
AHR Roundtable
The Weight of Words:
Writing about Race in the United States and Europe

MANFRED BERG, PAUL SCHOR, and ISABEL SOTO

IN 1993, THE HISTORIANS' GROUP IN the European Association for American Studies held a meeting at the Roosevelt Studies Center in Middelburg, the Netherlands. David Thelen, then editor of the *Journal of American History*, attended this meeting to beat the drum for his commendable project of internationalizing the study of American history by forging closer ties between the Organization of American Historians (OAH) and non-U.S. scholars, especially those in non-English-speaking countries.¹ In order to gather more information on the European group, Thelen distributed an OAH questionnaire. However, when the Europeans took a look at the form, some of them voiced their outrage that the OAH was asking not only for their names, affiliations, and fields of specialization, but also for their race. What did this mean? Perhaps the OAH was asking for "Aryan certificates," one colleague snapped, referring to the infamous racial classifications of Nazi Germany. Poor Dave had a hard time explaining that, quite to the contrary, inserting the box on race mirrored the OAH's respect for and commitment to the diversity of its membership. Still, the apprehension among some participants did not go away completely.²

The confusion surrounding the OAH questionnaire reveals something that those of us in the business of critical reading and intellectual history take for granted: meaning is unstable and contingent. Despite our shared academic usage of English, the term "race" may trigger very different associations among Americans and Europeans, although there is a seemingly simple and phonetically similar translation in so many European languages (*ras* in Dutch and Swedish, *race* in Danish, *rasă* in Romanian, *razza* in Italian, *rasa* in Polish). Those seeking to internationalize the writing of U.S. history often focus on the question of languages and translation (including a critical push by some multilingual historians in the U.S. for their colleagues to learn more languages). As the example of race shows, however, the issue of language is a matter not of mere translation of words, but of meanings. Words are shaped by specific historical and cultural contexts.

¹ Organization of American Historians, "The La Pietra Report: A Report to the Profession," <http://www.oah.org/about/reports/reports-statements/the-lapietra-report-a-report-to-the-profession/>.

² This account is based on Manfred Berg's personal recollections of the meeting.

SOME OF THE DIFFICULTIES OF CONCEPTUALIZING and expressing ideas across different national contexts can be explored by focusing on the conflicting usage of race by historians in the United States and in Europe. That the question of translating ideas is not one of language alone is shown by the fact that the meaning of race differs from the U.S. usage even for British and Irish historians. In mid-twentieth-century Britain, the word “coloured,” imported from the United States, referred to recent non-white Commonwealth immigrants. Thus Black Power in Britain (in contrast to the U.S.) easily incorporated Indian and Pakistani workers’ groups. Indeed, some Indians who moved there from the United States complained that racism was worse in Britain, because they had not been considered black in the U.S.³

Germany, France, and Spain have had complex national histories of grappling with race that also share some common traits. In Continental Europe, the word “race” seems to maintain an unbreakable tie to the history of racism in the West, and thus race as an analytical tool to describe American society (or other societies) remains problematic. Given the centrality of race in recent American historiography, this puts European scholars of the United States in an odd position. Beyond the apparent consensus that Americans as well as Europeans claim to use a deconstructed notion of race, the historical experience of the respective countries in which the term is used deeply informs its meaning. What kind of history of race in the United States does a German historian write when, in post-Holocaust Germany, *Rasse* conveys very different meanings and political connotations? And how is that same history of race approached by a Spanish scholar of American studies in a context where the term *raza* currently looks to Anglo-American as well as national meanings or referents? In France, where the state prides itself on refusing to make distinctions among citizens, the use of the concept of race regularly summons reference to Vichy France, the exceptional period when race had legal force in metropolitan France.

The discussion has been made even more complex for historians who spend most of their time reading U.S. scholars by the ubiquitous reference to race as if it did not have a particular national history in the United States: the use of race in American scholarship often appears not merely normal but also normative. This means that European historians of the United States, even those who tend to adopt the research objectives and language of their U.S. counterparts, can find themselves in a dilemma—at odds with their countrymen working on other regions as much as they feel the distance between themselves and their American colleagues. Conversely, U.S. colleagues working on foreign countries also act, unwittingly, as transmitters of American meanings of key concepts such as race.

The 2010 Convention of German Historians in Berlin featured a panel on “‘Humanitarian Development’ and Racism in Sub-Saharan Africa, 1920–1990.” Presenters could give their papers in German or in English. One German title in this session was “‘Rasse’ und Rassismus in den ‘Humanitären Entwicklungsgesellschaften’ in Tansania, Togo und Kamerun, 1920–1970,” whereas the title of a paper delivered

³ W. W. Daniel, *Racial Discrimination in England: Based on the PEP Report* (London, 1968), 48; Stephen Tuck, “From Greensboro to Notting Hill: The Sit-Ins in England,” in Iwan Morgan and Philip Davies, eds., *From Sit-Ins to SNCC: The Student Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s* (Gainesville, Fla., 2012), 153–170.

by an American historian was “Medical Aid as a Subject of Cold War History: Development, Race, and the Global Cold War.”⁴ The fact that the German historian put the term *Rasse* in quotation marks while his American colleague saw no reason to do the same with the word “race” highlights a major problem for German and more generally European scholars who work on race and racism. Unlike the word “race” in U.S. usage, the German *Rasse* has not made the semantic transition from a biological to a social and cultural category. Hence German historians, who of course subscribe to the idea that the concept of race is a social and cultural construction, are often ill at ease employing the term *Rasse* and put it in quotation marks.

The obvious explanation for this peculiarity is that Nazi genocidal racism has discredited the German word *Rasse* almost beyond redemption. For many years after World War II, German historians not only avoided the term but also shied away from employing race as an analytical category. Unlike class, race supposedly had no relevance for understanding social reality but merely reflected a misconceived ideology epitomized by Nazi fabrications such as the “Aryan master race” and the “Jewish race.” The self-image of postwar German society as racially and ethnically homogeneous reinforced this perspective. The term *Rasse* remained ideologically tainted as a marker of the Nazi past, while race as a social category allegedly had no bearing on German life. Racial problems, it seemed, occurred only in other societies, most notably the United States.

The same can be said about French historical writing. To make the matter even more confusing, the word is spelled the same way in French as in English. The usage is quite different, however, and it is common for French authors either to use quotation marks around the term or to include a disclaimer that “race does not exist.”⁵ The French colonial past, the reference to Vichy France and its official categorization of Jews as a race, and the fact that France is still grappling with this history of oppression of racialized others makes a neutral use of race difficult. Moreover, because the social scientific discourse on race is perceived not only as foreign but as American, those who argue in favor of the use of race as an analytical tool risk admitting a Trojan horse of concepts that carry with them the weight of a racialized view of the world embedded in the U.S. experience of slavery, segregation, and discrimination.⁶

The Spanish case has certain specificities, but also certain parallels with the German and French examples. The myth of racial homogeneity, for example, can be traced to the nineteenth century and the Franco period, with some scholars linking Spanish racial thought to a concept of “fusion” of Spain’s many cultural and regional groups.⁷ In a way that can be observed in other European countries, and in stark

⁴ “Über Grenzen,” 48th Deutscher Historikertag, September 28–October 1, 2010, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin. The presenters were Hubertus Büschel and Young Sun Hong, respectively.

⁵ See, for example, Paul Schor, “Liste des abréviations et note sur l’usage des termes,” in Schor, *Compter et classer: Histoire des recensements américains* (Paris, 2009), 7–8, here 8, explaining why the author chose to omit quotation marks when referring to terms used in context by historical actors and to keep some racial terms in English.

⁶ Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc Wacquant, “Sur les ruses de la raison impérialiste,” *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 121 (March 1998): 109–118.

⁷ Joshua Goode, *Impurity of Blood: Defining Race in Spain, 1870–1930* (Baton Rouge, La., 2009), chap. 1. Others qualify this, arguing that “under Franco lip-service was paid to the idea of cultural heterogeneity,” while the regime actually promoted “a unifying concept of nationalism” that “gloss[ed]

contrast to what happened in the United States, race was long used to construct a unifying notion of a Spanish *raza*, not as a category that broke down the population into irreducibly different groups.⁸ Indeed, the concept of *raza* is loaded with a plurisecular history of racial construction, against the Moors and the Jews first, and then in the context of the New World empire, on terms somewhat different from those of the English-speaking world, but also with the importation of scientific racism and of the influence of Nazi ideas during the Franco years. More recently, however, especially in academic circles, *raza* and derived terms such as *racial*, *racismo*, and *racista* tend to closely follow American English usage.

National histories of racism, discrimination, oppression, and murder in the name of racial superiority are also heavily freighted in Germany and France. The legacy of antisemitism and colonialism has made it difficult for French and German scholars to write about race as a social and cultural force in American history. Although German historians of the United States are not alone in grappling with this problem—specialists in German colonialism and Nazi racism cope with similar difficulties—they face the additional burden of translating the vocabulary of American race relations for their German non-specialist readers. In contrast to the narrow biological connotation of *Rasse*, American usage of the term “race,” both academic and popular, covers a vast semantic field and a broad spectrum of normative implications that are hard to convey in a German text. What is perhaps most puzzling for non-academic German readers is the willingness of many African Americans to embrace the term as the signifier of a collective identity based on skin color, history, culture, and life experience. For example, literal translation of terms such as “race man” and “race pride” into German would evoke suspicions of racism rather than be interpreted as connoting collective identity. In Germany, the term “race” is never used in connection with immigration from Africa and Muslim countries because branding immigrants as a race would be racist. The use of *Rasse* as an ascriptive term is simply unacceptable.

In the early post–World War II decades, the few German historians who wrote on U.S. history largely ignored race as a topic. Textbook authors typically devoted a few pages to the “race question” and translated the American terminology into German, including the now-abandoned words “Negro” (*Neger*) and “colored” (*Farbige*).⁹ Similarly, in France, readers would not object to mentions of racial tensions, or even racial differences, in the United States, but they would be uncomfortable if such language were used when discussing French history—an uneasiness that cannot be dismissed simply as denial. In both countries, authors seemed to assume race to

over the country’s non-European ethnic and racial traditions.” Isabel Santaolalla, “Ethnic and Racial Configurations in Contemporary Spanish Culture,” in Jo Labanyi, ed., *Constructing Identity in Contemporary Spain* (Oxford, 2000), 55–71, here 55.

⁸ The term is not, though, really comparable with “ethnicity” or “nationality.” Rather, it retains its association with lineage and purity of stock.

⁹ See, for example, Erich Angermann, *Die Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika seit 1917* (Munich, 1966). Curiously, the terms *Neger* and *Farbige* continued to be used in subsequent editions. See also Udo Sauter, *Geschichte der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika* (Stuttgart, 1975), 230–233; Hans R. Guggisberg, *Geschichte der USA* (Stuttgart, 1975), 281–282. The late Hans Guggisberg was a Swiss historian, but his usage of terms such as *Rasse*, *Neger*, and *Farbige* did not differ from that of German historians.

be a biological—or at least an essentialist—category, but made sure their readers understood that racial difference did not justify social and legal discrimination.

A generation later, the global coverage of the U.S. civil rights movement prompted a change. In Germany, writers became more sensitive about terminology. The introduction to Bernd Rüter's 1973 book *Rassenbeziehungen in den USA* (*Race Relations in the USA*) informed the reader that names such as *Neger* and *Farbige* had become contested, and that “Afro-American” and “black American” were now more respectable. Curiously, the author, though highly critical of American racism, also considered it necessary to point out that “only a minuscule fraction of the 23 million black Americans are of pure black race [*reinrassig schwarz*]”—a good example of how German authors who tried to distance themselves from both German and American traditions of racism could nevertheless fall into the trap of a tainted and cumbersome vocabulary.¹⁰

As younger scholars began to publish their work in English in the 1980s, they ostensibly avoided the problems of translating the American discourse of race into German. However, as teachers and public intellectuals, historians have an obligation to write for their domestic readers. This challenge goes beyond the terms “race” and *Rasse* and includes the need to provide the larger historical context of American race relations. For example, in the German version of his book *The Ticket to Freedom*, on the NAACP's struggle for black voting rights, Manfred Berg added a separate chapter on the political system of white supremacy, which he subsequently dropped from the American edition.¹¹ When writing in German, historians typically clarify their terminology in the introductions to their books, explaining why *Neger* and *Farbige* are no longer acceptable, and why “race” cannot simply be translated as *Rasse*. Indeed, some authors refuse to translate key terms such as “race,” “African American,” and “black community” at all, because there is supposedly no acceptable German translation for them.¹² From a stylistic point of view, this approach is not convincing because it tends to create an annoying linguistic mishmash. Meanwhile, German textbook surveys of American history devote more attention to race as a topic than their predecessors, but they also conspicuously shun the term *Rasse*—or put it in quotation marks to indicate that they consider race a social construction. Where the quotation marks are missing, *Rasse* stands as a descriptive synonym for skin color.¹³ Instead, the term *Afroamerikaner* (Afro-American) is widely used, and

¹⁰ Bernd Rüter, *Rassenbeziehungen in den USA* (Darmstadt, 1973), 10–11, 18–19. The following sentence explains this “miscegenation” by castigating the sexual exploitation of black slave women by their white masters.

¹¹ Manfred Berg, *The Ticket to Freedom: Die NAACP und das Wahlrecht der Afro-Amerikaner* (Frankfurt, 2000), 31–57; *The Ticket to Freedom: The NAACP and the Struggle for Black Political Integration* (Gainesville, Fla., 2005).

¹² Britta Waldschmidt-Nelson, *From Protest to Politics: Schwarze Frauen in der Bürgerrechtsbewegung und im Kongreß der Vereinigten Staaten* (Frankfurt, 1998), 19–24, 30–33; Norbert Finzsch, James O. Horton, and Lois E. Horton, *Von Benin nach Baltimore: Die Geschichte der African Americans* (Hamburg, 1999), 11–14. The book was co-authored in English by one German and two American historians but was translated into German by Norbert Finzsch.

¹³ See Jürgen Heideking, *Geschichte der USA* (Tübingen, 1996), 214, 400; Philipp Gassert, Mark Häberlein, and Michael Wala, *Kleine Geschichte der USA* (Stuttgart, 2007); Volker Depkat, *Geschichte Nordamerikas* (Cologne, 2008), 165–166, 252–254; Willi Paul Adams, *Die USA vor 1900* (Munich, 2000); Adams, *Die USA im 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 2000).

Schwarze (blacks) or *schwarze Amerikaner* (black American) is also common.¹⁴ American historians who work on Germany, by contrast, often use the term “race” as it is used in the American context, such as Heide Fehrenbach in her book *Race after Hitler*, on children fathered by black GIs during the Occupation period.¹⁵

In France, by contrast, it is not problematic to write about racial discrimination or even racial tensions, because it refers to a political situation, yet describing groups as races remains awkward. It still seems easier to use the adjective “racial” than the noun “race,” as if the adjective did not carry the same weight. Although most French historians who use the term nowadays do so in a social constructivist framework, the reception of their work takes place in the midst of polemics and debates over the use of racial categories and racial statistics.¹⁶ More generally, in France the generic term “origin” tends to be used rather than “race.” Politicians routinely state that race does not exist, and use a euphemism to refer to what outsiders might call postcolonial subjects: *issus de l’immigration*.¹⁷ Similarly, in academic discourse, the dominant approach in France has been to construct diversity in terms of immigration. Overall, the lexical use in France is complex, ambiguous, and shifting.¹⁸ Meanwhile, in all three countries the constitution (or in Germany’s case, the Basic Law) uses the word “race” to ban distinctions based on race.¹⁹

In contrast to France and Germany, in Spain the term *raza* can be closer to that found in American English, although it continues to be used in specific non-U.S. ways. In a discussion of “race” within a Western framework, Spain occupies a somewhat unusual position, having been historically and routinely excised from the nar-

¹⁴ Recently a public debate has also begun in Germany about whether racist terms such as *Neger* (Negro) should be discontinued in new editions of children’s books. For example, German editions of Astrid Lindgren’s *Pippi Langstrumpf* have substituted the term “South Sea King” for “Negro King.” “Die kleine Hexenjagd,” *Die Zeit*, January 17, 2013, 17–19, <http://www.zeit.de/2013/04/Kinderbuch-Sprache-Politisch-Korrekt>.

¹⁵ Heide Fehrenbach, *Race after Hitler: Black Occupation Children in Postwar Germany and America* (Princeton, N.J., 2005).

¹⁶ For opposite perspectives on the use of race and racial categories and statistics in France, see Alain Blum, “Resistance to Identity Categorization in France,” in David I. Kertzer and Dominique Arel, eds., *Census and Identity: The Politics of Race, Ethnicity, and Language in National Censuses* (Cambridge, 2002), 121–147; and Didier Fassin and Eric Fassin, eds., *De la question sociale à la question raciale? Représenter la société française* (Paris, 2006).

¹⁷ French Antilleans object to this term, though, reminding people that Guadeloupe and Martinique have been French for a much longer period than Corsica, Savoy, or the French Riviera.

¹⁸ French historians of other regions tend to see race not as a social structure or an attribute of people but as an ideology of oppression. In other words, race is always connected to racialization and racism. An example is Pap Ndiaye, *La condition noire: Essai sur une minorité française* (Paris, 2008), which describes blacks in France as people who are treated or perceived as black. Ndiaye was trained as an Americanist, and the book is full of references to U.S. scholars of race; he attempts to lay a foundation for black studies in France, but he is clearly in the social constructivist perspective.

¹⁹ See Simone Bonnafous, Bernard Herszberg, and Jean-Jacques Israel, “Le mot *race* est-il de trop dans la Constitution française? Une controverse,” *Mots* 33 (December 1992): 5–8. The inclusion of the word “race” in the constitution is controversial in France. The French député (member of the National Assembly) who introduced the proposal in 2008 (it did not pass) is a socialist lawmaker from the French Antilles, strongly supported by Christiane Taubira (from Guyana), who sponsored the 2002 law that made slavery a crime. Taubira is now the minister of justice. As a candidate, François Hollande promised to remove the word “race” from the French constitution. In sum, elected politicians from “visible minorities” in France generally support color-blind laws, as either they come from the Antilles, where legal equality (and color-blindness) has been central to their history, or they are from North Africa and are uncomfortable with the concept of race, for fear of racialization that would make them second-class citizens. The use of “race” is historically and strongly connected to deprivation of rights.

native of modernity, or at most constructed as a secondary player.²⁰ A critical part of that narrative should be the account of the Black Atlantic and its massive implications for the construction and performance of race. Rather, the othering of Spain and its attendant racialization and relegation to a negative exceptionalist paradigm have led not only to its excision from (Anglo-American) discussions of modernity, but, further, to the occlusion of its foundational role in the construction of racial identity or race-making, dating at least from the expulsion of the Moors and Jews, and its participation in the early Atlantic slave trade.²¹ Such discussions that have occupied recent scholarship on racial discourse in Spain remain for the most part beyond the purview of scholars in American studies.²²

Thus, acknowledging the past usage of *raza* within Spain restores its historical participation in the practice and making of “race.” The irony of Anglo-American neglect of the Spanish construction of race is that many racial terms used in the United States are borrowed from Spanish (e.g., “mulatto,” “mestizo,” and indeed “Negro”). In Spain, *raza* is probably most frequently used in conjunction with *humana*, even if its unqualified use is retained in specific academic contexts to address, for example, the Franco dictatorship’s obsession with differentiating Spain from internal and external others as expressed in its exaltation of *la raza*.²³ (To underscore the problem of transferring words across borders, in the United States “la raza” is an activist term in U.S. ethnic studies and Latino/a advocacy—and also the name of “the largest national Hispanic advocacy organization in the United States.”)²⁴

Despite a renewed interest in our countries in questions of race, fueled by references to the American experience but also by a new reading of European national histories in a global context, the stigma attached to the concept of race remains. The dominant strategy of German historians has been to avoid the term *Rasse* and

²⁰ Irene Silverblatt, “The Black Legend and Global Conspiracies: Spain, the Inquisition, and the Emerging Modern World,” in Margaret R. Greer, Walter D. Mignolo, and Maureen Quilligan, eds., *Rereading the Black Legend: The Discourses of Religious and Racial Difference in the Renaissance Empires* (Chicago, 2007), 99–116, here 99.

²¹ Already in the sixteenth century, during which the Black Legend emerged, Spain was being described Anglocentrically as “of all nations under heaven [. . .] the most mingled, most uncertayne and most bastardly.” Edmund Spenser, quoted in Margo Hendricks and Patricia Parker, “Introduction,” in Hendricks and Parker, eds., *Women, “Race,” and Writing in the Early Modern Period* (London, 1994), 1–16, here 2.

²² Among the most important works on this topic within Spanish and Hispanic studies are Labanyi, *Constructing Identity in Contemporary Spain*; Sebastian Balfour, *Deadly Embrace: Morocco and the Road to the Spanish Civil War* (Oxford, 2002); Magali M. Carrera, *Imagining Identity in Spain: Race, Lineage, and the Colonial Body in Portraiture and Casta Paintings* (Austin, Tex., 2003); T. F. Earle and K. J. P. Lowe, eds., *Black Africans in Renaissance Europe* (Cambridge, 2005); Greer, Mignolo, and Quilligan, *Rereading the Black Legend*; Susan Martin-Márquez, *Disorientations: Spanish Colonialism in Africa and the Performance of Identity* (New Haven, Conn., 2008); and Goode, *Impurity of Blood*.

²³ Franco pseudonymously scripted the 1942 film *Raza*, billed as “La película de España” (“The Film of Spain”) and funded by the Consejo de Hispanidad. Also, since the early twentieth century, Columbus’s first New World landfall has been celebrated in Spain on October 12, first as Día de la Raza and subsequently as Día de la Hispanidad. The dictatorship promoted the former usage, although both names reference the original use of *raza* to denote lineage or an essentialized people. In 1987 the name was changed to Fiesta Nacional de España.

²⁴ See <http://www.nclr.org>. As in the case of Germany, American-based scholars often transfer American terminology to the Spanish setting—sometimes with a view to challenging prevailing assumptions. For example, in *Passing for Spain: Cervantes and the Fictions of Identity* (Urbana, Ill., 2003), Hispanist scholar Barbara Fuchs uses the term “passing” as “a challenge to the strictures of Counter-Reformation orthodoxy” (x).

thereby distance themselves from discredited language and ideas. Nevertheless, this strategy has come at a price, because it deprives them of a short and convenient term to capture a key category of social analysis and forces them to work around it in ways that are often tedious and confusing for non-experts. Because of its insoluble association with Nazi ideology, the very idea of race appears too contaminated for a semantic resurrection, meaning that historians of race will continue to face the challenge of finding suitable translations for uninitiated readers, while at the same time remaining faithful to the discourse of their sources.²⁵ In France, the word *ethnique* has been used in recent years as a somewhat euphemized version of “racial,” but the debate is far from settled and has been complicated (and politicized) by the endorsement of “ethnic statistics” by President Nicolas Sarkozy’s government at the same time that it was pursuing restrictive immigration policies described by many as racist. In contrast to what goes on in the United States, the propensity to use “race” to describe groups is still perceived as a right-wing or far-right inclination.

SOME OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN Europe and the United States have diminished with the rise of American studies departments, where subjects are often taught fully in English, and thus with the use of American terminology (not to mention rising academic interest in the subject of American race). Yet importing a word embedded with such sedimented meaning implies much more than what the idea of translation ordinarily conveys: there is in a sense a worldview that travels with it, invisible to those who are used to the word, but striking to outsiders who see it as politically or ideologically freighted. This appears quite clearly in the Spanish case, where historians of the United States find themselves working under the weight of the history of race in Spain and speaking in the tongue of American academics.

Yet other differences between Europe and the United States still remain. Although we have noted the importance of specific national contexts, the three countries under discussion share a common history of the use of race to create unwanted or excluded others, that is, the historical experience of the racialization of the Jews, through forced conversion and rejection in Spain, and through genocide and persecution in Germany and France. Antisemitism is not absent from American history, but the distinction between ethnicity and race, which is blurry on the other side of the Atlantic, and the tendency to reserve “race” for peoples of color in the United States since 1945 have moved antisemitism out of the debate there. The difference compounds the difficulty in using the word as it is commonly used in American English. It seems that in the foreseeable future, European historians will be more comfortable using “race” to talk about racial tensions in the United States than as a way of describing social groups, and would rather apply it to the United States than to their own countries. As for American historians of the United States, the challenge is not simply to be bilingual, but also to make sense of the conceptual differences that arise when words and concepts travel. One way to do this might be to re-import the concepts after their foreign journey, an easy way of deconstructing and denat-

²⁵ See, e.g., the argument by Jürgen Zimmerer, a historian of German colonialism, in *Deutsche Herrschaft über Afrikaner: Staatlicher Machtanspruch und Wirklichkeit im kolonialen Namibia* (Münster, 2002), xiii.

uralizing not just problematic concepts such as race but American history in general. By engaging further in this international dialogue, American historians in the United States can also gain a clearer view of their national history.

Manfred Berg is the Curt Engelhorn Professor of American History at Heidelberg University, where he has taught since 2005. Previously he taught at the Free University of Berlin and was a Research Fellow (1992–1997) at the German Historical Institute in Washington, D.C. His research interests include the history of the African American civil rights movement, racial discrimination, popular violence, and criminal justice. His major publications include *The Ticket to Freedom: The NAACP and the Struggle for Black Political Integration* (University Press of Florida, 2005); *Popular Justice: A History of Lynching in America* (Ivan R. Dee, 2011); *Racism in the Modern World: Historical Perspectives on Cultural Transfer and Adaptation* (co-edited with Simon Wendt; Berghahn Books, 2011); *Globalizing Lynching History: Vigilantism and Extralegal Punishment from an International Perspective* (co-edited with Simon Wendt; Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); *The U.S. South and Europe: Transatlantic Relations in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (co-edited with Cornelis A. van Minnen; University Press of Kentucky, 2013); and *Geschichte der USA* (Oldenbourg, 2013).

Paul Schor is Associate Professor of History and American Studies at the Université Paris Diderot and specializes in U.S. social history. He is the author of *Compter et classer: Histoire des recensements américains (Counting and Classifying: A History of American Censuses)* (Editions de l'EHESS, 2009; to be published in English in 2015 by Oxford University Press), for which he received the OAH Willi Paul Adams Award in 2011; and numerous articles and book chapters on the history of ethnic and racial relations in the U.S. He has also written about the historiography of U.S. history in France and in Europe and co-authored (with Nicolas Barreyre) *De l'émancipation à la ségrégation: Le Sud des États-Unis après la guerre de Sécession, 1865–1896* (Presses universitaires de France, 2009). His current research focuses on the production and imposition of “American” norms of everyday life on marginal or impoverished populations in the U.S. before World War II, with an emphasis on the role of agents of the state (local and federal).

Isabel Soto is Honorary Research Fellow in the Modern Languages Department of Spain's Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia. She has been a Visiting Scholar at Vassar College and an Honorary Fellow of the Schomburg Center for Black Research and Culture. In 2000 she cofounded the Gateway Press, dedicated to publishing work on liminality and text. In 2008–2009 she was an Associate Fellow of the Rothermere American Institute, University of Oxford. She has taught, lectured, and published widely on Langston Hughes and is currently preparing a monograph on non-Anglophone constructions of the Black Atlantic and race, focusing on Hughes's work. Her most recent publication is *Western Fictions, Black Realities: Meanings of Blackness and Modernities* (co-edited with Violet Showers Johnson; LitVerlag and Michigan State University Press, 2011).