

Douglas Grant and Rudolf Marcuse: Wartime encounters at the edge of art

Tom Murray and Hilary Howes

This is a post-print version of the following article: Tom Murray & Hilary Howes (2019)

Douglas Grant and Rudolf Marcuse: Wartime encounters at the edge of art, *History and Anthropology*, DOI: 10.1080/02757206.2019.1607730

Abstract

In 1918, in a German POW camp, German Jewish sculptor Rudolf Marcuse modelled a bronze bust of Australian Indigenous serviceman Douglas Grant. We discuss these two men's life-histories, the political impetus for creating racialized images of POWs, the early twentieth-century globalization of colonial power structures, and the capacity of a personal, arbitrary encounter to resist simple, deterministic imperatives.

Keywords

Douglas Grant; Rudolf Marcuse; Wünsdorf; Australian Indigenous military service; First World War; POWs; history of race; wartime encounters

Introduction¹

First, the encounter. An Australian Indigenous draughtsman named Douglas Grant and a German Jewish sculptor named Rudolf Marcuse meet in a prisoner-of-war (POW) camp near Berlin in 1918. Grant becomes Marcuse's subject. This much has been known for years, and Gordon's ([1962] 1965) biography of Reg Saunders, *The Embarrassing Australian: The Story of an Aboriginal Warrior*, includes the following description:

In a prison camp outside Berlin, Grant became thoroughly famous. He was regarded as a prize capture as well as a considerable curiosity. Doctors measured and photographed his

skull, scientists and anthropologists invited him to the Berlin University, and the sculptor Rudolf Markoeser [sic] modelled his bust in ebony (Gordon [1962] 1965, 27).

Gordon lists key sources of information in his introduction, specifically thanking “the Australian Broadcasting Commission for making available information from their documentary on the life of Douglas Grant” (Gordon [1962] 1965, 9). However, *The Embarrassing Australian* does not include a bibliography, footnotes or endnotes. Despite this, Grant’s subsequent biographers have tended simply to repeat Gordon’s claims; several, including the author of the relevant *Australian Dictionary of Biography* entry, have reproduced word for word the statement, “the sculptor Rudolf Markoeser modelled his bust in ebony” (Clark 1973, 24; Clark 1983; Ramsland and Mooney [2006] 2012, 7; Stanley 2011, 222). Winegard’s (2012) monograph *Indigenous Peoples of the British Dominions and the First World War* is notable in using the correct spelling of the sculptor’s surname, but otherwise contains no additional information on Marcuse (Winegard 2012, 193).

In the hundred years since this meeting, Grant’s story has assumed a certain amount of additional fame. His biography has been illustrative of the general lack of public acknowledgement of, and the post-war prejudice suffered by, Indigenous servicemen, a lack that has more recently been addressed during the centenary commemorations of the First World War (see for example Beaumont and Cadzow 2018; Grant and Bell 2018). Supplementary to this narrative, Grant’s experience as a “prize capture” of German study adds another remarkable layer to the story. A scene in Tom Wright’s ([2014] 2015) play *Black Diggers*, in a clear reference to Grant’s meeting with Marcuse in the Wünsdorf camp, depicts an Indigenous man being subjected to anthropological study. But while this experience adds narrative colour to a story of Indigenous courage and exploitation, there is little to help us understand the context of

this extraordinary meeting – or, indeed, to help us come to terms with the personalities of Grant and Marcuse. Additionally, nothing is known of the embodiment of that meeting: Marcuse’s bust of Grant. This article seeks to provide a context for their meeting, and to track down the sculpture.

Rudolf Marcuse and the Ethnographic Enterprise

Generally speaking, authors who mention Marcuse’s bust of Grant provide no information on Marcuse’s background or motivations, nor do they consider the broader interest in “racially” diverse POWs amongst German ethnologists, linguists and anthropologists. Recent examinations of wartime anthropology in Germany fail to mention Marcuse’s contributions to this field at all (Evans 2010; Jones 2011).

So, a few biographical notes on Marcuse (Fig. 1). Born on 15 January 1878 in Berlin, he attended the Askanisches Gymnasium (grammar school) in what is now Kreuzberg, before commencing studies in 1895 at the Royal Academy of the Arts (Rapsilber 1909, 148). In 1902 he entered the public art scene, exhibiting bronzes with the titles “Consolation” and “Omar” at the annual Berlin Art Exhibition (Anon 1902, 112). The following year he was awarded the prestigious Prize of the Michael Beer Foundation, including funding for a year’s study in Italy, for his relief “The Judgement of Solomon” (Rapsilber 1909, 149). In addition to these and numerous other small bronzes, cast at Berlin’s Gladenbeck foundry, Marcuse produced a range of figurines for prominent porcelain manufacturers, including Goldscheider (Vienna), Rosenthal (Selb), and the Royal Porcelain Factory (Berlin), over the period 1908-25 (Niecol 2001, 14-18; Rapsilber 1909, 150-152; Schilling 2005, 79-80).

Young, artistically talented, Jewish – one of his contemporaries considered him “the pride of Israel” – and based in Berlin, Marcuse is representative of a generation described by Paul Mendes-Flohr under the heading “The Berlin Jew as Cosmopolitan” (Rapsilber 1909, 147; Mendes-Flohr 1999). The dedication of Berlin’s Oranienburger Strasse synagogue in 1866, Mendes-Flohr (1999, 16) argues, simultaneously marked

the emergence of Berlin as the prosperous capital of the new state ... and the coming of age of the city’s Jewish community, whose rapid growth was prominently associated with the city’s meteoric rise from a provincial backwater to a vibrant metropolis.

Although Berlin’s Jewish population never exceeded 4 per cent of the city’s total population, “their impact on the economic and intellectual life of Berlin far exceeded the limits of their demographic representation”, a fact which attracted both admiration and envy (Mendes-Flohr 1999, 16-21; Elon 2004, 259-95). Jews living in pre-Weimar Republic Germany still found themselves excluded from “important areas of German public life”, despite some progress towards civic equality over the course of the nineteenth century: “the court, the military, the state bureaucracy, and, to a large degree, the universities” were closed to them (Bilski 1999, 4-5; Elon 2004, 358). As a result, they “tended to gravitate to the free professions”, including the arts, both as practitioners – actors, journalists, literary and theatre critics, musicians, painters, poets, sculptors – and as “passionate supporters of high culture” (Bilski 1999, 5; Mendes-Flohr 1999, 17-21; Elon 2004, 260-265).

Writing in 1906-07, the journalist Maximilian Rapsilber described Marcuse as one of “a new genus of sculptors”, whose works, in contrast to those of the “mandarins of mass-produced monuments”, fostered “comfortably homely” feelings of “sensuous delight” (Rapsilber 1906-07, 354-355):

Sculpture was unpopular for an entire generation; the academic dreariness of plaster stared out of its empty eyes. Now this has changed, now a lascivious, laughing, wooing, twinkling spirit looks out of the modelled, tinted, patinated, gilded eyeballs, inlaid with amber and precious stones. What sculpture has lost in starchy, ceremonious dignity, it has gained in sparkling vitality and confidingness. Modern sculpture does not demand its own altar in the home, it wants to live with us and be merry ... sculptors have descended from the seventh and most boring heaven to the green and entertaining earth (Rapsilber 1906-07, 354).

Berlin's sculptors, Rapsilber opined, were "enjoying prosperous days"; "the sculptural turn of our times cannot be denied ... every sculptor who knows his business promptly finds an appreciative audience" (Rapsilber 1906-07, 354). The growing accessibility of sculpture in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries doubtless contributed to this climate of prosperity. As Gerhard Rupp (1990) has noted, members of the public in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Berlin were not limited to admiring historical and contemporary sculptures held in the collection of the National Gallery or exhibited in public spaces. Increasingly, their desires were catered to by "a large number of firms offering sculptures for residential use", including the abovementioned bronze and porcelain manufacturers for whom Marcuse worked (Rupp 1990, 337). Various factors, including the availability of machinery designed to reduce the size of sculptors' models, the establishment of copyright law, and significant improvements in casting methods and materials, contributed to these firms' success.

Marcuse's works may not have conformed to the tastes of more recent art critics, one of whom dismissed his porcelain figurines as "sickly sweet" (as quoted in Niecol 2001, 14-15), but they were evidently admired by prominent individuals of his day. Karl Möbius, Head of Zoological Collections at Berlin's Natural History Museum, acquired one of Marcuse's earliest pieces, an 1897 sculpture of an elephant, for the museum; Kaiserin Auguste Viktoria presented her husband Kaiser Wilhelm II with Marcuse's 1908 statuette of a swordsman as a Christmas gift

(Rapsilber 1909, 148-150). Even the King of Siam (now Thailand), Chulalongkorn the Great, purchased a number of Marcuse's works while visiting Europe in 1907, including a bronze and marble fountain exhibited at that year's Berlin Art Exhibition and a dozen copies of the figurine "Rest in the Studio", depicting a female artist's model balancing on a pedestal (Rapsilber 1909, 153-154).

Although Marcuse concentrated primarily on smaller items for the commercial market, he also produced two major public statues. The first, a bronze bust of the German Jewish philosopher Moses Mendelssohn, was erected in 1909 outside the Boys' School of the Jewish Community in Berlin (Rapsilber 1909, 147-148). The building still exists, and is functioning again as a Jewish grammar school after a period of ignominy serving as a deportation camp for Berlin's Jews during the Second World War, but the bust was destroyed in 1941 by members of a Nazi paramilitary organization, the *Sturmabteilung* or "Brownshirts" (Jüdische Gemeinde zu Berlin n.d.; Jüdisches Gymnasium Moses Mendelssohn 2012). The second, a bronze monument erected in 1926 in the Hagenbeck Zoological Park in Hamburg, still stands (Fig. 2). It depicts Carl Hagenbeck, the zoo's founder, standing beside a lion named Triest, who once saved him from an attacking tiger (Reichenbach 2001, 1231; Schirmer Medienservice 2015). Until recently, it was located at the entrance to the zoo, which is still a major tourist destination in Hamburg. However, following the construction of a new entrance, Hagenbeck and Triest have now been relegated to a more remote corner of the park.

For the purposes of this paper, it is strangely appropriate that Hagenbeck should be the subject of Marcuse's only major surviving work. Europe's leading animal dealer, he opened the original Hagenbeck Zoological Park in 1874, having inherited the business from his father. Although this first zoo was primarily an animal dealer's compound, Hagenbeck was later able to

realize his long-held dream of establishing a real zoological park at its current location. It was, Herman Reichenbach argues, “the first truly modern zoological park ... the first zoo in the world to combine the now universally accepted concepts of keeping largely acclimatized animals in mixed-species, naturalistic exhibits that employ concealed moats and hedges instead of high fences and bars as barriers” (Reichenbach 2001, 1228-1229). Opened in 1907, the new Hagenbeck Zoological Park was also exceedingly popular in its first years, attracting around a million visitors every year, despite its relatively inconvenient location (Reichenbach 2001, 1228-1229; Mohr 1966).

Importantly, Hagenbeck’s exhibits were not limited to exotic animals. From 1875 until his death in 1913, he was also actively involved in staging what he called “anthropological-zoological exhibitions”, groups of exotic peoples who wore supposedly traditional clothing and undertook everyday activities in full view of the public. The first such exhibition, featuring six Sami (Laplanders) accompanied by a herd of reindeer, was so enthusiastically received by the citizens of Hamburg that Hagenbeck subsequently took the group on tour to Berlin and Leipzig. Further exhibitions followed, becoming increasingly extravagant as their fame spread and Hagenbeck’s financial position improved: the “Ceylon Caravan” of 1884, for example, involved sixty-seven Sri Lankans – men, women and children – and some twenty-five elephants. In the space of only a decade, Nigel Rothfels observes, “Hagenbeck’s ‘people shows’ ... developed from a small ‘Lapland’ exhibit presented in the back court of the Hagenbeck property in Hamburg to huge productions touring all the major cities of Europe and patronized by hundreds of thousands of visitors”. After Hagenbeck’s death, his sons continued to organize similar shows, the last being held in 1931 (Rothfels 2002, 82-86, 141-142).

Despite Hagenbeck's own claims to the contrary, his "anthropological-zoological exhibitions" were not unique. Non-Europeans, Andrew Zimmerman (2001, 16) notes, had been "enlisted to perform in German zoos and variety shows ... since the eighteenth century". However, it is certainly true that such ethnographic displays, or *Völkerschauen*, became "much more frequent in the second half of the nineteenth century", and that Hagenbeck was one of their most important promoters (Rothfels 2002, 86-88; Zimmerman 2001, 16-18). Further prominent figures in the ethnographic display trade included the brothers Louis and Gustav Castan, owners of Castan's Panopticon in Berlin, an institution of popular education and entertainment inspired by Madame Tussaud's waxworks museum in London. Twenty-seven separate ethnographic troupes of varying sizes from across the globe performed in Castan's Panopticon over the thirty-year period from 1882 to 1911, including three groups of Australian Aborigines from Queensland (Friederici 2011, 2-3; cf. Poignant 2004). From the small-scale, relatively impromptu efforts of "colonial merchants returning to Germany, who would bring a few individuals with them to promote their firm and earn extra money", to the state-sponsored extravaganza of the 1896 Berlin Colonial Exhibition, which brought a hundred people from Germany's overseas colonies to perform in Berlin, ethnographic displays were a prominent element of metropolitan life in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Germany (Zimmerman 2001, 18, 24-36). By 1912, the *Vossische Zeitung*, Berlin's oldest daily newspaper, could assert that ethnographic displays no longer aroused "such amazement as they used to, for it is well known that the citizen of Berlin is able to view half a dozen foreign tribes every year in the panopticon or similar cradles of ethnography" (as quoted in Friederici 2009, 13).

These ethnographic displays, although intended primarily for a general audience, were also of crucial importance to the nascent scientific disciplines of physical anthropology and

ethnology. Prior to the First World War, Zimmerman (2001, 15) observes, “the majority of encounters between German anthropologists and the people they studied” did not occur in the colonies, as one might initially assume, but rather in Germany itself, “in circuses, panopticons, and zoos”. Physical anthropologists, ethnologists, linguists, musicologists and other specialists eagerly sought access to the bodies and minds of ethnographic performers: measuring their heads, tracing the outlines of their hands and feet, making plaster casts of their faces, photographing them with and without their clothing, inquiring into their religious beliefs, and attempting to record elements of their language. Members of anthropological societies decamped en masse to their local zoo or panopticon when ethnological displays were on offer, or arranged for performers to make special appearances at their regular meetings. Showmen like Hagenbeck and the Castan brothers, who worked closely with these societies, benefitted from their enthusiastic promotion of the scientific value of ethnographic displays. The vocal support of prominent anthropologists neutralized public concerns about the “heartlessness” of “dragging people to Europe” without clear evidence of their informed consent, the lack of human decency evident in “allowing our own kind to be [displayed] in zoological gardens”, and the frequent deaths of performers, and smoothed administrative hurdles associated with the shows’ sexualized nudity and occasional violation of child labour laws (Zimmerman 2001, 18-23; Rothfels 2002, 91-110; Virchow 1880, 270-271).

Against this backdrop, it is not surprising to find prominent German-speaking anthropologists during the First World War framing some of the POW camps of Germany and Austro-Hungary as a further form of ethnographic display. In his important monograph *Anthropology at War: World War I and the Science of Race in Germany*, Andrew D. Evans (2010, 131) records typical responses: POW camps were “a *Völkerschau* without comparison”,

“a very rich observational area for anthropologists”, an “opportunity for scientific research never present before and never to return”. Scholars in Berlin and Vienna, eager to exploit this opportunity before the “angel of peace” should intervene to tear it from their grasp, moved swiftly to secure state and military support for large-scale studies (Evans 2010, 135). By June 1915, the Viennese Anthropological Society had already received approval for its proposed studies from the Austro-Hungarian Imperial War Ministry. In the same year, the Oriental Seminar in Berlin joined forces with the Prussian Cultural Ministry to create the Royal Prussian Phonographic Commission (RPPC), designed to record the languages and folk songs of POWs. The latter project received substantial sums of money from Kaiser Wilhelm II’s personal dispensation fund, underlining Evans’ point that anthropologists conducting POW studies “enjoyed a new level of government support and cooperation” and that the discipline of anthropology “effectively [became] a part of the governmental-military complex for the duration of the war” (Evans 2010, 134-136).

While only relatively few German POW camps were utilized in this way,² the combination of state financial support, the cooperation of military and camp authorities in setting up “facilities for the studies and making the prisoners available for investigation”, and the vast supply of “perfect scientific material” (embodied by the prisoners within the POW camps) did indeed present a unique opportunity for German social scientists, as well as for the artists inducted by them (Evans 2010, 137; Evans 2002, 227). So it is into this highly charged historic moment that Rudolf Marcuse steps: a talented sculptor at the service of the Central Powers, ready to embark on a career-defining project in the POW camps of his nation.

Douglas Grant's "Great Wars"

Douglas Grant was born around 1885 into the Australian Indigenous Nations of the tropical Queensland rainforest that once occupied the area now known as the Atherton Tablelands. His date of birth is based on the approximation of a Scottish-born couple, Robert and Elizabeth Grant (Fig. 3), who "rescued" him while collecting flora and fauna for the Australian Museum in late 1887. They estimated him to be around two years old at the time (Anon. 1916a, p.5).

The following newspaper report describing the circumstances of his "adoption" was published in April 2015, and is indicative of reports published throughout the last century:

Originally named Poppin Jerri, he [Douglas Grant] was born in northern Queensland in the early 1880s. His life changed dramatically in 1887 when his parents and most of his community died in what began as a tribal fight. He was rescued and adopted by Scottish scientist Robert Grant, who was surveying nearby at the time (Stickney 2015).

Most of this account is questionable, including Grant's supposed name of "Poppin Jerri" – a name that local Indigenous elders such as Ernie Raymont (pers. comm. 2015) discount as being derived from regional languages. This is further evidenced by the fact that there is no consonant "p" in the Dyirbal language group orthography (Dixon 1972, 269-291). More substantially, in what sense and from what circumstances did this "rescue" take place? The question is important because it illuminates a legacy significant both to the processes of colonial memory and historiography and to Grant's biography. Stickney's (2015) article draws its inspiration either directly or indirectly from newspaper accounts published a century earlier, when Douglas Grant's enlistment to fight in WW1 brought his unusual biography to the notice of the press.

A *Lithgow Mercury* article of 28 April 1916 entitled "Sergt. Douglas Grant. Dark Skin But White Heart" was the first significant biographical article to bring Grant's story to public

light. It includes an explanation from Grant's adoptive father, Robert Grant, that is offered as a summary account rather than direct quote through the attribution: "Mr Robert Grant, chief taxidermist to the Australian Museum, Sydney ... is a most interesting conversationalist". It then goes on to explain how Robert came "across a little black boy whose mother and father were killed in a tribal disturbance" (Anon. 1916b, 6). This uses the then-common colonial syntax of "disturbances" and "dispersal" that were "adopted into bush slang as a convenient euphuism [sic] for wholesale massacre" (Anon. 1880, 560; cf. Reynolds 1998, 108-137).

The persistence of this colonial grammar today, or at least of the meanings superficially drawn from it, testify both to the deceptive intent of its use and to the politics that has always underscored it. Historian Ann Curthoys has described how the presence of Aboriginal men in the Native Police Force, working as the "agents of white society ... trickles down in settler consciousness as inter-tribal violence" (in Murray 2017). Hence, the presence of Aboriginal men as frontline soldiers, marshalled by state directive and white commanding officers, manages to obscure the role of the colony and be re-configured in popular media as "inter-tribal" violence. That numerous recent accounts – including the above-mentioned news article and the current *Australian Dictionary of Biography* entry on Douglas Grant – propose a "tribal fight" as the cause for Grant becoming separated from his family, offers strong evidence for the ongoing utility of this language to conceal and deny the realities of the Australian frontier (Clark 1983).

As historian Raymond Evans has described it, the Native Police was a "quasi-military" force based on British colonial precursors in the South African Cape and Indian frontiers, established as a state-authorized organization of "lethal force" and destined, if not designed, to "become the warring arm of land policy in Queensland" (Evans 2007, 71). While established by the State, and always led by white officers, it was a force of Aboriginal men tasked to remove

Aboriginal inhabitants who were considered an impediment to the economic and civilising project of squatters and settlers (Bottoms 2013, 5). Explorer, and later Protector of Aborigines, Archibald Meston (1889, 8) offers an account of native troopers being sent to the Russell River area of Douglas Grant's birth after a conflict between miners and local Indigenous people, and the influential newspaper *Queenslander* provided its readers with a graphic description of the state response to acts of Indigenous aggression towards miners and squatters:

unless the thick scrub foils the native troopers, vengeance will be wreaked on some people of the same color at least ... [whereby] ... the troopers will indiscriminately shoot all the men that cannot get out of range of their sniders quickly enough. (Anon. 1877)

In the case of Douglas Grant and his Indigenous relations, the dense rainforests had kept the expanding colony at bay to the extent that, by the time of his birth around 1885, most family members would not have come into contact with white people. This situation, however, was about to change rapidly. Within a month of the explorers/prospectors Charlie Palmerston, George Clarke and William Joss laying claim to the discovery of the Russell goldfield in October 1886, a correspondent of the *Brisbane Courier* (November 30, 1886) noted that there were 180 men on the Russell Goldfield and 'numbers are arriving and leaving' (cf. Bolton 1982, 6).

A year later, in the summer of 1887 when Robert and Elizabeth Grant arrived, tensions were high between white prospectors and Indigenous people forced to come to terms with a large community of men settling in their traditional country (see Anon. 1887). Given this friction, it is unsurprising that the expedition – which yielded seven species “new to the Museum, and three [that] are new to science” – would also witness the violence that was a hallmark of the frontier throughout Queensland at the time (Australian Museum 1888, 1).

In 2015, Mamu-Ngadjon Elder Ernie Raymont speculated that the event that orphaned Douglas Grant could have been one of a number of massacres committed in the region at the time, including one today commemorated in the descriptive name of “Butchers Creek”. Amateur local historian Jack May, in a goldfields history self-published in the 1970s, put it this way:

Stories are told by old Aboriginals of many massacred on the Russell [gold] field. The Aboriginals were always searching for food, and any discreet raid on a prospector’s camp would bring forth a posse of [Native] police from Cairns to clear the bush. Many hundreds are reported to have been shot down in this manner. Butchers Creek is reported to have received its name from such a slaughter on its banks (as quoted in Pannell 2005, 18).

Ngadjon-Jii Elder Auntie Emma Johnston explained that “[t]hey mustered all the people from *Djilan* bora ground to *Bundjabili* bora ground and killed them all ... No one survived that massacre at Butcher’s Creek”, except a boy who hid “up a hollow log when the shooting was going on” (as quoted in Pannell 2005, 17). Johnston explained that the boy was sent to Gordonvale by police and grew up with a white family who gave him the name “Tommy Allen”. This is a common frontier story – a child is sent by police or others to live with whites – but it is rarely an event that is described by Aboriginal people as a ‘rescue’. Indeed, Mamu-Ngadjon Elder Ernie Raymont believes that when Robert and Elizabeth Grant took Douglas away from his surviving family and down to Sydney “they meant well but ... what they did was completely wrong” (in Murray 2017).

Historians including Jonathan Richards (2005, 2008), Timothy Bottoms (2000, 2013), Noel Loos (1982), John Connor (2002), Henry Reynolds (1987, 2001, 2006), Raymond Evans (2004a, 2004b, 2006) and Robert Ørsted-Jensen (Evans and Ørsted-Jensen 2014) have variously attempted over the last few decades to estimate the scale of these colonial frontier wars in Queensland. Most recently, Evans and Ørsted-Jensen (2014, 5) have “arrive[d] at an aggregate of

66 680 killed” in the frontier wars of Queensland between 1824 and 1898. They continue: “Students of World War One will also notice that the figure of 66 680 is remarkably close to the Australian combat death rate of 62 300 in that war”. They conclude that the frontier conflict in Queensland “was also, in immediate terms, *our* Great War – a war for both the defense and conquest of Australia” (Evans and Ørsted-Jensen 2014, 6).

Data is lacking on the number of Indigenous children and families displaced and made refugees by such a vast, long-running and lethal conflict, but enough accounts of Indigenous children “saved” from its battlegrounds exist to appreciate that Grant’s story is far from isolated. That Douglas Grant was a refugee of the “Great War” raging across the country of his birth is rarely foregrounded in the story of his “adoption” by immigrants from Scotland, but it adds poignancy to his presence as a foot soldier in Australia’s other “nation-defining” conflict: the “Great War” of 1914-18.

Towards Encounter

To bridge the distance between the frontier battle in which Grant was estranged from his birth family in 1887, and his meeting with Marcuse near Berlin thirty years later, some brief notes will suffice. Named Douglas by the Scottish couple, he was smuggled out of Queensland (it was illegal to remove Aboriginal children across state boundaries at the time) in 1887 and taken by steamer to Sydney where he was raised by Robert and Elizabeth Grant (Alec Chisolm in Murray 2017), together with their first-born son Henry (b. 1892). They lived first in the regional town of Lithgow, and later in Annandale, a Scottish-diaspora suburb of Sydney. Douglas attended Annandale public school, trained and worked as a draughtsman, and was working as a wool

classer on a property near Scone when he joined the Australian Imperial Force (AIF) (Fig. 4) on 13 January 1916 (Ramsland and Mooney [2006] 2012, 2-15; Griffiths 2014, 9-16).

In the AIF Grant attained the rank of Sergeant and (most likely jokingly) the *Lithgow Mercury* reported his ambition: “Not satisfied with his present rank, Douglas is going for a lieutenancy” (Anon. 1916b, 6). Instead, in circumstances relating to bureaucratic concerns about his Aboriginality (see Anon. 1916c, 26), he was stripped of his rank in the Thirty-Fourth Battalion of the AIF before embarking for Europe on the *Wiltshire* as a private with the Thirteenth Battalion a few months later, in August 1916 (Griffiths 2014, 18). After initial training in England, he shipped to France, and after a brief stay at a camp in Etaples joined the main body of the Thirteenth Battalion on 12 February, where they worked to repair various facilities before beginning a period of pre-battle training (White 1924, 91-94; Griffiths 2014, 19). In early April 1917 an attack on the Hindenburg Line near Bullecourt was decided, and despite contrary advice from Australian officers that such an attack was “useless” without appropriate artillery support and the prior cutting of German protective barbed wire, it went ahead on 11 April (White 1924, 91). In heavily falling snow Grant and other men from the Thirteenth Battalion faced a “tornado of lead” and Thomas A. White, a Captain in the Thirteenth Battalion, noted: “Pte D. Grant, the popular aboriginal, although wounded, was amongst these last fighters” (1924, 94). The First Battle of Bullecourt had proved a disaster, with over fifty percent of Australians who fought in the battle becoming casualties, and a further fifteen percent, including Grant, becoming POWs (Ramsland and Mooney 2006, 5-6).

What immediately followed for Grant as a POW was a dangerous stint on the German frontlines as a “prisoner of respite” in a “working party” that was kept purposely (according to a German declaration from 1917) “very short of food, bad lodging, no beds, hard work ... no pay,

no soap for washing and shaving, no bath, no towels, no boots etc”, in retaliation for allies using German POWs in a similar fashion (see Anon 1931b; Pegram 2017, 7-9). During this period of abusive incarceration Grant suffered malnourishment; according to his POW colleague Harry Adams, their “daily ration was one slice of bread” (Thompson and Hungerford 1957, 10).

After a period in the Wittenberg camp (Anon. 1918) Grant eventually arrived at the Wünsdorf POW camp near Berlin towards the end of 1917. Wünsdorf was a camp unlike any other, having been chosen as the location for two curious experiments: one scientific, the other imperial (Evans 2010). In an earlier section we briefly touched upon the role of the Prussian Cultural Ministry, Prussian War Ministry, and the Royal Prussian Phonographic Commission (RPPC) in exploiting the “*Völkerschau* without comparison” by engaging artists and social scientists in the business of documenting, studying and representing the “colourful mixture of peoples [that] our enemies have collected” (Evans 2010, 131). The imperial experiment was also an opportunistic response to having large numbers of captive POWs. It was initiated by the German Intelligence Office for the East (*Nachrichtenstelle für den Orient*, NfO) and commenced with the building of Germany’s first-ever mosque at the *Halbmondlager* (Half Moon Camp) site (Fig. 5), with the intention “to persuade Muslim prisoners of war to change sides and join the Ottoman-German Alliance against the British and French Entente” (Gussone 2016, 179). The strategy at the Wünsdorf camp was to offer special treatment to Muslim prisoners as a “propagandistic means to win sympathy and support for the Central Powers” so that they would return to their homelands with sympathetic views of Germany (Gussone 2016, 181). The camp even produced a newspaper, *El Jihad*, in several languages, including Arabic, to spread news of German support for the Islamic cause in Allied colonies (Höpp 1997, 25).

This account serves to illustrate the complex political, strategic, opportunistic, pragmatic, bureaucratic, and personal motivations that were simultaneously at play when Douglas Grant – an Australian Indigenous draughtsman and POW – met Rudolf Marcuse, the Jewish cosmopolitan sculptor, at Wünsdorf.

The Context of Encounter and the Human Object of Study

Douglas Grant was one of only a handful of Aboriginal Australians to be interned in a German POW camp and was prized as a “full-blood” (*ein Vollblut*) in the German literature (Ubach et al. 1923, i, xxiv). This made him “the prize piece, the prize capture”, according to his former AIF colleague Roy Kinghorne (Thompson and Hungerford 1957, 11). But as far as the cultural anthropologists were concerned he was a disappointment (cf. Riseman 2014, 159). Leonhard Adam, a German Jewish anthropologist and lawyer who later fled Nazi Germany for England, only to be shipped to Australia and interned as an “enemy alien” (Denning 1993), recalled:

I met Douglas Grant in the Prisoners of War Camp, at Wünsdorf ... I myself was then a member of the Royal Prussian Phonographic Commission ... engaged in recording ... exotic languages and folk songs among the many different tribesmen who had been captured at the Western and Eastern front ... Grant, who had been brought up by white foster parents, was practically unable to give me any information that we did not already know from the literature ... his attitude to his own people was exactly like that of a white person (Thomson and Hungerford 1957, 11).

Disappointments such as Adam’s aside, there was great clamour and competition to be involved in this wartime science. This is evidenced by a letter from Georg Thilenius, Head of the Hamburg Ethnological Museum, who complained about the Berlin bias of the studies (Evans 2010, 137). It was thus likely to Rudolf Marcuse’s advantage that he was Berlin-based. The enthusiasm to be involved also reflected a belief in the advantageous circumstances for study

provided by the POW camps. Otto Reche, for example, who had been part of the Hamburg South Seas Expedition of 1908-10, was particularly pleased that in the POW camps the dangers from threats and acts of violence encountered in the Pacific were eliminated because “the people ... stand under military guard [and are therefore] more accessible for bodily measurements than they would be in their homeland” (as quoted in Evans 2010, 142). For Rudolf Pöch, the controlled environments in which the scientists operated in the POW camps made it more like “work in a laboratory, compared to that of the research trip outside” (as quoted in Evans 2010, 143).

While study efforts within the camps were most often led by researchers such as Felix von Luschan with an interest in physical anthropology – men who believed themselves to be studying “the mysteries of race and the origins of humankind through the scientific study of human characteristics” - the project was a vastly interdisciplinary one (Evans 2002, 227). For example, Carl Stumpf, a psychologist who helped establish the RPPC arm of the project, was particularly interested in musicology and linguistics (Ziegler 2003, 529), and a large number of professional artists like Marcuse were also inducted into the war effort.

The atmosphere in which they all worked must have been exciting, given the creative challenges and the scale of the operation. In a 2014 interview with Andrea Baumgartner, whose father Thomas Baumgartner worked as a painter in the POW camps, she explained that “it was a very exciting time for my father ... he would have worked for free, given what he learned and got out of it” (pers. comm. 2014). But there must also have been an undercurrent of hostility that permeated the place. This can be seen in the 1916 book *Unsere Feinde* (Our Enemies), published by Otto Stiehl, a photographer, architect, and deputy commander of the Wünsdorf POW camp. Stiehl writes:

Anyone who has made the acquaintance of this motley crew [the POWs] will agree with all their heart with the words of a neutral [observer] who declared, while visiting a camp of coloured English and French [prisoners]: “It is to France’s and England’s eternal shame and dishonour that they have set this riff-raff on a civilised land.” One shudders to think of the fate that would have befallen our well-tended, artistic villages and cities, and, above all, our women and children, if we had not succeeded in keeping these wild hordes ... at arm’s length from our fatherland. Doubtless in some a justifiable bitterness will arise [at the thought] that we have had to deploy our sons – carefully brought up, schooled in high ideals, proficient in the arts and sciences, capable of all the intricacies of a sophisticated trade – against such crude and morally inferior adversaries. But stronger still must be the feeling of pride that Germany’s sons have prevailed victoriously against such a torrent of hostile peoples (Stiehl 1916, 31-32).

Stiehl’s book features a series of photographic images of POWs from throughout the British, French and Russian empires, but its presentation departs from the frontal/profile “mug shot” style of photography pioneered by Alphonse Bertillon as a tool for criminal and forensic applications (Morris-Reich 2013, 506) that was strictly observed by camp anthropologists such as Egon von Eickstedt and Rudolf Pöch (Evans 2010, 166). On the contrary, many of the images in Stiehl’s book seem to resist the political considerations that might be understood to motivate their production: to create images that represent captives subdued and controlled by a superior German power, or images that emphasize the otherness of those represented in order to express German racial unity and supremacy to the “wild hordes”. Instead, many of Stiehl’s images undeniably represent personable human beings. His two images of Douglas Grant (taken in 1917 and therefore not included in his 1915 book), for example, present us with an empathetic figure (Figure 6), and the images express (at least to these authors) Grant’s sense of homesickness for Australia that is described in his letters from the camp (e.g. Grant 1918b). Given Stiehl’s expressed political views and objectives, it is interesting to consider why and how his photographic images express a humanism contrary to his writings. Did the living presence of

Grant, or the sensory-aesthetic process of photography stir in him an association of empathy, a relationship with his subject that is absent from the rhetoric of his writing?

Another way of looking at these images, if we wish to imagine Stiehl's creative and political muses as being in accord, is to appreciate the "surplus" values that are inevitably captured within the photographic process and cannot be controlled - particularly in the case of a non-professional photographer with limited technical means in the early twentieth century. Like Jacques Derrida's (1976, 144-145) idea of the "dangerous supplement" emerging from certain forms of representation, perhaps it is simply the case that these images escaped Stiehl's capacity to control them. The "surplus" of these images resisted the photographer's attempt to create a racialised or dehumanized subject, and their presence speaks to us despite him.

A further consideration relates to the specific kind of expressive encounter that we experience when we engage with what Gilles Deleuze has described as the "visage" of the human face. In writing about cinema and how we "envisage" others, Deleuze (2008, 89) notes the importance of proximity in producing emotional engagement: "[the] affective-image is the close-up, and the close-up is the face". The potential of the human face to bring people into relationship was also an important consideration for the philosopher Emmanuel Levinas (1991, 194), who wrote that "the face is present in its refusal to be contained ... the face speaks to me and thereby invites me to a relation ... The face is a living presence; it is expression ... The face speaks".

Given what Otto Stiehl has written about the "riff-raff" he captured with his lens, as compared to the views we will soon learn that Marcuse held towards those he fashioned in bronze, it would be safe to imagine that the face of Douglas Grant spoke more eloquently to the

sculptor over the days they spent together than it did to a photographer imagining himself chronicling Germany's enemies at 1/50th of a second.

A Post-War Imperial Museum: The Confidence of the Central Powers

Unlike many of the anthropologists introduced above, Rudolf Marcuse was not employed by the RPPC. Instead, his statuettes and busts were among a number of artworks purchased by Ludwig Justi, Director of Berlin's National Gallery from 1909 to 1933, for a proposed Imperial War Museum to commemorate Germany's anticipated victory (Osborn 1919, 281; Lange 2011; Pommeranz 2016). Initially Justi had applied simply for funding "to purchase artworks commemorating the war", urging the need to "secure" the best of the "numerous artworks" being produced "on the battlefield, under the immediate impression of experiences on the front", in order to prevent "the memory of the war from being distorted by grandiose paintings commissioned later" (Justi n.d., 439, 441). When this application was rejected, he reworked his initial concept into a far more ambitious plan, obtained the support of both the Kaiser and the Ministry of War, and in 1917 was appointed to lead the Ministry's newly-created Imperial War Museum Department (Justi n.d., 457-459).

In a 1917 memorandum intended for distribution amongst military personnel at home and on the front, Justi outlined his vision for a museum that would "bring to life, in a single location, the collective achievement of the German people in the World War, and transmit it in an impressive fashion to future generations". He advocated a deliberate break from the traditional practice of displaying paintings of battles and collections of historical weapons in separate institutions, arguing that a combined display facilitating the "living interconnection" of artworks and artefacts would be far more effective. "Lifeless objects" – "weapons, equipment, terrain

maps” – would be supplemented by “photographs, maps and graphic depictions of every kind”, while “carefully selected” artworks would reveal “the human soul which lived, fought and suffered with and in all these things” (Justi [1917] 1936, 272-273). As well as more traditional forms of visual commemoration, notably statues and portraits of military leaders, Justi insisted on the importance of humbler scenes. An “artistic depiction of a guard keeping watch in a trench while his comrades sleep”, for example, would reveal “the spiritual significance of even so stationary a fulfilment of duty”; further paintings could depict “recruiting depots and parade grounds” or expose “the terrible effects” of the various guns displayed (Justi [1917] 1936, 279, 281-282). Justi also referred explicitly to “depictions of the various types of prisoners” which would show the “colourful mixture of peoples amongst our enemies”. He envisaged these as part of a “detailed depiction of [wartime] imprisonment” (Fig. 7) including “photographs and models” enabling visitors to “visualize the accommodation of prisoners” in POW camps, as well as “statistical tables, graphic depictions and photographs” giving “an overview of prison labour” and illustrating the “achievements of the Red Cross” in relation to “prison welfare and prisoner exchange” (Justi [1917] 1936, 278-279).

Existing documentation is silent on exactly how and when Marcuse became involved in Justi’s Imperial War Museum project. Was he approached by Justi, or did he volunteer to participate? We do not know. Nor is it clear whether Marcuse received detailed instructions from Justi, and, if so, how they outlined the task he was expected to complete. On the one hand, Justi’s references to “depictions of the various types of prisoners” and the “colourful mixture of peoples amongst our enemies” suggest that he wanted Marcuse to create records of “racial types” rather than individuals (Justi [1917] 1936, 278). On the other hand, Justi’s memoirs record that he “repeatedly stressed to [his] superiors [that] objects, models, photographs, film, maps and

overviews should be used to depict what was factually important”, whereas the function of art was to capture the human face of war: “the spiritual achievements, the greatness of responsible leaders, the courage and endurance of the troops, and ... the pathos of battle itself”. He insisted, therefore, that only artworks which “offered that which could not be captured mechanically” should be purchased for the museum (Justi n.d., 497). These priorities would indicate a more individual and personal focus for Marcuse’s work.

It seems Marcuse attempted to combine elements of these apparently contradictory expectations. A portfolio of photographs of his busts and statuettes was published in 1919 under the title *Ethnic Types from the World War*; each artwork was identified by a brief description of the subject’s perceived ethnicity, with the addition of a geographical descriptor in some cases. In this context, the bust of Grant was transformed into an anonymous “*Australier*” (a German term used at that time to refer specifically to Aboriginal Australians) and sandwiched between a “Siberian” and a “Somali”. Other companion pieces included a “Negro from Liberia”, an “elderly Japanese”, a “French alpine hunter”, and a “Russian with guitar” (Marcuse 1919a, n.p.). It is also clear that Marcuse deliberately searched various POW camps for individuals who conformed to his preconceived ideas of “racial” typicalness. Writing in 1919 to a Mr Starck, who had taken a particular interest in two of Marcuse’s POW models, he described meeting one of them in “the Sielow camp ... while searching for completely racially genuine types”, and arranging “to have him transferred” to another camp in order to facilitate his artistic work (Marcuse 1919b).

Yet the human encounter persisted. Inka Bertz, Fine Arts Curator at Berlin’s Jewish Museum, has pointed out “the contradiction between the title page of the portfolio [*Ethnic Types*] and Rudolf Marcuse’s sculptures”, noting that in many cases Marcuse “depict[ed] the whole

person” and emphasized details of individual prisoners’ military uniforms or traditional costumes rather than focusing solely on their facial features (Bertz 2014). Admittedly, this applies only to the statuettes, not to the busts of Grant and others. Apart from the bust itself, we have no direct record of how Marcuse experienced his encounter with Grant. However, his abovementioned letter to Mr Starck reveals that the enforced anonymity of his “ethnic types” concealed profoundly intimate encounters and meaningful relationships with distinct individuals. In describing the models for his “Moroccan” and “Scot”, Marcuse transformed them again into living, breathing men, supplying their names and details of their background, family life, education, and military service, as well as his own impressions of their behaviour in the POW camps. He was particularly close to the “Moroccan”, Hadj Mahomed ben Landondi, who had served as his “factotum in the Merzdorf camp”, describing him as:

an impeccable soldier, clean and conscientious; he reported to me for duty every day in a freshly washed and ironed uniform, supplied me with strong coffee when I was on night watch and not allowed to fall asleep, hauled along to me as models those of his comrades who still possessed a complete uniform, and took an interest in every respect in the progress of my work (Marcuse 1919b).

Marcuse also provided considerable detail on the “Scot”, John Mackie, despite claiming that “my poor English scarcely permitted a more intimate understanding” (Marcuse 1919b). His descriptions of Mackie are particularly interesting for the glimpses they give us of the agency exerted by prisoners and the interest they took in the portraits made of them:

[Mackie] was one of the best and most willing people with whom I became acquainted amongst the prisoners, and my activities interested him to such an extent that he hauled every comrade who came to visit him in the camp along to my studio to show him my work. I had arranged to have him transferred to my camp from the Sielow camp ... but had to allow his best friend to accompany him, as he would not have come alone ... he had a great many

friends amongst the prisoners, which in view of his truly dignified character and impeccable behaviour was no wonder ... he took [a replica of] his statuette in plaster with him to Scotland, where it met with great acclaim, as I learned from various letters (Marcuse 1919b).

Much of what Marcuse wrote about Mackie could also have applied to Douglas Grant. Certainly he was sociable and dignified. He was also literate, well-read, and educated enough to be apprenticed as a mechanical draughtsman from 1909-1910 and thereafter employed for a number of years at Mort's Dock in Sydney prior to his war service (Griffiths 2014, 13-14). In the relative egalitarianism of the war (in 1929 Grant wrote, apparently "rather bitterly", that "the colour line was never drawn in the trenches" [as quoted in Anon. 1929a, 6]) his leadership qualities were also recognized. This meant that he headed the "British Help Committee" in the Wünsdorf camp, and was responsible for the welfare of large numbers of men from the British colonies, including Indian soldiers on whose behalf he was constantly brokering for additional clothing and other necessities such as curry powder from assistance agencies (e.g. Grant 1918a). His letters also chronicle literary interests including the poetry of Australians Adam Lindsay Gordon and Henry Lawson, and the work of Robert Louis Stevenson (e.g. Grant 1918b). RPPC anthropologist Leonhard Adam, who often met Grant during the course of his work at Wünsdorf, describes a confident and bookish man who had read the classic Australian anthropology texts of Spencer and Gillen, and had a love for the literature of the English satirist Jerome K. Jerome (Thompson and Hungerford 1957, 11-12). Clearly, Grant was an intelligent man, and given his enjoyment of Jerome we can imagine a man with a sense of humour that was honed to the absurdities of social etiquette and society (see Jerome's classic novels *Idle Thoughts of an Idle Fellow* (1886) and *Three Men in a Boat* (1889)).

The Terms of Peace

As the war drew to an end, it became clear that Ludwig Justi's plan to construct an Imperial War Museum would never be realized. Over the following years, Marcuse nevertheless found several opportunities to exhibit his busts and statuettes publicly. Critics' responses to these exhibitions indicate that they perceived Marcuse's artworks as depicting "types" rather than individuals, and as serving a primarily anthropological purpose. In 1919, for example, the entire collection was displayed in the *Künstlerhaus St. Lukas*, a building complex in Berlin's Charlottenburg district containing accommodation and studios for artists (Bezirksamt Charlottenburg-Wilmersdorf von Berlin 2017). The art historian Max Osborn (1919, 282-285), reviewing this exhibition of "ethnic types", emphasized the "unique opportunity" offered by POW camps: "typical figures were present *en masse*, from representatives of the oldest cultures to descendants of savage tribes ... Germany resembled an enormous anthropological garden ... science had only to choose". He described Marcuse's sculptures as serving primarily a "factual, documentary purpose", preserving "authentic evidence" of "the magically colourful mixture of peoples" for future generations. "Meticulous depiction of reality was the highest priority", and Osborn could "easily understand that scientific institutions in various parts of Germany [had] already obtained casts" of Marcuse's busts, though he also believed that the sculptures had an "aesthetic impact" which would not have been achieved by taking plaster casts of prisoners' faces directly.

Almost a decade later, in July/August 1928, the bronzes from Marcuse's collection were exhibited at the Olympia centre in London as part of the Daily Telegraph Exhibition of Antiques and Works of Art. While the exhibition catalogue described them simply as "[o]riginal modern bronzes" (Anon. 1928a, 228), art critic Herbert Furst (1928, 172-173) asserted that Marcuse had "specialized in what one may perhaps call ethnographical sculpture, mainly through the stimulus

of the war, which brought him in contact with the most varied types and races of humanity”. He praised Marcuse for his “accurate and penetrating eye for racial and national characteristics”, and suggested that “the National History Museum in South Kensington ought to acquire a set of these heads, which are of exceptional interest from the educational point of view and quite apart from their more purely aesthetic merits”.

With the rise of the Nazis in the 1920s, culminating in Adolf Hitler’s appointment as German Chancellor in 1933, it is understatement to say that it was not a good time to be a Jewish artist. Thus, on 30 October 1936, at the age of fifty-eight, Rudolf Marcuse left Germany for England on board the passenger ship *Europa* (Wesling 2017). With him were some of his busts and statuettes (cf. Thompson and Hungerford 1957, 12), perhaps including his bust of Douglas Grant, but we do not know what became of his family members; no other passenger with the same surname travelled on the *Europa*, and although the passenger list records his marital status as “married”, his first wife Elisabeth Seligsohn (née Schlomer), also a German Jewish sculptor, did not accompany him (Standesamt Berlin-Charlottenburg 1915; Wesling 2017).

The Creative Object: Marcuse’s Sculpture of Grant

After nearly a hundred years in which the existence of the sculpture and its materiality has been debated in various Australian news articles and profiles of Grant, the authors finally saw proof of its existence on the website of the Jewish Museum in Berlin (Fig. 8). Above the descriptor “*Australier*” and additional information describing it as a “Bust portrait of an older man with a broad nose” (*Porträtbüste eines älteren Mannes mit breiter Nase*), we could finally confirm the existence of Marcuse’s sculpture of Douglas Grant. We didn’t yet know if it had survived the mass destructions of the Second World War, or if it had been relegated to a dusty attic and was

unlikely to resurface for generations. But we could confirm that it had once existed, and depicted a man staring grimly ahead.

In his pre-war profile of Marcuse's work, Maximilian Rapsilber (1906-07, 354) described "a lascivious, laughing, wooing, twinkling spirit" peeping from "the modelled, tinted, patinated, gilded eyeballs" of Berlin's new wave of sculpture, but this is not the spirit we see when we look at the bust of Grant completed at the Wünsdorf POW camp. There is a palpable tension in his jaw and in his forehead furrows. There are no pupils in the eyes, as seemed to be Marcuse's style, but the deep depressions beneath the eyes convey exhaustion and sadness. It is cast in bronze, not carved in ebony as conjectured, and is a good likeness, immediately obvious as Douglas Grant.

Several months of detective work ensued. We tracked the sculpture from one art and antiques dealer to the next, until finally we seemed to have struck a clue. A British dealer remembered a "Negro" sculpture similar to the one in our photograph, and the name of the man who had bought it. We contacted this man, and many weeks passed whereby the etiquette concerning the number of emails that can legitimately be sent to a stranger possibly harbouring a lost First World War sculpture was tested. In any case the outcome was a happy one, and the man – a retired accountant named Rupert O'Flynn, who had purchased the sculpture from the London *Olympia Art & Antiques Fair* – was thrilled to hear the story of his sculpture. Somewhere along the line it had become separated from the information describing its provenance, and O'Flynn had been told it was an "African Negro" and had been satisfied with that.

In an interview in December 2016, O'Flynn explained his attraction to the sculpture: "It has got a presence to it and it is big and bold. It's just the sort of thing I like and it has a reality to

it – it’s fantastic!” (Figure 9) These sentiments largely accord with Maximilian Rapsilber’s (1906-07, 354-355) summation of Marcuse’s work as fostering “comfortably homely” feelings of “sensuous delight”, and on seeing the bust first-hand it does have a powerful impact. For the authors though, feelings for the work have to be contextualised with the knowledge of Douglas Grant’s biography, and the evident homesickness of a POW in a wintry camp, far from his homeland.

But the strange happenstance by which this bronzed representation of a wartime encounter had ended up in his own house in a quaint English village, where it stood on a plinth to one side of a large fireplace hearth – with another of Marcuse’s wartime sculptures on the other – was not lost on O’Flynn. “How should I have a German bronze bought in England from an Aborigine? It’s just bizarre for it to end up with me.”

Biographical Endnote

Three years after arriving in England, Rudolf Marcuse remarried in Hampstead. The district’s register of marriages recorded his “condition” as “widower” (General Register Office England [1939] 2015).

Marcuse had permission from the Home Office to work in England as a freelance artist. In January 1940 he wrote to the Ministry of Information seeking to join the war effort in this capacity, stating:

Some days ago I read in the Daily Telegraph that an Artists’ Advisory Committee has been appointed “to draw up a list of artists qualified to record the war at home and abroad”. As I have worked in this direction already during the last war and I am a very known sculptor, German refugee, I would be very pleased if you could use my abilities for your purpose ... I beg to enclose several photos of sculptures which I made during the war and which can be seen in my home in case you are interested (Marcuse 1940).

Within a fortnight, Marcuse received a brief reply from the Institute of Education, returning “the specimens of [his] work” and advising him that his name would be “entered on the list of applicants for employment as official artists” (Institute of Education 1940). But only a few months later, on 3 April 1940, he passed away at Middlesex Hospital, aged sixty-two. His effects in England, amounting to £417, were left to his widow Alice Sara Marcuse, formerly Frankel (née Samter) (Principal Probate Registry [1940] 2015).³

Just as Rudolf Marcuse struggled to find a niche in wartime Britain, so too Douglas Grant struggled in post-war Australia. He explained to a friend that “his colour prevented him from getting permanent work” (Thompson and Hungerford 1957, 13). However, during the 1920s he did manage to give numerous public speeches about his war service, and argue for the rights of women, as well as writing a number of powerful opinion pieces for the press against the brutal treatment of Indigenous Australians, such as evidenced by the Coniston Massacre of 1928 (Anon. 1928b, 4; Grant 1929, 5). Throughout the 1920s Douglas Grant’s biography was also routinely referenced in popular news media as evidencing “Aboriginal intelligence”, which therefore offered proof for the capacity for Aboriginal people to participate in, and be assimilated into, colonial society. In these arguments, described as “proto-assimilationist” by Noah Riseman (2014, 158), Grant’s achievements are often placed beside those of other notable Aboriginal figures such as David Unaipon and James Noble (for example, Anon. 1917, 25; “Undana” 1925, 2; Anon. 1925b, 46).

He then spent almost the entire decade of the 1930s at Callan Park Mental Hospital (previously known as Callan Park Hospital for the Insane) after a mental breakdown in 1931. This episode followed a series of documented problems with alcohol, including an incident in 1925 that led to a charge of assault (Anon. 1925a); his experience of post-war racism (Anon.

1929a); retrenchment from work at the Lithgow Small Arms Factory (Anon. 1929b); the rejection of a potentially major scientific discovery by the Australian Museum (Anon. 1930a); and his failure to be awarded a number of employment opportunities, including at a museum in Canberra and an architect's position at La Perouse (Anon. 1930b). June Madge, a member of the extended Grant family, thought that rejection by a woman may have precipitated Douglas' breakdown (in Murray 2017), and given that Grant was resident in "B Ward" at Callan Park – the ex-servicemen's ward – it is also likely that his war experience had an impact on his mental health.

This decade, however, was perhaps not as grim as one might immediately expect given our notions of early twentieth-century sanatoria. It seems that along with designing and building a replica of the Sydney Harbour Bridge as a memorial to the "fallen" of WW1 that is still standing today (Anon. 1931a), there were sporting activities such as golf and bowls (Anon. 1938) and occasional afternoons drinking in the nearby pubs around the Hospital, much to the annoyance of Grant's nurses.⁴

After leaving Callan Park in 1939, Grant resumed working at the Small Arms Factory in Lithgow (Anon. 1939a) and appeared on the "Digger's session" of local radio station 2LT discussing his service experiences (Anon. 1939b). He returned to live in Sydney with his brother Henry in 1943, and worked a number of jobs, including at a paper factory, before being declared unfit for work in 1949 (Griffiths 2014, 34-36). A former AIF colleague of Grant's, Roy Kinghorne, remembered recognizing him in the Sydney Domain during an ANZAC day march in the late 1940s or early 1950s. Kinghorne recalled trying to persuade Grant to join his fellow comrades in the commemorative march, and Grant apparently replied: "Oh, I'm not wanted

anymore ... I've lived my part. I don't belong. I've lived long enough to see that I don't belong anywhere. They don't want me" (Thompson and Hungerford 1957, 14).

Douglas Grant died a few years later in Sydney's La Perouse in 1951, at the age of about sixty-six.

Conclusion

Both Douglas Grant and Rudolf Marcuse were men born into volatile social and political situations where race and war defined them. Their brief coming-together is indicative of the globalization of colonial power structures in the early twentieth century and foreshadows the vast displacements of people throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. It is also a meeting that illustrates the powerful capacity for a personal, arbitrary and unique encounter to resist simple and deterministic imperatives – such as the development of categorical race typologies, or the service to war propaganda. The sculpture of Grant by Marcuse is a record of encounter that demonstrably represents the coming together of two unique human individuals. That the sculptural object had been separated from its provenance, and therefore disenfranchized from a wartime production context associated with racial science ideologies that have proved devastatingly destructive wherever they have been applied, perhaps speaks more to the vagaries of commerce and object collection than it does to any other consideration. But the fact that this object, purchased nearly a century after its production, has the capacity to enthrall its new owner with its “boldness” and sense of personality, can be read as a testament to the meeting of Marcuse and Grant. We would like to read it as a gesture toward the humanistic impulse as “meeting place”, and to the hopeful possibility of co-existence.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the following individuals and institutions for their assistance with various aspects of our research: Andrea Baumgartner; Inka Bertz, Head of Collections / Curator for Art, Jüdisches Museum Berlin; Claire Brenard, Curator, Art, Department of Collections, Imperial War Museum London; Machteld Dumon, Galerij Victor Werner, Antwerp; Beate Ebelt-Borchert, Zentralarchiv, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin; Silvio Fischer, Museum des Teltow, Wünsdorf; Tony Griffiths; Daniel Kester, “thekesters.net” website owner, Williamsville, NY; Clemens Klöckner, Collections, LETTER Stiftung, Cologne; Richard Lane, former Director, Natural History Museum, London; Rupert O’Flynn, London; Mamu-Ngadjon Elder Ernie Raymont; Wiebke Witzel, Archiv der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin; and two anonymous reviewers for *History and Anthropology*.

References

- Anon. 1877. “‘Police Protection’ in the North.” *Queenslander*, December 8.
- Anon. 1880. “The Way We Civilise.” *Queenslander*, May 1.
- Anon. 1887. “Blacks on the Warpath.” *Cairns Post*, October 8.
- Anon. 1902. *Katalog Grosse Berliner Kunst-Ausstellung 1902*. Berlin, Stuttgart, Leipzig: Union Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Anon. 1916a. “An Aboriginal Soldier.” *Myrtleford Mail and Whorouly Witness*, May 18.
- Anon. 1916b. “Sergt. Douglas Grant. Dark Skin But White Heart.” *Lithgow Mercury*, April 28.
- Anon. 1916c. “Douglas Grant.” *Western Champion*, September 7.
- Anon. 1917. “A Plea for the Australian Aborigines.” *Sydney Mail*, July 11.
- Anon. 1918. “An Australian in Germany.” *Sydney Mail*, March 20.
- Anon. 1925a. “Aborigine assaults Chinese.” *The Argus*, September 19.
- Anon. 1925b. “An Aboriginal Intellectual.” *Observer* (Adelaide), October 10.
- Anon. 1928a. *The Daily Telegraph Exhibition of Antiques and Works of Art. Olympia, July 19 to August 1, 1928. Catalogue*. [London]: n.p.
- Anon. 1928b. “Women’s Influence: As Seen by Digger Douglas Grant.” *Blue Mountain Echo*, December 1928.
- Anon. 1929a. “Colour Line Again.” *Mercury (Hobart)*, June 24.
- Anon. 1929b. “Plea for His Mates by Educated Abo. Dismissed Diggers.” *Labour Daily*, July 7.

- Anon. 1930a. "Clever Abo." *The Scone Advocate*, April 1.
- Anon. 1930b. "Full-Blooded Aborigine Architect Seeks to Benefit His People." *The Register News Pictorial* (Adelaide), September 3.
- Anon. 1931a. "Model of Bridge as War Memorial." *Sydney Morning Herald*, August 5.
- Anon. 1931b. "Lever on Britain: Prisoners Suffer." *Reveille*, December 31.
- Anon. 1938. "P'Matta Bowlers Club Championship." *The Cumberland Argus*, April 14.
- Anon. 1939a. "Doug Grant: Returns to Lithgow." *Lithgow Mercury*, July 10.
- Anon. 1939b. "Diggers' Appreciation: Hopes for the Future." *Lithgow Mercury*, November 13.
- Australian Museum. 1888. *Report of the Trustees for 1887*. Sydney: W.A. Gullick.
- Beaumont, Joan, and Allison Cadzow (eds). 2018. *Serving Our Country: Indigenous Australians, War, Defence and Citizenship*. Sydney: New South Publishing.
- Bertz, Inka. 2014. "Der Erste Weltkrieg in der jüdischen Erinnerung. Kabinettausstellung 3. Juli - 16. November 2014." Film accompanying an exhibition in the Jüdisches Museum Berlin, accessed 13 July 2015. <https://www.jmberlin.de/inka-bertz-kuratorin-fuer-bildende-kunst-ueber-darstellungen-von-kriegsgefangenen>
- Bezirksamt Charlottenburg-Wilmersdorf von Berlin. 2017. "Künstlerhaus St. Lukas." Accessed 19 January 2017. <https://www.berlin.de/ba-charlottenburg-wilmersdorf/verwaltung/aemter/stadtentwicklungsamt/stadtplanung/denkmalchutz/artike/1.295605.php>
- Bilski, Emily D. 1999. "Introduction." In *Berlin Metropolis: Jews and the New Culture, 1890-1918*, edited by Emily D. Bilski, 3-13. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Bolton, G.K. 1982. *Christie Palmerston: Explorer of the Rainforest*. Millaa Millaa: Eacham Historical Society.
- Bottoms, Timothy. 2000. "A History of Cairns – City of the South Pacific 1770–1995." PhD diss., James Cook University.
- Bottoms, Timothy. 2013. *Conspiracy of Silence: Queensland's Frontier Killing Times*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Clark, C.D. 1973. "Aborigines in the First AIF." *Army Journal: A Periodical Review of Military Literature* 286: 21-26.

- Clark, Chris. 1983. "Grant, Douglas (1885–1951)." *Australian Dictionary of Biography*. National Centre of Biography, Australian National University. Accessed 11 July 2017. <http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/grant-douglas-6454/text11049>
- Connor, John. 2002. *The Australian Frontier Wars, 1788-1838*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 2008. *Cinema 1: The Movement Image*. London: Continuum.
- Dening, Greg. 1993. "Adam, Leonhard (1891-1960)." *Australian Dictionary of Biography*. National Centre of Biography, Australian National University. Accessed 22 July 2017. <http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/adam-leonhard-9962/text17651>
- Derrida, Jacques. 1976. *Of Grammatology*. Translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Dixon, Robert M.W. 1972. *The Dyirbal Language of North Queensland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Elon, Amos. 2004. *The Pity of It All: A Portrait of the Jews in Germany 1743-1933*. London: Penguin.
- Evans, Andrew D. 2002. "Capturing Race: Anthropology and Photography in German and Austrian Prisoner-of-War Camps during World War I." In *Colonialist Photography: Imag(in)ing Race and Place*, edited by Eleanor M. Hight and Gary D. Sampson, 226-256. London and New York: Routledge.
- Evans, Andrew D. 2010. *Anthropology at War: World War I and the Science of Race in Germany*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Evans, Raymond. 2004a. "Across the Queensland Frontier." In *Frontier Conflict: The Australian Experience*, edited by Bain Attwood and S.G. Foster, 63-75. Canberra: National Museum of Australia.
- Evans, Raymond. 2004b. "'Plenty Shoot 'Em': The Destruction of Aboriginal Societies along the Queensland Frontier." In *Genocide and Settler Society: Frontier Violence and Stolen Indigenous Children in Australian History*, edited by A. Dirk Moses, 150-173. New York: Berghahn.
- Evans, Raymond. 2006. "Past Imperfect/Present Tense [Review of Attwood, Bain. *Telling the Truth about Aboriginal History* (2005) and *Macquarie Atlas of Indigenous Australia*:"

- Culture and Society Through Space and Time. Arthur, Bill and Morphy, Frances (eds) (2005)].” *Overland* 184: 23-27.
- Evans, Raymond. 2007. *A History of Queensland*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, Raymond, and Robert Ørsted-Jensen. 2014. “‘I Cannot Say the Numbers that Were Killed’: Assessing Violent Mortality on the Queensland Frontier.” Paper presented at “Conflict in History”, The Australian Historical Association 33rd Annual Conference, The University of Queensland, July 7-11. Accessed 23 July 2017.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2467836>
- Friederici, Angelika. 2009. *Nur im Pschorr-Bräu – Friedrichstraße 165*. Vol. 5/2009 = A7 of *Castan’s Panopticum. Ein Medium wird besichtigt*. Berlin: Karl-Robert Schütze, 2008-.
- Friederici, Angelika. 2011. *Völker der Welt auf Castans Bühnen*. Vol. 10/2011 = D3 of *Castan’s Panopticum. Ein Medium wird besichtigt*. Berlin: Karl-Robert Schütze, 2008-.
- Furst, Herbert. 1928. “Art News and Notes.” *Apollo: A Journal of the Arts* 8 (45): 164-176.
- General Register Office England. (1939) 2015. MXG 644264, “Certified Copy of an Entry of Marriage in the Registration District of Hampstead” [Marriage solemnized at the Register Office in the District of Hampstead between Rudolf Israel Marcuse and Alice Sara Frankel formerly Samter, 26 July 1939], issued 14 October 2015.
- Gordon, Harry. (1962) 1965. *The Embarrassing Australian: The Story of an Aboriginal Warrior*. New ed. Melbourne: Lansdowne.
- Grant, Douglas. 1918a. Letter, February 22. MLMSS 2766/Item 1: Douglas Grant Papers, ca. 1918, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney.
- Grant, Douglas. 1918b. Letter, May 5. MLMSS 2766/Item 1: Douglas Grant Papers, ca. 1918, Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, Sydney.
- Grant, Douglas. 1929. “A Call for Justice.” *Sunday Pictorial*, February 3.
- Grant, Lachlan, and Michael Bell (eds). 2018. *For Country, For Nation. An Illustrated History of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Military Service*. Canberra: Australian War Memorial.
- Griffiths, Tony. 2014. *Douglas Grant: Ngadjonji Man, Scotsman, Draughtsman, Digger, Lithgow, RSL & SAF Man*. Terrey Hills: Toptech Engineering.
- Gussone, Martin. 2016. “Architectural Jihad: The ‘Halbmondlager’ Mosque of Wünsdorf as an Instrument of Propaganda.” In *Jihad and Islam in World War I: Studies on the Ottoman*

- Jihad at the Centenary of Snouck Hurgronje's "Holy War Made in Germany"*, edited by Erik-Jan Zürcher, 179-221. Leiden: Leiden University Press.
- Höpp, Gerhard. 1997. *Muslimen in der Mark. Als Kriegsgefangene und Internierte in Wünsdorf und Zossen 1914 – 1924*. Zentrum Moderner Orient, Geisteswissenschaftliche Zentren Berlin e.V. Berlin: Das Arabische Buch.
- Institute of Education. 1940. Letter to Rudolf Marcuse, January 15. Catalogue No. ART/WA2/03/018: Correspondence General, M, Correspondence with Artists, Art and Popular Design Collection, Imperial War Museum London.
- Jones, Heather. 2011. "Imperial Captivities: Colonial Prisoners of War in Germany and the Ottoman Empire, 1914-1918." In *Race, Empire and First World War Writing*, edited by Santanu Das, 175-193. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jüdische Gemeinde zu Berlin. n.d. "Friedhof Groß Hamburger Straße." Accessed 14 November 2018. <http://www.jg-berlin.org/judentum/friedhoefe/grosse-hamburger-strasse.html?page=Catalog.Item>
- Jüdisches Gymnasium Moses Mendelssohn. 2012. "Geschichte der Schule." Accessed 18 November 2015. <http://josberlin.de/top/ueber-uns/geschichte-der-schule/>
- Justi, Ludwig. n.d. "Memoiren." Filmsammlung Nr. 98, Rolle 5, NL Justi, L., Archive of the Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences, Berlin.
- Justi, Ludwig. (1917) 1936. "Das Reichs-Kriegs-Museum." In *Ludwig Justi: Im Dienste der Kunst*, edited by Alfred Hentzen, Paul Ortwin Rave and Ludwig Thormaehlen, 272-291. Breslau: Wilh. Gottl. Korn.
- Lange, Britta. 2010. "AfterMath: Anthropological Data from Prisoner-of-War Camps." In *Doing Anthropology in Wartime and War Zones: World War I and the Cultural Sciences in Europe*, edited by Reinhard Johler, Christian Marchetti and Monique Scheer, 311-335. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag.
- Lange, Britta. 2011. "Das Kapitel »Reichskriegsmuseum«. Plan eines idealen Themenmuseums." In *Ludwig Justi – Kunst und Öffentlichkeit. Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen 2010. Beiheft*, edited by Kristina Kratz-Kessemeier and Tanja Moormann-Schulz, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, 99-105. Berlin: Gebr. Mann.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. 1991. *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*. Translated by Alphonso Lingis. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.

- Loos, Noel. 1982. *Invasion and Resistance: Aboriginal-European Relations on the North Queensland Frontier 1861-1897*. Canberra: Australian National University Press.
- Marcuse, Rudolf. 1919a. *Völkertypen. Eine Sammlung von Kunstblättern in Kupfertiefdruck nach Skulpturen von Rudolf Marcuse*. Leipzig: Gustav Fock. Fully digitised by the Jüdisches Museum Berlin, available from <http://objekte.jmberlin.de/object/jmb-obj-138295>
- Marcuse, Rudolf. 1919b. Letter to "Herr Starck", November 23. FL 39828, Archive of the LETTER Stiftung, Cologne.
- Marcuse, Rudolf. 1940. Letter to Ministry of Information, January 2. Catalogue No. ART/WA2/03/018: Correspondence General, M, Correspondence with Artists, Art and Popular Design Collection, Imperial War Museum London.
- Mendes-Flohr, Paul. 1999. "The Berlin Jew as Cosmopolitan." In *Berlin Metropolis: Jews and the New Culture, 1890-1918*, edited by Emily D. Bilski, 14-31. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Meston, A. 1889. *Report of the Government Scientific Expedition to Bellenden-Ker Range upon the Flora and Fauna of That Part of the Colony*. Brisbane: James C. Beal, Government Printer.
- Mohr, Erna. 1966. "Hagenbeck, Carl Gottfried Wilhelm Heinrich." *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 7: 487-488, accessed 8 September 2015. <http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd118700502.html>
- Morris-Reich, Amos. 2013. "Anthropology, Standardization and Measurement: Rudolf Martin and Anthropometric Photography." *British Journal for the History of Science* 46(3): 487-516.
- Murray, Tom. 2017. "Douglas Grant: The Skin of Others." ABC Radio National Earshot broadcast, August 8. <http://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/earshot/douglas-grant:-the-skin-of-others/8742008>
- Nicol, Emmy. 2001. Vol. 3 of *Rosenthal Kunst- und Zierporzellan 1897-1945*. Wolnzach: Kastner, 2001-04.
- Osborn, Max. 1919. "Rudolf Marcuses Völkertypen aus dem Weltkrieg." *Ost und West. Illustrierte Monatsschrift für das gesamte Judentum* 19 (11/12): 281-286.

- Pannell, Sandra. 2005. *Yamani Country: A Spatial History of the Atherton Tableland, North Queensland*. http://rainforest-crc.jcu.edu.au/publications/yamani_country.htm
- Pegram, Aaron. 2017. "'A Life of Torture and Hell': Australian Prisoners of War on the Western Front and the German Reprisals of 1917." *Sabretache* 58(2): 4-12.
- Poignant, Roslyn. 2004. *Professional Savages: Captive Lives and Western Spectacle*. New Haven and London: University of New South Wales Press.
- Pommeranz, Johannes. 2016. "Das Reichskriegsmuseum. Eine Architekturvision für Berlin." In *Kriegszeit im Nationalmuseum, 1914-1918*, edited by Frank Matthias Kammel and Claudia Selheim, 184-193. Nürnberg: Germanisches Nationalmuseum.
- Principal Probate Registry. (1940) 2015. "Marcuse Rudolf Israel." Calendar of the Grants of Probate and Letters of Administration made in the Probate Registries of the High Court of Justice in England. Retrieved from online database "England & Wales, National Probate Calendar (Index of Wills and Administrations), 1858-1966", maintained by Ancestry.com Operations, Inc. Accessed 29 September 2015.
- Ramsland, John, and Christopher Mooney. (2006) 2012. *Remembering Aboriginal Heroes: Struggle, Identity and the Media*. Melbourne: Brolga.
- Rapsilber, M. 1906-07. "Rudolf Marcuse – Berlin." *Deutsche Kunst und Dekoration. Illustrierte Monatshefte für moderne Malerei, Plastik, Architektur, Wohnungskunst u. künstlerisches Frauen-Arbeiten* 19: 354-359.
- Rapsilber, M. 1909. "Rudolf Marcuse." *Ost und West. Illustrierte Monatsschrift für das gesamte Judentum* 3: 147-154.
- Reichenbach, Herman. 2001. "Tierpark Hagenbeck. Hagenbeck Zoological Park." In Vol. 3 of *Encyclopedia of the World's Zoos*, edited by Catharine E. Bell, 1228-1233. Chicago and London: Fitzroy Dearborn.
- Reynolds, Henry. 1987. *Frontier: Aborigines, Settlers and Land*, 2nd ed. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Reynolds, Henry. 1998. *This Whispering in Our Hearts*. St Leonards: Allen & Unwin.
- Reynolds, Henry. 2001. *An Indelible Stain? The Question of Genocide in Australia's History*. Melbourne: Viking.
- Reynolds, Henry. 2006. *The Other Side of the Frontier: Aboriginal Resistance to the European Invasion of Australia*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.

- Richards, Jonathan. 2005. "‘A Question of Necessity’: The Native Police in Queensland." PhD diss., Griffith University.
- Richards, Jonathan. 2008. *The Secret War: A True History of Queensland’s Native Police*. St Lucia: University of Queensland Press.
- Riseman, Noah. 2014. "Aboriginal Military Service and Assimilation." *Aboriginal History* 38: 155-178. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22459/AH.38.2015>
- Rothfels, Nigel. 2002. *Savages and Beasts: The Birth of the Modern Zoo*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Rupp, Gerhard. 1990. "Gips, Zink und Bronze – Berliner Vervielfältigungsfirmen im 19. Jahrhundert." In *Ethos und Pathos: Die Berliner Bildhauerschule 1786-1914. Beiträge mit Kurzbiographien Berliner Bildhauer*, edited by Peter Bloch, Sibylle Einholz and Jutta von Simson, 337-351. Berlin: Staatliche Museen Preußischer Kulturbesitz.
- Schilling, Wolfgang. 2005. "Rosenthal, Philipp." *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 22: 79-80. Accessed 16 July 2015. <http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd132466325.html>
- Schirmer Medienservice. 2015. "Carl-Hagenbeck Denkmal." *Kulturkarte.de: Hamburgs Kultur-Stadtplan*, accessed 18 November 2015. <http://www.kulturkarte.de/hamburg/13023carlhagenb>
- Standesamt Berlin-Charlottenburg. 1915. "Civil registration of marriage between Rudolf Marcuse and Elisabeth Seligsohn (née Schlomer), 16 Nov. 1915, Charlottenburg, Nr. 552." Heiratsregister der Berliner Standesämter 1874-1920, digitised by Landesarchiv Berlin. Retrieved from online database "Berlin, Germany, Selected Marriages, 1874-1920", maintained by Ancestry.com Operations, Inc. Accessed 29 September 2015.
- Stanley, Peter. 2011. "‘He was Black, he was a White Man, and a Dinkum Aussie’: Race and Empire in Revisiting the Anzac Legend." In *Race, Empire and First World War Writing*, edited by Santanu Das, 213-230. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- State Archives and Records NSW. n.d. Record Series 4998: Medical journals [Callan Park Mental Hospital], Western Sydney Records Centre, Kingswood.
- Stickney, Steve. 2015. "Aboriginal war efforts ignored but now soldiers such as Douglas Grant are getting the recognition they deserve." *Inner West Courier*, 24 April. Accessed 23 July 2017. <http://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/newslocal/inner-west/aboriginal-war-efforts->

ignored-but-now-soldiers-such-as-douglas-grant-are-getting-the-recognition-they-deserve/news-story/22a85bb5723197ae837e4c0eb35cfece

- Stiehl, O. 1916. *Unsere Feinde. 96 Charakterköpfe aus deutschen Kriegsgefangenenlagern*. Stuttgart: Julius Hoffmann. Fully digitised by the Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen, available from <http://idb.ub.uni-tuebingen.de/diglit/Ae1003>
- Thompson, John, and Brian Hungerford. 1957. "The Story of Douglas Grant." ABC Radio Feature Script, Box c21, NAA: SP1297/2, National Archives of Australia, Canberra.
- Ubach, Ernst, Ernst Rackow, Georg Kampffmeyer, Hans Stumme, and Leonhard Adam. 1923. *Quellen zur ethnologischen Rechtsforschung von Nordafrika, Asien und Australien: Eigene Angaben und Schilderungen von Eingeborenen, systematisch aufgenommen in deutschen Kriegsgefangenenlagern*. Stuttgart: F. Enke.
- "Undana". 1925. "Diary of a Man About Town: Aboriginals of Note." *The Mail* (Adelaide), October 31.
- Virchow, [Rudolf]. 1880. "Eskimos von Labrador." *Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte* 12: 253-274, Plate XIV.
- Wesling, Karl. 2017. "Bremer Passagierlisten" database. A joint project of Die MAUS Gesellschaft für Familienforschung e.V. Bremen, Staatsarchiv Bremen and Handelskammer Bremen. Accessed 22 July 2017. <http://www.bremer-passagierlisten.de>
- White, Thomas A. 1924. *The History of the Thirteenth Battalion, A.I.F.* Sydney: 13th Battalion, A.I.F. Committee.
- Winegard, Timothy C. 2012. *Indigenous Peoples of the British Dominions and the First World War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wright, Tom. 2015. *Black Diggers*. South Brisbane: Playlab. First produced by Queensland Theatre Company and Sydney Festival, and presented by Sydney Festival in association with The Balnaves Foundation, premiering at the Sydney Opera House on 18 January 2014.
- Ziegler, Susanne. 2003. "'Voices from the Past'. Caucasian Polyphony in Historical Sound Recordings From the Berlin Phonogram Archive." In *The First International Symposium on Traditional Polyphony Proceedings*, edited by Rusudan Tsurtsunia and Joseph Jordania, 521-546. Tbilisi: International Research Center for Traditional Polyphony of Tbilisi State Conservatoire.

Zimmerman, Andrew. 2001. *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Figure Captions

Figure 1. “Master of sculpture. Rudolf Marcuse.” Promotional flyer, December 1911. Zentralarchiv, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz (hereafter SMB-ZA), Berlin, V./Slg. Künstler, Marcuse, Rudolf. Reproduction courtesy SMB-ZA.

Figure 2. Memorial to Carl Hagenbeck, designed by Rudolf Marcuse. Hagenbeck Zoological Park, Hamburg, 29 November 2016. Photograph courtesy Tom Murray.

Figure 3. Douglas Grant with his adoptive family, c. 1896. National Archives of Australia (hereafter NAA), Canberra, SP1011/1, 2176. Reproduction courtesy NAA.

Figure 4. Douglas Grant in uniform, 1916. NAA, Canberra, SP1011/1, 2176/1. Reproduction courtesy NAA.

Figure 5. Postcard of Wünsdorf camp, showing Germany’s first mosque. Reproduction courtesy Museum des Teltow, Zossen.

Figure 6. Photograph of Douglas Grant by Otto Stiehl, Wünsdorf/Zossen, Germany, 1917. Reproduction courtesy Museum Europäischer Kulturen, Berlin.

Figure 7. “Imperial War Museum. Ground Floor.” (Note section *Gefangenenwesen*, “Wartime Imprisonment”, immediately right of centre.) Architectural plan. Justi ([1917] 1936, facing page 284). Reproduction courtesy Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nuremberg.

Figure 8. “Aboriginal Australian.” Photogravure on paperboard. Marcuse (1919a, n.p.). Reproduction courtesy Jüdisches Museum Berlin.

Figure 9. Rupert O’Flynn with Rudolf Marcuse’s bronze bust of Douglas Grant, December 2016. Photograph courtesy Tom Murray.

¹ Unless otherwise specified, all translations from German are by Hilary Howes.

² In addition to the Wünsdorf camp, discussed in more detail below, other POW camps utilized for anthropological research included the Sielow camp near Cottbus, south-east of Berlin (utilized by Marcuse, as discussed below); the Theresienstadt and Reichenberg camps, both located in the present-day Czech Republic, and the Hart bei Amstetten camp in Lower Austria (utilized by Rudolf Pösch); and the Darmstadt, Erfurt, Groß-Breesen and Ohrdruf camps, all in present-day Germany (utilized by Egon von Eickstedt) (Lange 2010).

³ An “Alice Fraenkel”, presumably the same woman, is listed immediately above Marcuse on the Europa’s passenger list of 30 October 1936 (Wesling 2017). Possibly the two met on board ship; alternatively, they may have emigrated as unmarried partners (though both were listed as “married”) or as spouses whose marriage was not recognised under British law.

⁴ Grant’s typewritten doctor’s reports from Callan Park Medical Records are annotated with handwritten comments from nursing staff such as ‘should not have leave – ALCOHOLIC’ and ‘no more leave ever’. Record Series 4998: Medical journals [Callan Park Mental Hospital], State Archives and Records NSW, Western Sydney Records Centre, Kingswood.