit{Völkerkunde} within the University. Thus, whereas in the winter semester of 1920/21 \textit{Völkerkunde} was not specifically mentioned in the lecture catalogue of the University, by the winter semester 1922/23 the \textit{Völkerkunde Abteilung des Geographischen Instituts} (Ethnological Department of the Geographic Institute), as well as the ethnographical collection received a special mention.\footnote{See \textit{Vorlesungsverzeichnisse} (‘Lecture Catalogues’) 1920/21 and 1922/23, held at the archive of the University of Tübingen.}
In November 1925 Krämer was eventually appointed *Honorarprofessor* (Honorary Professor) by the *Württembergischen Kulturministerium*.908 This appointment was followed by the award of the *Ehrendoktorwürde* (Honorary Doctorate) from the University of Hamburg on 24 December that year. The later award was based on Krämer’s services and contribution to the advancement of *Völkerkunde*, in particular in regard to Oceania.909

---

908 See the letter from the *Württembergischen Kulturministeriums*, which was the successor to the *Württembergischen Ministerium des Kirchen- und Schulwesens*, to the Academic Vice-Chancellorry of the University of Tübingen dated 20 November 1925. In its appointment of Krämer, the Ministry also received an application for promotion from the Philosophical Faculty from 19 February that year. Letters held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, Sig. 126/347.

909 The *Urkunde* (official document) of Krämer’s appointment as Honourable Doctorate of the University of Hamburg, due to his ‘Verdienste zur Völkerkunde besonders zu Ozeanien’, is still held at the *Ethnologisches Institut* at the University of Tübingen. In the document, Krämer’s work as part of the *Hamburg Südsee-Expedition* receives special mention. See FIG. 7.6.
Both appointments certainly helped to strengthen his position within the University. In the summer semester of 1928, Krämer’s teaching position was extended to four weekly lectures, and in the summer of 1929 he received a small amount of funding from the Geographic
Institute. In mid-1931, Krämer decided to expand his position within the University once again, using his private collection as a bargaining-tool. In a letter from the Philosophical Faculty to the Württemberg Ministry of Culture from early November 1931, it is reported:

The Honorary Professor in the Philosophical Faculty, Mr. Dr. Augustin Krämer has expressed his wish for the official designation as ‘director of the Völkerkunde Institute’. He expects that this would contribute to and amplify the importance of the subject, as well as to increase the relationship with similar scientific institutions. ... In an earlier letter to the philosophical faculty from the 4th of this month, Mr. Krämer explained, that he will ‘donate his ethnographic collection’, which is located at the castle, to the University, [if] this semester would see the establishment of an ethnological institute, which would be referred to as “Völkerkunde-Institute and Collection” under his directorial position in the lecture catalogue for S. S. 1932.

Eventually the Ministry followed this recommendation by the Philosophical Faculty and, in late November 1931, Krämer officially received the title ‘Vorstand des Völkerkunde-Institut und Sammlung’ (‘Director of the Ethnological Institute and Collection’).

This appointment as ‘Director of the Ethnological Institute’ certainly marked the zenith of Krämer’s institutional career. After 12 years at the University, he had succeeded in establishing a (nearly) independent Ethnological Institute. He had also helped to make Völkerkunde a part of the University curriculum, as well as establishing a distinctive ethnographical collection, which still remains with the Ethnological Institute today. In a letter to Dr. Bauer from the Württemberg Ministry of Culture, he acknowledged:

After the Philosophical Faculty has applied for the establishment of a Völkerkunde Institute and the collection to be placed under my direction, which the Württemberg Ministry of Culture had agreed to support, I now donate my ethnographic collection, which is already located at Tübingen castle to the University.

---

910 See correspondence held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, Sig. 126/347.
911 Krämer must have demonstrated his wish in June 1931, as it is mentioned in a memorandum ‘Zur Farge eines Völkerkundlichen Instituts und der Universität Tübingen’ (‘To the Question about an Ethnological Institute at the University of Tübingen’) by Dr. Uhlig to the Philosophical Faculty dated 22 June 1931. Letter held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, Sig. 117C/505.
912 Letter by the Philosophical Faculty to the Württemberg Ministry of Culture dated 9 November 1931, held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, Sig. 126/347, translation by the author.
913 The newly formed institute was not as independent as Krämer might have wished, but remained part of the Geographical Institute, at least in regard to its financial affairs and facilities. See correspondence by the Ministry, Faculty and Vice Chancellor, held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, Sig. 126/347.
914 Indeed, the collection had been the key reason for the foundation of the Schlossmuseum Hohentübingen, which still organises exhibitions, such as the exhibition ‘Südseebilder’ in 1992. For more details on the exhibition, see Volker Harms, ed. “Südseebilder”: Materialien zu einer Ausstellung, Völkerkundliches Institute Tübingen, Tübingen, 1992 and Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen “Ethnographische Sammlung und Völkerkunde-Abteilung im Schlossmuseum”, in Herrmann von Helmholtz-Zentrum für Kulturtechnik, online, nd, available at: http://publicus.culture.hu-berlin.de/sammlungen/detail.php?dsn=310&print=on, visited 3 January 2007.
915 See letter of Krämer to Dr. Bauer from the Württemberg Ministry of Culture dated 23 November 1931. Letter held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, Sig. 126/347, translation by the author.
However, Krämer’s success was short lived. In a letter of 10 June 1933, the Ministry informed the University:

Corresponding to the lowering of the retirement age of university professors, their teaching assignments expire with their 68th birthday following either the 1st of April or the 1st of October, in relation to professors, who have already celebrated their 68th birthday, their teaching assignment expires on the 1st of October 1933. This new ruling certainly applied to Krämer who, in August that year had celebrated his 68th birthday. It thus marked a sudden end of his institutional career. Krämer was able to stretch the boundary by continuing his teaching assignments for the next semester. In a letter to the Vice-Chancellor in August 1933, Krämer justified his continued involvement by emphasising his duty towards the collection, as a successor had not been found, as well as his duty towards his students. In doing so, one can assume, he also used his extensive bibliotheca (private library), which contained around two thousand volumes, as a bargaining tool. Eventually, Krämer offered his library to the University to buy. This offer was declined, very much to the disappointment of Krämer’s former student and eventual successor at the institute, Dr. Elisabeth Gerdt-Rupp, who acknowledged that the subsequent selling of Krämer’s library to private collectors had a negative impact on the collection at the University Library.

With the beginning of the summer semester in 1934, however, Krämer’s involvement with the University of Tübingen, as well as his institutional career finally came to an end. Despite his retirement, Krämer’s contribution to Völkerkunde and in particular to the Ethnologischen...
Institut at the University endured: his portrait still hangs on the floor of the Institute, remembering its founding father.

Chapter Eight.

Krämer: Remembered, Forgotten and Rediscovered

With his official retirement in October 1933, and his de facto withdrawal from the University of Tübingen in early 1934, Augustin Krämer’s life slips largely from public view. As Dietrich Schleip reports, he ‘withdrew into his private life’. This ‘withdrawal’ went hand in hand with his earlier retreat from his involvement in the Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte (German Society for Anthropology, Ethnology, and Prehistory). However, he did not abandon his intellectual pursuits, for he continued the writing up of his ethnological research on the Pacific. This included the publication of his last volumes relating to the Hamburg Wissenschaftlichen Stiftung and his travels on the Hamburger Südsee-Expedition, as well as a number of short reviews on Oceanic issues. He also continued to give public lectures on his experiences.

Despite his enduring interest in the Pacific, Krämer also developed a new field of interest closer to home. As a long time member of the local Württembergischen Anthropologischen Gesellschaft (Anthropological Society of Württemberg), he began to focus on local history and archaeology, concentrating in particular on the history of the local Schwäbischen Bauernhäuser (‘Swabian farmhouses’). This work eventually brought Krämer into conflict with local officials and their National Socialist ideology.

---

920 With Krämer’s retirement, it becomes more difficult to trace him. One reason for this is that the bulk of his correspondence from this time onwards remained in his private possession, which has unfortunately been lost after his death.
922 Krämer had been chairperson of Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte (German Society for Anthropology, Ethnology, and Prehistory) from 1911 to 1921. With his retirement, however, his involvement within the Society came to an end. For more details, see Chapter Seven.
923 For Krämer’s publications after retirement, see ‘Publications by Dr. Augustin Krämer’, in Appendix V. For details on publication and Krämer’s participation in the Hamburg Südsee-Expedition, see Chapter Six.
924 For information on his lecture activities, see Krämer’s correspondence held at the archive of the University of Tübingen. These lectures, however, were mainly in regard to his continuous involvement with the Württembergischen Anthropologischen Gesellschaft (Anthropological Society of Württemberg).
925 This change of focus is illustrated in Krämer’s later publication focusing on ‘schwäbische Bauernhäuser’ (‘Swabian farmhouses’), like his articles ‘Die Anthropologie Württembergs’, in Medizinisches
In February 1936 the local Gaukulturamt (National Socialist Culture Office) sharply criticised Krämer’s research, arguing that the ‘topic of German prehistory … is of special political importance [and that] laymen were not supposed to spread different information’. 926 The main reason for this criticism was an article of Krämer that had been published in a local paper. In it he argued that the history and existence of the schwäbische Bauernhaus showed a strong Slavic influence. 927 This view was strongly opposed by the Gaukulturamt, which favoured a more ‘Germanic focus’ in the interpretation of the prehistory of Swabia. 928 Nevertheless, Krämer stayed firm in his belief, although it seems he was especially annoyed by the comparison drawn between him and a layman. In his response of 17 February 1936 he made his anger known, stating:

It is an insult, from which I can not calm down. Not even my correct name, Krämer instead of Kramer, is known by the Gaukulturamt; while it is clearly stated in every recent encyclopaedia or academic calendar. For 40 years I have worked for Germany’s colonies at home and in the field and in particular I have focused on housing and dwellings. After the war, the Ministry of Culture conferred to me a teaching assignment in Völkerkunde at the University of Tübingen, which I still attend to.

For my activities I was awarded the [title of ] Honorarprofessor (Honorary Professor) from the University of Tübingen and the [title of ] Ehrendoktor der Philosophie (Honorary Doctorate of Philosophy) from the University of Hamburg.

Part of the focus of Völkerkunde was the house, that is why, after my return from the South Seas and after the completion of my many works, I have begun to focus on the history of the Swabian farm stays’, which have been largely unknown within the German Empire. I am in contact with leading experts in Berlin and Hanover, who agree unconditionally with my findings. In addition, for the last 20 years I have been the first

---

926 See letter from the Gaukulturamt to Krämer, dated 11 February 1936, translation by the author. The letter is held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, SIG. 126/347. It must be mentioned that many leading ethnologists at the time had to endure ongoing critique from the National Socialists. One example was Georg Thilenius, who was verbally attacked for displaying Jewish artefacts in the Völkerkunde Museum in Hamburg. See Jürgen Zwernemann “Enttäuschte Hoffnungen: Das Museum zwischen den Kriegen (1919-1939)”, in Wulf Köpke and Bernd Schmelz eds., Die Ersten 112 Jahre: Das Museum für Völkerkunde Hamburg, Hamburg, 2004, pp. 117-119.

927 See Krämer’s article ‘Grundformen des schwäbischen Bauernhauses’, in Schwäbischer Merkur [Newspaper] from 20 December 1935. The article was based on a lecture Krämer must have given to the Württembergischen Anthropologischen Verein, a few weeks earlier. See Krämer’s correspondence with the Gaukulturamt, held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, SIG. 126/347.

928 See letter from the Gaukulturamt to Krämer from 11 February 1936, held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, SIG. 126/347.
chairperson of the *Württembergischen Anthropologischen Verein* which ... is committed to the investigation of the prehistory of Schwaben (Swabia).

It seems, however, that Krämer’s statement, and in particular his personal references, fell on deaf ears in the *Gaukulturamt*. In a letter of 21 February, its Director, whose name remains unknown, countered:

You might have worked 40 years for Germany’s colonies at home and abroad, however what you have claimed about the prehistory is plainly wrong and stands in the sharpest contrast to the efforts which, at the present time, have been advocated by [the country of] Württemberg. I would be willing to discuss this matter with you in my office. ... Should you be able to convince me that I am wrong, I will of course draw the necessary conclusions.

Although the exact outcome of this incident remains unknown, it nevertheless demonstrated that within the new political regime respect for Krämer’s work and achievements had begun to dwindle. Indeed, the rise of the National Socialist regime during the early 1930s began to change not only the political, but also the academic, landscape in Germany. Schleip notes that, ‘although [Krämer] had all his life advocated the economic exploitation of the colonies, the “inferior races” of the Nazis however did not belong to his world view’. In fact, one can presume that Krämer, who was in his late sixties at the time, was not necessarily opposed to a National Socialist Government, but rather put off by its style, form and repressions. In the universities, for example, the ideology of new regime expressed itself in book burnings, as well as in official party interpretations being placed upon research. Analysing Krämer’s relationship with the regime in this light though, gives a poignant meaning to Krämer’s last official entry in his *Tübinger Tagebuch* (Tübingen Diary), where he stated that: ‘In Spring 1934 [I] brought my bibliotheca (‘private library’) back to Stuttgart, due to the uncertain of the situation’.

---

929 See Krämer’s letter to the *Gaukulturamt* dated 17 February 1936, held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, SIG. 126/347, translation by the author.

930 See letter from the *Gaukulturamt* to Krämer dated 21 February 1936, translation by the author, held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, SIG. 126/347. Both letters from the *Gaukulturamt* are machine written copies, thus the name of the *Gaukulturamtseiter* (director of the NS Culture Office) remains unknown.


932 See Krämer’s *Tübinger Tagebuch* (Tübingen Diary), held at the *Ethnologisches Institut* at the University of Tübingen, translation by the author. This official diary contains details about Krämer’s lectures, students and courses during his time at the University.
However, regardless of his motivations, Krämer soon put his library on the market. In 1936 he sold it to the well known antiquarian bookseller Hiersemann in Leipzig.\textsuperscript{933} This step had a financial rationale, Schleip remarks, as ‘Krämer’s financial situation seemed to have been depressing’.\textsuperscript{934} One reason that might have contributed to his increasing hardship was his deteriorating health. Although the exact details of his health condition remain unknown, it is acknowledged, that during his final years Krämer suffered from a long illness.\textsuperscript{935}

Eventually, on 10 November 1941, a few months after celebrating his 76\textsuperscript{th} birthday Augustin Krämer died in his house in Cannstatt near Stuttgart. His death was followed by that of his wife, Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow, on 9 February 1945.\textsuperscript{936} Both were laid to rest at the Krämer family’s burial site at the Uff-Friedhof (cemetery) in Cannstatt.\textsuperscript{937}

\textsuperscript{933}See Schleip, ‘Ozeanische Ethnographie und Koloniale Praxis, Das Beispiel Augustin Krämer’, p. 146, as well as Dr. Elisabeth Gerdt-Rupp’s letter to the Philosophical Faculty of the University of Tübingen dated 3 March 1951, held at the archive of the University of Tübingen, Sig. 117c/505. The price he received for his bibliotheca, however, remains unknown. Dr. Gerdt-Rupp, who was Krämer’s successor at the University of Tübingen, acknowledged the loss of this resource for the university. For more details, see Chapter Seven.

\textsuperscript{934}Schleip, ‘Ozeanische Ethnographie und Koloniale Praxis, Das Beispiel Augustin Krämer’, p. 146, translation by the author.

\textsuperscript{935}See Tübinger Chronik ‘Zum Tode von Prof. Dr. A. Krämer’, 17 November 1941, which argues that Krämer died ‘nach langer Krankheit’ (after a long illness), translation by the author.

\textsuperscript{936}While Augustin Krämer’s death was briefly mentioned in an article in the local paper as well as by a condolence letter from the university, the circumstances regarding Elisabeth Krämer-Bannow’s death remain unknown. It can be assumed that her death occurred without any larger notification, as no articles or obituaries could be found during this research.

\textsuperscript{937}Besides the resting place of Augustin and Elisabeth Krämer, are other members of Krämer’s family. The tombstone lists the names of Krämer’s brother and his family. It has been described by Schleip, as ‘one of the finest graves in the cemetery’, see Schleip’s article ‘Persönlichkeiten vergangener Zeiten’, translation by the author.
FIG. 8.1  The Krämers’ grave and tombstone at the Uff-Friedhof in Cannstatt

(Photograph Sven Mönter, November 2006)
Forgotten and Remembered: Reactions to Krämer’s Death

There was no direct response to Krämer’s death from within the wider ethnological community. In an article in the *Tübinger Chronik* from 17 November 1941, the University of Tübingen stated that his death marked ‘the loss of a well-known researcher in scientific circles’; but immediate reaction amongst his peers was slow. Only in 1944, three years after his death, did an article appear in the *Ethnologischer Anzeiger*, recognizing Krämer’s achievements to *Völkerkunde*.

This slow response was due to a number of factors. The first was undoubtedly based on his estranged relationship with National Socialist ideology and its representatives. This did not change, even though in 1939, Krämer had contributed an article to a *Festschrift* (Commemorative Volume) celebrating Otto Reche, a former companion on the *Hamburg Südsee-Expedition* and, by then, a highly regarded race hygienist. Krämer’s death occurred unnoticed. The *NS-Kurier*, Germany’s general National Socialist Newspaper, as Schleip remarks, ‘kept completely quiet [about Krämer’s death].’

A second reason for the reserved reaction amongst the ethnological community at the time, was of a more personal nature. As demonstrated throughout this thesis, Krämer had a rather estranged and complicated relationship with his colleagues and fellow ethnologists. His expectations of his subordinates and his pedantic attention to questions of hierarchy can therefore be seen as contributing to the lack of posthumous acknowledgements. Krämer’s relationship with his peers was, as Schleip summarises, ‘marked by the respect for [his] ethnological and organizational abilities on the one hand, as well as an open displeasure for working with him on the other’. It seems, therefore, not surprising that Krämer’s later

---

938 *Tübinger Chronik* ‘Zum Tode von Prof. Dr. A. Krämer’, 17 November 1941, translation by the author.
942 Ibid., p. 148, translation by the author. A similar point is mentioned by Hans Fischer, pp. 65-68.
obituary was written by the German ethnologist Hans Damm, who had never worked with him nor did he know him personally. In Krämer’s defence, however, it needs to be stressed that many of his former colleagues, associates and friends, like Count von Linden, Georg Thilenius and Felix von Luschan, had died prior to his death, and were thus unable to remember him and his contribution to the field of *Völkerkunde*.

A third reason for the reserved reaction on Krämer’s death is to be found in the fact that by 1941 the German colonial empire was no longer in existence. With the signing of the Treaty of Versailles in 1919, Germany had renounced all its colonial territories. Thus Krämer’s work on the Pacific, which had stood in close regard with the Germany’s colonial interests in the region, had lost much of its importance.

A fourth, and probably the most obvious reason contributing to the lack of acknowledgment of Krämer’s death in Germany as well as aboard, was, however, the Second World War. At the time of Krämer’s death in November 1941, this war was not only in its second year, but had also reached a new level of escalation. In June that year Germany had invaded Russia, German troops were fighting in North Africa and, in early December, Germany declared war against the USA. Given these circumstances as well as the reality of the war, it seems indeed not surprising that his death received little attention at the time.

It was only after the war that ethnologists in Germany again began, on occasions, to remember Krämer and his contribution to *Völkerkunde*, which expresses itself in the large body of his publications. In an obituary of 1951 Oscar Paret, Krämer’s successor as Chairman of the *Württembergischen Anthropologischen Verein*, highlighted his predecessor’s achievements during his time at the helm of the Society, claiming that Krämer’s name would

---

943 Ibid., p. 148, who argues that Damm neither knew Krämer nor worked with him. Indeed, there is no evidence suggesting otherwise, as Hans Damm, who in 1955 became Director of the Völkerkunde Museum in Leipzig, was certainly from a later generation of ethnologists than Krämer.

944 Indeed, Krämer’s closest colleagues and associates had died. Count von Linden died in 1911 (see Chapter Seven), Georg Thilenius had died in Hamburg in 1937 and Felix von Luschan in Berlin in 1924. Additionally, one has to mention Paul Hambruch, who had died in 1932.

945 See Chapter Seven.

946 Indeed, 1941 can be described as the year the Second World War became truly a world war. On 22 June 1941, Germany invaded Russia, German troops had been supporting their Italian ally in North Africa since the late 1940s and, based on an agreement between Germany and Japan, Germany declared war on the USA on 11 December, four days after Japan attacked the US fleet at Pearl Harbour.

947 See ‘Publications by Dr. Augustin Krämer’, in Appendix V.
‘always be remembered in conjunction with the blooming of the Württembergischen Anthropologischen Verein’.

Commemorating what would have been Krämer’s one hundredth birthday in 1965, Hans Damm once again brought up Krämer’s contribution to the wider field of Völkerkunde in general and the ethnology of Oceania in particular. Damm especially highlighted Krämer’s contribution to the ethnographic collections of various institutions, such as the Linden Museum, the University of Tübingen and the former Naturalien Cabinett, today’s Staatliches Museum für Naturkunde (National Museum for Natural History).

Indeed, it seems that it is because of his contributions to these various ethnographical collections that Krämer is most remembered in Germany. In 1991, for example, the Ethnological Institute at the University of Tübingen held an exhibition of photos of the South Seas, called ‘Südseebilder’. The material for the exhibition was based on Krämer’s legacy of photographs and artefacts, which he had collected and left to the institute during his time as its director. In the exhibition catalogue, Dr. Volker Harms, Krämer’s later successor at the Institute and organiser, once again acknowledged Krämer’s service to Völkerkunde, arguing, that ‘is mainly based on his enormous diligence with which he gathered ethnographical information on the South Seas’ cultures’. Harms also recognises that Krämer was a pioneer in the field of ethnology, stressing that, as a ‘Völkerkundler’

---

950 Ibid., p. 8.
951 Additional to Krämer’s contribution to the previously named institutions, the Linden Museum, the Ethnological Institute at the University of Tübingen and the Naturkundemuseum in Stuttgart, it should also be mentioned that some of his collected artifacts form part of the collection held at the Ethnological Museums in Berlin and Hamburg.
952 The Exhibition “Südseebilder” – Begegnungen mit einem Mythos was held at the Schlossmuseum Hohentübingen at the University of Tübingen in 1991 and 1992. The exhibition was the result of a seminar project at the Ethnological Institute. It was based on Krämer’s large collection of photographs, of which 1200 alone relate to the South Seas. For more details of the Exhibition, see Vorwort (‘Preface’) and Einführung (Introduction) in Volker Harms ed. “Südseebilder”; Materialien zu einer Ausstellung, Völkerkundliches Institute Tübingen, Tübingen, 1992, pp. i-vii.
953 See ibid., as well as Chapter Seven for details of Krämer’s relationship with, and contribution to the collection of the Ethnological Institute.
(Ethnologist) Krämer was an autodidact. This fact was captured by Hans Damm’s late obituary on Krämer, where he appropriately sums up Krämer’s life:

> Coming from medicine and the natural sciences, Krämer has, like many other Völkerkundler (Ethnologists) of his time, developed from an outsider to become a world renown Oceanic expert, whose name will live on in his works.

Indeed, Krämer’s name lives on. His work, as the present thesis has demonstrated, is not only held in high regard among scholars interested in the Pacific, but also among the people of the Pacific. It is in particular for Krämer’s work on Palau and Samoa that his name is still remembered, thus contributing to his lasting legacy as an ethnological expert on Oceania.

Despite Krämer’s legacy and the lasting fame of his work, his life, research and fieldwork in the Pacific remains largely unknown. It is in this imbalance that the present thesis has found its raison d’être. By providing a detailed biography of Krämer’s life, this thesis has attempted to redress the balance. Paying special attention to Krämer’s travels and fieldwork in the Pacific, this work has been able to provide a deeper understanding of the history of Krämer’s work and his legacy as an ethnological expert on Oceania. In doing so, it has also presented an insight into the development of Völkerkunde (Ethnology) in Germany, as well as revealing aspects of the history of German ethnological work in the Pacific in the early twentieth century, thereby opening a door for further research. In this respect this thesis intended to demonstrate the usefulness of a bibliographical study of Dr. Augustin Krämer, ‘a German ethnologist in the Pacific’.

---

957 The only exception is, as mentioned, Dietrich Schleip’s MA thesis ‘Ozeanische Ethnographie und Koloniale Praxis, Das Beispiel Augustin Krämer’, which he conducted as a student at the Ethnological Institute at the University of Tübingen under the supervision of Dr. Volker Harms in 1989.
Appendix I:

Karl Graf von Linden

FIG. 9.1 Karl Graf von Linden (1838-1911)

Karl Graf von Linden was born in Württemberg on 28 May 1838. He was a trained jurist and economist who, as Friedrich Kussmaul argues, had proved himself in state service, eventually becoming Hofmarshall (Lord Steward) and Oberkammerherr (Lord Chamberlain) of the King of Württemberg. In 1886, not even 50 years old, Linden retired. In 1889 he was elected first chairman of the Württembergische Verein für Handelgeographie (Württemberger Society for Trade Geography), a position he held until his death in January 1911. During this time, as Kussmaul argues, Linden was a keen organiser, mentor and diplomat, who was able to expand not only the collection of artefacts, but also the number of members of the Society (among them Krämer’s friend and mentor Dr. Kurt Lampert). He was in constant contact with administrators, traders and scientists in Germany and aboard, like Dr. Albert Hahl, Richard Parkinson, Max Thiel, Dr. Augustin Krämer, Dr. Wilhelm Solf

958 Friedrich Kussmaul ‘Linden-Museum Stuttgart, Staatliches Museum für Völkerkunde. Rückblick, Umschau, Ausblick’, in TRIBUS (Sonderdruck), Nr. 24 (November 1975), p. 18. Kussmaul’s article provides not only the greatest details to the history of the Linden Museum, but also in regards to the person of Karl Count von Linden. Kussmaul himself was director of the Linden Museum from 1954 to 1986.
959 Ibid., pp. 18-20. For details of Kurt Lampert, see also Chapter Two.
and Franz Bolominski to name a few, asking for their help in collecting and donating artefacts.\footnote{See Linden’s correspondence with various personalities in Germany and in the Pacific, held at the Linden Museum.} Linden certainly envisioned the foundation of an Ethnological Museum, however, only a few days after the cornerstone ceremony, on 15 January 1910, Linden died.\footnote{See Kussmaul, p. 28. See also Linden-Museum ed. Museum, Linden-Museum Stuttgart, Staatliches Museum für Völkerkunde, Magazin Presse, 1987, pp. 10-11.} The Museum was finally opened on 28 May 1911. In commemoration of Linden’s contribution, the museum was named after him: Linden Museum.

FIG. 9.2  Linden-Museum

(Linden-Museum ed. Museum, Linden-Museum Stuttgart, p.11)
Felix Ritter von Luschan

FIG. 9.3 Felix Ritter von Luschan (1854-1924)


Felix Ritter von Luschan was born in Hollabrunn, Lower Austria on 11 August 1854. He died in Berlin on 7 February 1924. Von Luschan was not only a medical professional and traveller, but also an anthropologist, ethnologist and archaeologist. He was a founding and longstanding member of the Deutschen Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte (German Society for Anthropology, Ethnology and Prehistory).

Luschan studied medicine at the University of Vienna and anthropology in Paris. During his military service between 1878-1879, Luschan was deployed in Bosnia as a military doctor. He travelled extensively through Dalmatia, Montenegro and Albania.

On his return, from 1880 to 1882 Luschan worked as medical doctor in the General Hospital in Vienna. After his examination in 1882, he worked as private docent at the University in Vienna, before eventually moving to Berlin, where he became assistant at the königlichen Museum für Völkerkunde (today: Ethnologisches Museum) in Berlin.

In his early career Luschan conducted numerous expeditions, which led him to South Africa, New Zealand, Hawaii, North America and most of all, Asia. During these travels Luschan collected a number of ethnological objects and other artefacts. Luschan also worked
archeologically. Together with Otto Benndorf, he conducted some research in Lykien in south-western Turkey. There they discovered the ruins of Sam’al, the capital of an old kingdom, which he helped to unearth between 1888 and 1902. From 1904 to 1911 Luschan became director for the Africa and Oceanic collections at the Museum for Völkerkunde in Berlin, succeeding his predecessor Adolf Bastian, who is generally referred to as “father of anthropology in Germany”. Luschan was among the few ethnologists [together with Georg Thilenius, P. Wilhelm Schmidt and Richard Thurnwald] who took part at the first German Colonialkongress in 1902.

In 1911 he took over a teaching position in the newly founded Department of Anthropology at the Humboldt University in Berlin. During his professional life Luschan not only participated in, but also organised, a number ethnological expeditions, including the Deutsche Marine-Expedition to German New Guinea in 1907-1909. His work included not only specific ethnological works but also theoretical essays, ranging from artefact preservation to the discussions of race hygiene. However in regards to race hygiene, as the historian Paul Weindling remarks, Luschan ‘consequently represented a type of anthropology more orientated to social issues than to the ideas of Aryan racial ideology’. Furthermore, Luschan was convinced that the division of races due to anthropometrical measurements was impossible, such that he argued: ‘all attempts trying to divide mankind into artificial groups either by their skin colour, length or width of their brain capsule or due to the different kind of hair etc. lead astray’. In this sense it is not surprising that Felix von Luschan, even after his death in 1924, was and is still remembered as ‘a pioneer of modern anthropology and ethnology’.


Appendix III:

The *GLOBUS, Illustrierte Zeitschrift für Länder- und Völkerkunde* (Illustrated Magazine for Geography and Ethnology) has been described as the ‘German National Geographic’ of the early twentieth century. As a journal, it became an important correspondence paper for the development of ethnology in Germany.

Founded by Karl Theodor Andree (1808-1875), a geographer and publisher, in 1862, the publication of the *Globus* was later continued by his son Richard. Richard Andree (1835-1912) had studied geology and geography in Munich, and also had a great interest in ethnology (*Völkerkunde*). It was under his guidance, that the *Globus* became one of the leading German magazines of its time. Published in Braunschweig by the publishing house Friedrich, Vieweg & Sohn, the journal contained articles which covered a wide range of topics: from natural scientific observations and botanical topics, to geographical, socio-historical even ethnological topics. Apart from these articles, which were contributed by a wide range of authors (among them renowned ethnologists like Felix von Luschan, Georg Thilenius and Otto Finsch), the journal also contained book reviews, and had a set page for any new findings and publications. Apart from the fact that his book *Die Samoa-Inseln* was well received in the review section of the *Globus*, Augustin Krämer was also a frequent

---


967 For more details and information on Dr. Richard Andree, see *Braunschweiger Stadtlexikon*, Johann Heinrich Meyer Verlag, Braunschweig, 1992, pp. 19-20.

---

968 See Georg Thilenius ‘A. Krämer, Die Samoa-Inseln’, in *Globus*, (1904) Bd. 85, pp. 53-59. In his review Thilenius describes Krämer’s work as very detailed and a valuable contribution to the field of ethnology. See also Chapter Three.

969. For details see ‘Publications by Dr. Augustin Krämer’, in Appendix V.
Appendix IV:

**Place Names**

Place Names and the new names given by the Germans shortly after annexation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>German Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Guinea Mainland</td>
<td>Kaiser-Wilhelm-Land/Kaiser-Wilhelmsland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Britain</td>
<td>Neu-Pommern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Ireland</td>
<td>Neu-Mecklenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavongai</td>
<td>Neu-Hannover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admiralty Islands</td>
<td>Manus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sek</td>
<td>Alexishafen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madang</td>
<td>Friedrich-Wilhelm-Hafen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokopo</td>
<td>Herbertshöhe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepik River</td>
<td>Kaiserin-Augusta-Fluss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabaul</td>
<td>Simpsonhafen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix V:

Publications by Dr. Augustin Krämer

The following bibliography aims to provide a complete and chronologically ordered overview of Krämer’s publications. Although the present list is based on Dietrich Schleip’s work ‘Ozeanische Ethnographie und Koloniale Praxis, Das Beispiel Augustin Krämer’, MA Thesis, Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen, 1989, pp. 176-186, it has been completed and supplemented by the author.


‘Einige ornithologische Notizen aus Samoa’, in Ornithologische Monatsberichte, Berlin, Jg. 4, (1896), pp. 69-76
1897: *Über den Bau der Korallenriffe und die Planktonverteilung an den samoanischen Küsten*, Verlag von Lipsius & Tischer in Kiel und Leipzig, 1897

‘Bericht über neue samoanische Überlieferungen’, in *Globus*, Bd. 71, (1897), pp. 76-78

‘Zur Mikrofauna Samoa’s’, in *Zoologischer Anzeiger*, Leipzig, Nr. 529, (1897)

1898: ‘Der Phallusberg von Molokai (Hawaii-Inseln)’, in *Globus*, Bd. 73, (1898), pp. 1-3

‘Nauru’, in *Globus*, Bd. 74, (1898), pp. 153-158


‘Die samoanische Königsfrage im Hinblick auf die letzten Ereignisse zu Apia’, in *Globus*, Bd. 75, (1899), pp. 185-189

1900: ‘Die angeblichen Hebungen und Senkungen auf Samoa’, in *Petermanns Geographische Mitteilungen*, Bd. 46, (1900), pp. 8-12

‘Ein Besuch von Gran Canaria’, in *Globus*, Bd. 78, (1900), pp. 365-370

1901: ‘Samoa in der Geschichte und als wissenschaftliche und kommerzielle Station in der Südsee’, lecture held at the Geographischen Gesellschaft (Geographical Society) in Hamburg, 2. May 1901; handwritten manuscript held at the Ethnological Institute at the University at Tübingen (transcribed by Dietrich Schleip, 1988)

‘Der Steinnagel von Samoa’, in *Globus*, Bd. LXXX, Nr. 1 (Juli 1901), pp. 7-9


‘Etat für das Schutzgebiet Samoa für das Rechnungsjahr 1902’, in *Deutsche Kolonialzeitung*, No. 6, (1902), pp. 51-52


*Die Samoa-Inseln: Entwurf einer Monographie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Deutsch-Samoas*, Bd. 1, Herg. mit Unterstützung der Kolonialabteilung des Auswärtigen Amts (edited with the support of the Colonial Department of the Foreign Office), Stuttgart: E. Schweizerbart, 1902


1903: *Die Samoa-Inseln: Entwurf einer Monographie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Deutsch-Samoas*, Bd. 2, Nebst einem besonderen Anhang: *Die wichtigsten Hautkrankheiten der Südsee*, Herg. mit Unterstützung der Kolonialabteilung des Auswärtigen Amts (edited with the support of the Colonial Department of the Foreign Office), Stuttgart: E. Schweizerbart, 1903

‘Etat für das Schutzgebiet Samoa für das Rechnungsjahr 1903’, in *Deutsche Kolonialzeitung*, No. 7, (1903), pp. 63-64


‘Wechselseitigkeitsethnographischer und geographischer Forschung nebst einigen Bemerkungen zur Katographie der Südsee’, in *Globus*, Bd. 84, (1903), pp. 362-363


‘Zur Frage der Deportation der Hereros’, in Deutsche Kolonialzeitung, No. 21, (1904), pp. 202-203

1905: ‘Das neue Kolonialalphabet in seiner Anwendung auf die Südsee’, in Globus, Bd. LXXXVII, Nr. 17 (4 May 1905), pp. 293-295


‘Anthropologische Notizen über die Bevölkerung von Sierra Leone’, in Globus, Bd. 90, (1906), pp. 13-16
‘Die Forschungsreise S.M.S. “Planet”,’ in *Globus*, Bd. 90, (1906), pp. 101-104


‘Curacao, nebst einigen Bemerkungen über eine Westindische Reise (1899-1900)’, in *Globus*, Bd. 90, (1906), pp. 293-299


1909:  Article by Krämer in *Ozeanographie: Mit einer Abhandlung über stereophotogrammetrische Arbeiten von Dr. Kohlschütter*, edited by W. Brennecke (of the Deutsche Seewarte) published in the series *Forschungsreise S.M.S. “Planet”*, Bd. 3, supported by the Reichsmarineamt, Berlin


‘Rede zur Eröffnung des Linden-Museums’, in Württembergischer Verein für Handelsgeographie und Förderung deutscher Interessen im Ausland, e. V., 1911, pp. 33-34


‘Redet Deutsch in unseren Kolonien!’, in Deutsche Kolonialzeitung, 30, no. 24, (1913), pp. 406-407


‘An die deutschen Universitäten. –Die Notwendigkeit anthropologischer Lehrstühle and en Universitäten’, conjoint declaration of the German Society for Anthropology,


Palau, Abteilung: II. Siedlungen, Bezirke, Dörfer, Verfassung und IV Demographie, Anthropologie, Sprache, aus Ergebnisse der Hamburg Südsee-Expedition 1908-1910, edited by Dr. G. Thilenius, Hamburg, 1919


‘Der Dimorphismus bei Mann und Frau’, in Zeitschrift für Sexualwissenschaften, Bonn, Bd. 7, pp. 1-9


1923: Salamasia: Bilder aus alt samoanischer Kultur und Geschichte, Stuttgart: Strecker & Schröder, 1923

1924: ‘Die neue Erforschung der Südsee Inseln’, in Petermanns Geographische Mitteilungen, Bd. 70,(1924), pp. 33-34

‘Das Ofnet-Problem’, in Fundberichte aus Schwaben, Neue Folge, Bd. 2, (1924), pp. 1-3


*Die Málanggane von Tómbara*, München, 1925


‘Die Ausbreitung der indischen Kultur im malaischen Archipel’, in *Schwäbischer Merkur* [Newspaper], 18 March 1926


‘Was die Cocuspalme alles leistet’, in *Erdkundliches Quellenbuch*, Frankfurt, (1926), pp. ?


‘Tätowiren, Tatauiren, Tatuiren und die Wasserflasche’, in *Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie*, Bd. 28, Heft 1/2, (1927), pp. 31-34


‘Anfänge der Wirtschaft und erste wirtschaftliche Produkte’, in Schwäbischer Merkur [Newspaper], 15 December 1927


‘Der Palolo’, in Erdkundliches Quellenbuch, Frankfurt, 1927, pp. ?


‘Neugliederung der Wirtschaftsreformen’, in *Forschungen und Fortschritte*, Leipzig, Jg. 4, (1928), p. 320


‘Die Besteigung des Bidiboen’, (Newspaper article) in *Tübingen Chronik und Steinlachbote*, 14 January 1928


*Palau, IV. Teilband, Abteilung: VII. Geschichten und Gesänge und VIII. Botanischer, Zoologischer und Palauwörter-Index, Ergebnisse der Hamburg Südsee-Expedition 1908-1910*, edited by Dr. G. Thilenius, Hamburg, 1929


‘Sebastian Münsters Kosmographie’, (Newspaper article) in *Tübinger Chronik*, 20 February 1931

1932: *Truk, Ergebnisse der Hamburg Südsee-Expedition 1908-1910*, edited by Dr. G. Thilenius, Hamburg, 1932

[Newspaper], 25th July 1933


‘Ferdinand von Hochstätter, ein Schwäbischer Forscher’, in Fundberichte aus Schwaben, Neue Folge, Bd. 8, (1935), pp. 6-9

‘Grundformen des schwäbischen Bauernhauses’, in Schwäbischer Merkur
[Newspaper], 20th December 1935


‘Die Zerstörung von Rabaul’, in Stuttgarter Neues Tagesblatt – Abendausgabe
[Newspaper, evening edition], 13th August 1937


1938: Ralik-Ratak (Marshall-Inseln) Bd. 11, Ergebnisse der Hamburg Südsee-Expedition 1908-1910, (co-written by Dr. Hans Nevermann), Hamburg, 1938
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