Short Essay

'NEXT TIME WHEN YOU FEEL COMPELLED TO MAKE A CONFESSION, PLEASE, SPEAK FOR YOURSELF ONLY AND NOT FOR ME WITHOUT ASKING ME. I AM NOT A NAZI, DEFINITELY NOT!': A VIGNETTE ON GENDERING GERMAN INTERNMENT IN SECOND WORLD WAR INDIA[1]

Suchintan Das
University of Oxford, Oxford

Introduction

Our story begins at three different locations in 1934. That year, representatives of different countries and delegates of the International Committee of the Red Cross convened at Tokyo to discuss the possibility of drafting an international treaty that would protect civilians during war by regulating the conditions of their possible captivity in enemy or enemy-occupied territory. The concerns that finally brought the high-contracting parties to the discussion-table had been generated by the experiences of the First World War, when belligerents detained those civilians whom they considered 'out of place' and/or 'out of line', en masse.[2] Those very concerns with regard to the detention of combatants had culminated in the drafting and consequent ratification of the *1929 Geneva Convention on Prisoners of War*. A group of jurists and military doctors also met in 1934, at Monaco, to grapple with a similar question of how to treat captive civilians as humanely as possible if and when war broke out. The document that emerged at the end of those deliberations, called the *Monaco Draft*, however, did not gain much traction among the member-states of the then League of Nations.[3] On the other hand, the *Tokyo Draft Convention*, which was a much more official affair, failed to materialise into a legally binding agreement too. The delegates and representatives were scheduled to meet again in 1940

but war broke out between the European 'great powers' before they could. In 1934, two young Germans, Otto Wolff and Hanna Dorr were undergoing training in Protestant Theology under the aegis of the Pomeranian Confessional Synod of Germany. They would both receive their doctorates from the University of Tübingen (Otto before Hanna), marry each other, and travel to India in January 1937. There they would join the Goßner Mission at Ranchi in Bihar, lecturing at the local seminary and teaching at the missionary high school, where Otto would also serve as the principal.[4]

When Neville Chamberlain announced that the British Empire was at war with Germany in September 1939, all German[5] males of military age in India were rounded up and interned as the wartime colonial state swung into prompt action. All German women were forewarned to leave British territory if they could.[6] The assumption behind such a directive was that most German females as unprotected dependents were both 'a risk' and 'at risk' in the eyes of the state. In the absence of any international legal covenant specifying how to deal with 'enemy aliens' who were women, the British Indian Government thought it fit to give them the opportunity to leave the country on their own. However, missionaries like Hanna Wolff, who had submitted undertakings of political neutrality for residing and working in India, had heightened Church responsibilities to tend to in the absence of men.[7] A committee constituted under the chairmanship of senior civil servant Sir Malcolm Darling soon began to make inquiries into the individual cases of the interned men and recommend their continued detention or (un)conditional release.[8] Otto Wolff was let out in November 1939. However, during the summer of 1940, as the 'phoney war' in Europe coalesced into a 'total war' with Hitler's series of *blitzkriegs*, renewed and indiscriminate detention ensued across the British Empire. In India, a paradoxically strict policy of mass-internment was carried out by the government until the very end of the war, notwithstanding concessions granted in the metropole. This meant long-term captivity in camps for most Germans in the subcontinent, including German-Jewish émigrés and stateless displaced persons, women as well as children.[9] Our encounter with Hanna Wolff would also happen in an internment camp mediated by a letter-fragment that has survived in the colonial surveillance archive.

Where are the Women?

Before we undertake that task, though, we need to ask a simple but important question: where are the women in the historiography

of wartime internment?[10] Historically, wars have always had contradictory effects on gender relations and 'total wars' even more so. While the two world wars created many opportunities for women and blurred conventional gender-boundaries, lasting and effective structural changes were few and far between.[11] Yet, studies of women's involvement in the war effort or the effect of war on perceptions of gender typically focus on achievements in spite of barriers but not on the barriers themselves and how warfare buttresses them. Once this pattern is acknowledged, it becomes clear that warfare did intensify gender inequalities and post-war demobilisation could reverse many wartime gains.[12] On the balance, it can be said that the precarity of women tends to increase during armed conflict and in any form of ensuing captivity. This, however, should not be taken to mean that women who find themselves so detained do not actively engage in subversive activities, weaving networks, building alliances, asserting opinions, or even outright defiance – of their interned husbands, and of the (usually) male overlords of the detaining powers who seek to exercise custodial control over them.

During the two World Wars, internment camps held disproportionately more men than women. This is because civilian men were often considered as combatants-in-waiting by the detaining authorities. At the same time, however, these camps were depicted as emasculating spaces (even for captive combatants), where men as 'enemy aliens' experienced a loss of purpose – away from *their* womenfolk and work, and from their regiments and the battlefield.[13] Nevertheless, this was far from the universal civilian-internment experience. Many women too spent time behind barbed wires during the wars and had different stories to tell. While German women in the British Isles largely evaded internment during the First World War owing to their favourable depiction in anti-German propaganda as victims of aggressive and callous German men, a substantial number of them were detained elsewhere in the Empire – in India, Africa, and the Pacific.[14] Contrary to popular belief, however, those women could be and often were deeply implicated in the German nationalist politics of the day and performed their patriotism within the camp in a gendered way.[15] Meanwhile, one of the lasting shifts in perception in surveillance networks and military culture during the inter-war years was the greater and greater acknowledgement of the possibility that women – dissident or alien – could also constitute a security risk for the male-dominated state.

By the time of the Second World War, women's internment had become normalised even further. In the USA, entire families of all those with Japanese ancestry were rounded up regardless of age,

gender, citizenship and political conviction. In spite of facing racism in the camps, second generation (Nisei) Japanese-American women achieved wage-parity with men and became considerably more self-reliant in matters of travel, education and marriage.[16] On the other side of the wartime divide, British women who made up half the population of the Stanley Camp in Japanese-occupied Hong Kong, also acquired a greater measure of personal freedom (as the grasp of traditional gender roles on them loosened) and forged a group-solidarity that cut across class lines under the conditions of enforced communal living in captivity.[17] At the high point of internment in Second World War Britain, some 4000 German women were detained and most of them were taken to the Rushen women's camp in the Isle of Man. As among the male internees, conflict abounded between Nazi and non-Nazi internees (some of whom were even Jewish) there, when forced to share camp-spaces. For many German-speaking refugee women, the whole experience of internment was an affront to their integrity and therefore construed as utterly humiliating.[18] Nonetheless, once the reality of their detention had fully set in, women too made conscious efforts 'to recreate forms of social, political and cultural organisation in captivity.'[19]

The history of German civilians' internment in second World War India has so far been studied in terms of a divergence in refugee policy (Delhi adopting a far stricter stance in matters of immigration and internment than London), the deflation of the supranational status of German Christian missions in India, and the exacerbation of political risk for German multinational corporations in the subcontinent.[20] It is yet to be gendered. Even though interned German men greatly outnumbered interned German women in wartime India, at least 217 were in the camps in August 1940 – the moment of maximum leniency when the colonial government had released as many from internment as it was willing to.[21] Moreover, most German women who remained in India, unlike their counterparts in Britain who underwent detention for a year at the most, were kept behind barbed wires for over five, and in some cases even six years. Sources illuminating their exact numbers and internment experiences are elusive in the colonial archive. But they are not absent. And it is when we pay close attention to them, we can hear what the historian Ranajit Guha has called those "(small) voice(s) of defiant subalternity", with their "undertones of despair and determination…committed to writing (their) own history".[22] The rest of this paper will be dedicated to do precisely this: by eavesdropping on a fragment of a letter that Hanna Wolff had written to her husband Otto on 15th September, 1942.

The Story of a Letter-Fragment

From the summer of 1940, Hanna Wolff was placed under detention in the Central Parole Camp at Hazaribagh, Bihar, along with other German missionary women. Restrictions were placed on their mobility and communication, and a soft discipline of camp-life was also enforced. Her husband Otto was in the Central Internment Camp in Dehra Dun with the other men and thousands of Italian prisoners of war who resided in separate wings.[23] They would not be reunited until late 1942, when both would be sent to the Internment Camp and Parole Centre at Satara in Bombay Presidency. In May 1944, Hanna and Otto would be relocated to the Internment Camp and Parole Centre at Purandhar, also in Bombay Presidency, where they would spend the last two years of captivity together, before being repatriated to Germany in 1946.[24] Both Hanna and Otto were trying to get back together ever since they had been interned separately. Hanna had even unsuccessfully petitioned the colonial government, requesting that her husband be allowed to join her in the parole camp at Hazaribagh.[25] Later that year, when an opportunity arose for separated families to be reunited in two new parole camps at Purandhar and Satara, Otto seized it immediately.

A slippery figure politically, Otto had been a member of the SA[26] in Germany (in his defence he claimed that he was coerced to join it) and also part of the anti-Nazi Confessional Church before coming to India. The Darling Committee, while recommending his release in November 1939, had found him to be a 'non-Nazi' and he had registered as such at the time of his re-internment in the summer of 1940, even though the provincial intelligence department at Ranchi was unconvinced.[27] Later, he would be identified as one of 'the worst of the lot…absolutely Gestapo types' by the Camp Commandant at Satara but would also be praised for his 'exemplary conduct' at Purandhar.[28] Hanna, on the other hand, had a much cleaner track-record. Although initially accused of harbouring a concealed wireless transmitter in the Hazaribagh camp, she was soon found to be above suspicion.[29] What smeared her reputation more permanently, though, was a unilateral act on part of her husband.[30] When asked to choose between Satara (where those classified as Nazis were being sent) and Purandhar (where those who identified as Jews or non-Nazis were going), Otto chose the former. By doing so, he signalled to the camp authorities that he was a Nazi. Moreover, to ensure that his wife would also join him there, he registered Hanna as a Nazi too.[31]

This did not go down well with Hanna. Taking great offence to

this sudden political confession by Otto that adversely implicated her too, she sent off a scathing response, only a fragment of which now survives in the archive, having been intercepted by the Hazaribagh camp censors and quoted in their fortnightly report:

> *I was angry about you and am still. Next time when you feel compelled to make a confession, please, speak for yourself only and not for me without asking me. I am not a Nazi, definitely not! Although I am an ardent German Nationalist. Besides that it would have been sufficient if you call yourself a Nazi in order to go to Satara, although I wonder since when you have become one. This way of acting made me very angry and disappointed. You seem to think that Nationalism is only to be found at Dehra Dun in Wing No. 1. But you can be sure that I shall keep away from this narrow mindedness which may suit Klups, Holland and Geisse etc., but not to me and you also will not convert me to that. I write perhaps a little bitter. I know when we shall meet again all misunderstandings will be removed quickly but you will never get me among these extremists. I have seen too much of their true character and heart.*[32]

This letter-fragment is a remarkable document for several reasons beyond the immediate pungency of the prose. The dominant emotion that becomes the vessel for Hanna's politically charged rejoinder is admittedly that of anger. The reason behind that anger is what she felt and articulated as the unfair appropriation of her agency by her husband – that of voicing her distinct political opinion. Her refusal to espouse her husband's political self-identification is evident from her clear assertion that she is "an ardent German Nationalist" who is most definitely not a Nazi. In this letter-fragment, Hanna is astonished by her husband's new political affiliation and argues that Otto's personal confession would have been sufficient for both of them to go to Satara and he need not have misrepresented her position, which was both unnecessary and inexcusable. She made no secret of her feelings of betrayal and disappointment and also chastised Otto for associating with other "narrow-minded" Nazi internees in Dehra Dun. She claims to know these extremists far too better for her husband to convert her to their cause. Hanna acknowledges that she "writes perhaps a little bitter" and indicates that she is open to the possibility of reconciliation when they meet but not at the cost of her steadfast political conviction. This letter-fragment bears testimony that not only was she challenging the domestic and political wisdom of her husband but also reserving for herself her distinct political will and agency, informed by her own personal experiences and observations before and during captivity.

Hanna's tone throughout this letter is confident, cross, and even somewhat cutting. Her objective seems to be that of setting the

record straight, both with Otto, and with the camp authorities who she knew would have read this letter.[33] There can be no doubt that she was acutely aware of this other potential audience. If we rule out the possibility of this letter being a subterfuge to conceal her actual thoughts, it cannot be interpreted as anything but a sincere attempt to reclaim and reassert her politics in public.[34] Latent in this reclamation, I would argue, was a critique of not merely Otto's *faux* opportunism but that of Nazi machismo in general – of that misogynist ideology which viewed women as no more than mute nationalist wombs.[35] Hanna's voice is significant both because of its unabashed political sensibility and its historical location – coming from someone who had witnessed the rise of the Nazi regime in Germany and faced detention in enemy territory because of her very nationality. She wrote that letter to make a point but ended up doing so much more. She defied the Nazi expectations of her prescribed gender-role, refused to accept that her political individuality could be subsumed under and overridden by her husband's manifest will, and publicly defended her non-Nazi credentials by alluding to her own lived experience and wisdom.

Conclusion

Our story ends here but Hanna's does not. She along with Otto went on to help run the children's school in Satara. There is an oblique reference to her eventually winning Otto over politically in a former internee's recollections. Jürgen Kulp, who was 8 years old when he was interned with his family in Hong Kong in 1939 and had also spent time at Camp Diyatalawa in Ceylon before being transported to India, was taught by Hanna at Hazaribagh, Satara, and Purandhar. He writes:

> *I can still vividly remember the annual public history exam, which the whole camp attended. However, it was an advantage that I had the audience behind me and only had to concentrate on Dr. (Mrs.) Wolff…It wasn't really clear to me why we went to Purandhar back then. The only thing I knew was that the Wolff couple wanted to go there, I guess, from their political attitude. Probably, since my father thought similarly and a continuation of my school education by the Wolff couple was very important to him, we moved along.*[36]

The so called 'non-Nazi camp' was in Purandhar, and the Wolffs' migration there was probably due to Otto's change of heart, yet again, this time under Hanna's influence.[37] They would have two children together, the first (who died an infant) while still in captivity. After being repatriated in 1946, they both taught theology for a couple of

years at Reutlingen, returning to India in 1951 following a brief stint in Bolivia in between.[38] They both wrote books. Otto corresponded with India's first President Dr Rajendra Prasad and was roped into pedagogical and policy work in Bihar and in Benaras. Hanna learnt depth psychology at the Carl Jung Institute in Zurich and practiced psychotherapy in Reichenbach from 1969. She passed away in 2001.

What can a historical inquiry like the one that we have undertaken tell us? First, it can educate us about the occluded presence of women in historiographies where they are far from the usual suspects – such as that of wartime internment. It can establish the need for writing women back into the histories of war in general and foregrounding their gendered experiences of all that warfare had in store for them, including but not limited to temporary and indefinite periods of captivity. Second, it can provoke us to be curious about fragmentary sources – those that seem too brittle and little to be able to tell a coherent story. I do not claim to have told one. There are far too many gaps and assumptions involved. However, by paying close attention to our letter-fragment, I do feel that we have been able to better approximate a "small voice of defiant subalternity" and recover Hanna Wolff's subject-position in a manner that would not have been possible by writing a more conventional account of German civilians' internment in India, otherwise replete mostly with stories and statistics of captive men. Third (and on a more personal note because I have also attempted that more conventional endeavour elsewhere already), inquiries driven by the feminist-informed question 'where are the women?' bring about much-needed lens-corrections that prevent the historian from ever becoming complacent with what they have written. So that when they talk about war and society, women have to be necessarily factored in, sooner rather than later.

Notes

1. This paper was written for the Centre for Gender, Identity and Subjectivity's 'Women and War Workshop' at the University of Oxford on 2 June, 2023.
2. Usually forced migrants of war (including refugees, asylum seekers, and stateless persons) and citizens/subjects of enemy states were deemed 'out of place' whereas groups identified as potentially or actually disloyal within the nation-state or empire (including conscientious objectors, political dissidents, and ethnic minorities) were considered 'out of line'. Both kinds of people were detained when military hostilities broke out. See Rotem Kowner and Iris Rachamimov (eds.), *Out of Line, Out of Place: A Global and Local History of World War I Internments*, New York: Cornell University Press, 2022.
3. See Boyd van Dijk, 'Human Rights in War: On the Entangled Foundations of

the 1949 Geneva Conventions', *American Journal of International Law*, Vol. 112, No. 4, 2018, pp. 563-566.

4. 'Hessian Biography: Wolff, Otto (ID = 15208)' https://www.lagis-hessen.de/pnd/1055487921 (12 May 2023).
5. Including both German nationals and speakers, post-Anschluß Austrians and Sudetan Germans.
6. Provisional Instructions for the Control of Foreigners in War. National Archives of India (NAI), Home Political: NA/1939/NA/F-21-4-39 (PR_000003037630): 'Treatment of Foreigners in War'.
7. Suchintan Das, "'My magic mountain transformed into a military camp surrounded by barbed wire': The Internment of German Civilians in Wartime India (1939-1946)" (MSt dissertation, University of Oxford, 2022), p. 28.
8. Ibid., pp. 18-19.
9. Ibid., pp. 22-25.
10. Cynthia Enloe in her provocative engagement with militarisation as a process has demonstrated how it brings women and war into a mutually affective relationship that is as much material as it is discursive. She remarks that questions such as 'where are the women?' are deceptively simple feminist-informed excavation tools that can help uncover "the ideas, relationships, and policies (that) (unequal) gendered workings rely upon" not even but especially during armed conflict. Cynthia Enloe, *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014, p. 6.
11. Christa Hämmerle, Oswald Überegger and Birgitta Bader Zaar, "Introduction: Women's and Gender History of the First World War – Topics, Concepts, Perspectives", in Christa Hämmerle, Oswald Überegger and Birgitta Bader Zaar (eds), *Gender and the First World War*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014, p. 3.
12. Yasmin Khan, 'Women and War in the British Empire', *War & Society*, Vol. 39, No. 3, 2020, p. 227.
13. Stefan Manz and Panikos Panayi, *Enemies in the Empire: Civilian Internment in the British Empire During the First World* War, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020, p. 18.
14. Ibid., p. 113. Also see Zoë Denness, 'Gender and Germanophobia: The Forgotten Experiences of German Women in Britain, 1914–1919', in Panikos Panayi (ed), *Germans as Minorities during the First World War: A Global Comparative Perspective*, Farnham: Frank Cass, 2014, pp. 71–98.
15. For an account of interned German women's celebration of the Empress' birthday in the Fort Napier women's camp, see Manz and Panayi, *Enemies in the Empire*, pp. 268-269.
16. See Valerie Matsumoto, 'Japanese American Women During World War II', *Frontier: A Journal of Women Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 1, 1984, pp. 6-14. Also see Precious Yamaguchi, *Experiences of Japanese American Women During and After World War II: Living in Internment Camps and Rebuilding Life Afterwards*, Lanham: Lexington Books, 2014, for a generational auto-ethnography foregrounding the wartime experiences of Japanese-American women within and outside camps.
17. See Bernice Archer and Kent Fedorowich, 'The Women of Stanley: internment in Hong Kong 1942-45', *Women's History Review*, Vol. 5, No.3, 1996, pp. 373-399.
18. Miriam Kochan, "Women's Experience of Internment", *Immigrants and Minorities: Historical Studies in Ethnicity, Minority and Diaspora*, Vol. 11, No. 3, 1992, pp. 151-154.

19. Charmian Brinson, '"In the Exile of Internment" or "Von Versuchen, aus einer Not eine Tugend zu machen": German-Speaking Women Interned by the British during the Second World War', in James Jordan and William Niven (eds), *Politics and Culture in Twentieth-Century Germany*, Suffolk: Boydell & Brewer, 2003, p. 63.
20. See Joseph Cronin, 'Framing the Refugee Experience: Reflections on German-Speaking Jews in British India, 1938-1947', *German Historical Institute London Bulletin*, Vol. 41, No. 2, 2019, pp. 45-74; Paul von Tucher, *Nationalism, Case and Crisis in Missions: German Missions in British India, 1939*-1946, Erlangen-Nuremberg: Self-Published, 1980; Christina Lubinski, Valeria Giacomin and Klara Schnitzer, 'Internment as a business challenge: Political risk management and German multinationals in Colonial India (1914-1947)', *Business History*, Vol. 63, No. 1, 2021, pp. 72-97.
21. See table in Das, 'Internment of German Civilians in Wartime India', pp. 23-24.
22. Ranajit Guha, 'The Small Voice of History', in Shahid Amin and Dipesh Chakrabarty (eds), *Subaltern Studies IX: Writings on South Asian History and Society*, Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1996, p. 12.
23. See Bob Moore and Kent Fedorowich, *The British Empire and its Italian Prisoners of War*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002, p. 112.
24. Untitled and undated intelligence report on Otto Wolff. NAI, Home Political: EW 1941/NA/F-24-7-1 (PR_000003013346): 'Personal File of Dr Otto Wolff, German Missionary, now at the Central Internment Camp, Dehra Dun, and Mrs. Wolff (Wife), Restricted to the Parole Centre at Hazaribagh', ff. 18-22.
25. Letter from Hanna Wolff to the Home Secretary, Government of India, through the Superintendent of the Hazaribagh Camp dated March 3, 1942. NAI, Home Political: EW 1941/NA/F-24-7-1, f. 42.
26. Sturmabteilung (Storm Troopers), also known as the 'brown-shirts' for the colour of their uniform, constituted the original paramilitary wing of the NSDAP.
27. Untitled and undated intelligence Report on Otto Wolff. NAI, Home Political: EW 1941/NA/F-24-7-1, ff. 18-22.
28. Ibid., f. 22. Otto Wolff's internee information form with remarks by the Camp Commandant, Purandhar. NAI, Home Political: EW 1941/NA/F-24-7-1, ff. 23-25.
29. Letter from Under-Secretary, Home Department Political (EW) Section to Camp Commandant, Purandhar dated 23 October, 1942. Letter from Camp Commandant, Satara to Under-Secretary, Home Department Political (EW) Section dated 13 November, 1942. NAI, Home Political: EW 1941/NA/F-24-7-1, ff. 47-48 and f. 52. The Colonial Government was particularly anxious about the possibility of German women engaging in espionage from within India. See Das, 'Internment of German Civilians in Wartime India', pp. 28-29.
30. Since this incident, Hanna was also identified as a Nazi along with Otto in official and secret bureaucratic correspondence. Untitled and undated intelligence report on Otto Wolff. NAI, Home Political: EW 1941/NA/F-24-7-1, f. 20.
31. According to a fellow German internee Johannes Stosch, Otto had made this choice specifically to be near his friend and a committed Nazi, Mr. Jellinghaus and his family. See Johannes Stosch, 'Internierung 1939', Gaebler Info und Genealogie blog http://www.gaebler.info/2014/07/stosch (12 May, 2023). Hanna's diatribe against Otto's other friends in the German Wing [no. 1] of

Camp Dehra Dun mentioned in her letter was aimed at precisely these kinds of political influences that, she argued, were clouding Otto's judgement.

32. Letter from Hanna to Otto Wolff dated 15 September, 1942 extracted from the fortnightly report on the Central Parole Camp at Hazaribagh for the fortnight ending on 26 September, 1942. NAI, Home Political: EW 1941/NA/F-24-7-1, f. 53.
33. Mail-censorship was an established practice in internment camps and the internees were made aware of this through the camp manuals. Government of India Home Department, *Civil Internment Manual* (Simla, 1943), pp. 65-66. British Library (BL), IOR/L/PJ/8/30B: August 1943-March 1948; 'Coll 101/10A/I; Treatment of aliens, prisoners of war and civilian internees of India.'
34. The camp authorities were clearly convinced, and this letter-fragment was indeed quoted to establish her non-Nazi credentials. Letter from Camp Commandant, Satara to Under-Secretary, Home Department Political (EW) Section dated 13 November, 1942. NAI, Home Political: EW 1941/NA/F-24-7-1, f. 52.
35. For a nuanced treatment of the misogynist, militant, and mainstream constructions of the image of women in Nazi ideology and how they could be flexible and mutually reinforcing with a possible double appeal, see Leila Rupp, 'Mother of the "Volk": The Image of Women in Nazi Ideology', *Signs*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 1977, pp. 362-379.
36. Jürgen Kulp, 'Internierung in Ceylon und Britisch Indien', Gaebler Info und Genealogie blog http://www.gaebler.info/kulp/index.html#hazaribagh (12 May, 2023).
37. Designations like 'Nazi camp' and 'non-Nazi camp' should not, however, be regarded as unambiguous and infallible. Political misattribution could still be quite rife in these camps and internees were constantly miscategorised and mischaracterised. For example, the Selzers, who were German-speaking stateless Jews and whose children were British citizens by birth, did spend time in the 'Nazi camp' at Satara. See Das, 'Internment of German Civilians in Wartime India', pp. 36-40.
38. 'Hessian Biography: Wolff, Otto'.

References

Primary Sources

BL, IOR/L/PJ/8/30B: August 1943-March 1948; 'Coll 101/10A/I; Treatment of aliens, prisoners of war and civilian internees of India.'

Kulp, Jürgen, 'Internierung in Ceylon und Britisch Indien', Gaebler Info und Genealogie blog, http://www.gaebler.info/kulp/index.html#hazaribagh (12 May, 2023).

Stosch, Johannes, 'Internierung 1939', Gaebler Info und Genealogie blog, http://www.gaebler.info/2014/07/stosch (12 May, 2023).

NAI, Home Political: NA/1939/NA/F-21-4-39 (PR_000003037630): 'Treatment of Foreigners in War'. https://www.abhilekh-patal.in/jspui/handle/123456789/2724907 (12 May, 2023).

NAI, Home Political: EW 1941/NA/F-24-7-1 (PR_000003013346): 'Personal File of Dr Otto Wolff, German Missionary, now at the Central Internment Camp, Dehra Dun, and Mrs. Wolff (Wife), Restricted to the Parole Centre at Hazaribagh'. https://www.abhilekh-patal.in/jspui/handle/123456789/2714143 (12 May, 2023).

Secondary Sources

Archer, Bernice, and Fedorowich, Kent, 'The Women of Stanley: internment in Hong Kong 1942-45', *Women's History Review*, Vol. 5, No. 3, 1996: 373-399.

Brinson, Charmian, '"In the Exile of Internment" or "Von Versuchen, aus einer Not eine Tugend zu machen": German-Speaking Women Interned by the British during the Second World War', in James Jordan and William Niven (eds), *Politics and Culture in Twentieth-Century Germany*, Suffolk: Boydell & Brewer, 2003.

Cronin, Joseph, 'Framing the Refugee Experience: Reflections on German-Speaking Jews in British India, 1938-1947', *German Historical Institute London Bulletin*, Vol. 41, No. 2, November 2019: 45-74.

Das, Suchintan, "'My magic mountain transformed into a military camp surrounded by barbed wire': The Internment of German Civilians in Wartime India (1939-1946)" (MSt dissertation, University of Oxford, 2022)

Denness, Zoë, 'Gender and Germanophobia: The Forgotten Experiences of German Women in Britain, 1914–1919', in Panikos Panayi (ed), *Germans as Minorities during the First World War: A Global Comparative Perspective*, Farnham: Frank Cass, 2014: 71–98.

Enloe, Cynthia, *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014, Second Edition (Completely Revised and Updated).

Guha, Ranajit, 'The Small Voice of History', in Shahid Amin and Dipesh Chakrabarty (eds), *Subaltern Studies IX: Writings on South Asian History and Society*, Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1996: 1-12.

Hämmerle, Christa, Überegger, Oswald and Zaar, Birgitta Bader, 'Introduction: Women's and Gender History of the First World War – Topics, Concepts, Perspectives' in Christa Hämmerle, Oswald Überegger and Birgitta Bader Zaar (eds), *Gender and the First World War,* London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014: 1-15.

'Hessian Biography: Wolff, Otto [ID = 15208]' https://www.lagis-hessen.de/pnd/1055487921 (12 May 2023).

Kochan, Miriam, "Women's Experience of Internment", *Immigrants and Minorities: Historical Studies in Ethnicity, Minority and Diaspora*, Vol. 11, No. 3, 1992: 146-166.

Kowner, Rotem, and Rachamimov, Iris (eds), *Out of Line, Out of Place: A Global and Local History of World War I Internments*, New York: Cornell University Press, 2022.

Lubinski, Christina, Giacomin, Valeria, and Schnitzer, Klara, 'Internment as a business challenge: Political risk management and German multinationals in Colonial India (1914-1947)' *Business History*, Vol. 63, No. 1, 2021: 72-97.

Manz, Stefan, and Panayi, Panikos, *Enemies in the Empire: Civilian Internment in the British Empire During the First World War*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.

Matsumoto, Valerie, 'Japanese American Women During World War II', *Frontier: A Journal of Women Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 1, 1984: 6-14.

Moore, Bob, and Fedorowich, Kent, *The British Empire and its Italian Prisoners of War*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.

Rupp, Leila J., 'Mother of the "Volk": The Image of Women in Nazi Ideology', *Signs*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 1977: 362-379.

van Dijk, Boyd, 'Human Rights in War: On the Entangled Foundations of the 1949 Geneva Conventions', *American Journal of International Law*, Vol. 112, No. 4, 2018: 553-582.

von Tucher, Paul, *Nationalism, Case and Crisis in Missions: German Missions in British India, 1939-1946*, Erlangen-Nuremberg: Self-Published, 1980.

Yamaguchi, Precious, *Experiences of Japanese American Women During and After World War II: Living in Internment Camps and Rebuilding Life Afterwards*, Lanham: Lexington Books, 2014.