Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Final Assignment for

Course: German Social History in the 20th Century (54674)

Instructor: Tobias Ebbrecht-Hartmann

Negotiating Belonging after 1945:

Afro-German Occupation Children in Post-War West Germany, 1945-1960

Submitted by Benny Hochster

Student ID: 028793339

15 March 2026

Table of Contents

Introduction....3
Historical Context: Occupation, Race, and the Post-War Social Order....4
Welfare Institutions and the Social Management of Difference....5
Separation, Adoption, and the Boundaries of Belonging....7
Toxi and the Visual Politics of Sympathy....8
Lived Experience, Memory, and Later Reframing....9
Conclusion....11
Bibliography....12

Negotiating Belonging after 1945: Afro-German Occupation Children in Post-War West Germany, 1945-1960

Introduction

The end of the Second World War did not create a social reset or "tabula rasa" in Germany. Indeed, after 1949, the Federal Republic began to emerge as a democratic state, but older assumptions about social order still influenced everyday life and public institutions. One useful way to examine those continuities is to look at the treatment of Afro-German occupation children, i.e. children born to German mothers and Black soldiers of the Allied forces, especially African American GIs, in the aftermath of the war. Their numbers were relatively small, yet they drew disproportionate public attention because they stood at the intersection of several anxieties that marked post-war West German society: defeat, occupation, illegitimacy, race, and the boundaries of national belonging (Fehrenbach 2009; Lemke Muniz de Faria 2003).

My paper asks how the treatment of Afro-German occupation children exposed the limits of social inclusion in the early days of post war West Germany. The main issue was not only prejudice at the level of individual attitudes and actions. Public authorities and institutions (especially welfare institutions), as well as popular culture, often also approached these children as a special "issue" or "problem" to be "managed". In official and semi-official discourse, the preferred vocabulary was usually one of care, welfare, education, protection or assistance rather than overt racial language. But that language did not produce full social acceptance. More often, it reframed racial categories and difference as a welfare issue, and imagined the children's future outside the normal framework of German family and national life, sometimes even physically outside the borders of Germany itself. The result was marginalization and a pattern of conditional sympathy without true belonging.

The topic I chose, belongs firmly within German social history because it connects everyday experience, family life, state institutions, marginalized groups, and visual culture. It also speaks directly to our course themes of modernity, crisis, post-war reconstruction, cultural and visual representations of social change. By reading policy debates together with memoir and film, the paper shows that treatment of Afro-German children exposed a revealing current at the margins of the new Federal Republic: they were present within German society, but they were seldom imagined as an ordinary and integral part of it.

Historical Context: Occupation, Race, and the Post-War Social Order

The birth of Afro-German occupation children was a direct consequence of the Allied presence in Germany after 1945. American forces included Black soldiers who served in an army still marked by segregation and by the racial politics of Jim Crow. As Heide Fehrenbach shows, the presence of Black American soldiers and the racial practices of the U.S. military shaped post-war German debates about race at the same time that Germans were attempting to move away from Nazi racial doctrine (Fehrenbach 2009). This did not mean that ideas about race disappeared. Rather, the terms of racial thinking shifted. Openly Nazi language had become discredited, but anxieties about visible difference, mixture, and national homogeneity remained.

For German society, the issue of "occupation children" was never only about the children themselves. These births were also connected to debates about women's sexuality, illegitimacy, and the moral meaning of occupation. Children born to German mothers and Black fathers attracted special attention because they were visibly marked in a way that many white occupation children were not. Their bodies became public reminders of defeat and foreign presence. In that sense, they were burdened with meanings that far exceeded private family life.

The setting of the 1950s is important here. Scholars of the Adenauer era have emphasized that reconstruction in West Germany was accompanied by a conservative emphasis on order and stability alongside modernization (Schildt and Sywottek 1997). The concept of family was central to that project. The same was true of the national aspiration to present the Federal Republic as a modern Western democracy. Within such a framework, a child who did not fit dominant assumptions about whiteness, legitimacy, and familial normality could easily be viewed as special. That is why Afro-German occupation children became a site where broader questions of post-war belonging were negotiated.

A social-historical approach is especially useful here. As Thomas Lindenberger argues, everyday history broadens post-war history beyond formal politics by focusing on social practice, lived experience, and the actions of ordinary people (Lindenberger 2001). In the case of Afro-German children, the key question is not only what politicians or experts said, but how institutions and cultural norms turned social anxiety into everyday benign categories such as care or discipline.

Welfare Institutions and the Social Management of Difference

One of the clearest findings of the scholarship is that Afro-German occupation children were often sent into systems of welfare surveillance, not formally because of racial categories, but because many were born outside marriage. In legal terms in West Germany, that status already exposed them to intervention by youth welfare authorities. What made their situation different was that race intensified the degree to which they were discussed as a collective social problem. Fehrenbach, Yara-Colette Lemke Muniz de Faria, and Azziza B. Malanda all show in different ways that welfare institutions did not simply respond neutrally to need. They also helped define these children as a special category requiring supervision and intervention (Fehrenbach 2009; Lemke Muniz de Faria 2003; Malanda 2021).

This is one of the main points of the paper. Post-war West Germany did not usually describe Afro-German children in the blunt racial language of the Nazi period. Instead, officials and commentators often used the language of pedagogy, adaptation, or child welfare. That shift mattered because it allowed exclusionary assumptions to survive in a more respectable form. The question was no longer framed as one of racial purity. It was framed instead as whether such children could "adjust," whether German society could "absorb" them, and whether their upbringing would be better handled in special settings or outside Germany altogether.

The welfare state therefore played an ambivalent role. On the one hand, youth offices and welfare agencies could provide material assistance. On the other hand, they also classified and pathologized. Lemke Muniz de Faria's work is particularly valuable because it demonstrates how debates over the fate of Black occupation children were embedded in both German and American discussions about race, family, and policy. The children were often discussed in terms of care, placement, and adjustment rather than as ordinary members of German society (Lemke Muniz de Faria 2003).

What emerges from this literature is not a simple picture of a single state policy imposed from above. The archive is more uneven than that. There were disagreements, local differences, and cases in which mothers or advocates resisted removal. Still, the broader pattern is clear: welfare discourse often turned racism into administration. Instead of asking how German society should change in order to accept these children, institutions often asked how the children should be managed so as to reduce social friction. That distinction matters. It marks the boundary between inclusion and mere supervision.

Separation, Adoption, and the Boundaries of Belonging

The question of adoption brings these tensions into especially sharp focus. Public debates in West Germany and the United States increasingly treated transatlantic adoption as a possible solution for at least some Afro-German children. The subject was not only humanitarian. It also reflected the widespread assumption that Germany was not a natural or comfortable place for Black children to grow up. Lemke Muniz de Faria's article on U.S. adoption plans shows that such proposals were shaped by contradictory impulses: genuine concern for the children's welfare, African American activism on their behalf, and the tacit acceptance of the claim that their future might lie elsewhere (Lemke Muniz de Faria 2003).

This is where the rhetoric of care has to be read carefully. It would be too simple to say that all adoption initiatives were cynical or merely disguised racism. Some advocates, especially within African American circles, clearly saw adoption as an attempt to rescue children from social hostility. Yet from the perspective of German social history, that humanitarian motive does not cancel the larger significance of the process. The fact that removal appeared plausible, even desirable, already reveals something important about the limits of belonging in early West Germany. The "solution" to racism was often imagined not as changing German society but as relocating the child.

Fehrenbach’s work makes this point with particular force. She shows that post-war discussions of Black occupation children unfolded in a transatlantic context in which German and American actors brought different racial assumptions, even as both sides often treated these children as socially exceptional (Fehrenbach 2009). Adoption could therefore function in two ways at once: as an act of care for individual children and as a way of resolving a social discomfort that German society had not overcome.

The same logic appears in the role of institutions such as children's homes. Memoir evidence suggests that some children experienced these settings not as places of belonging but as spaces of discipline, shame, and estrangement. Such evidence has to be handled carefully, because retrospective memoir cannot stand in for every case. Even so, it is historically valuable because it shows how institutional categories were lived from below. It reveals what welfare administration looked like when translated into childhood experience.

Toxi and the Visual Politics of Sympathy

The importance of visual culture to this topic is one of the reasons it fits the course so well. The 1952 film Toxi is especially useful because it shows how the issue of Black occupation children was presented in popular post-war culture. Its premiere was timed to the beginning of the public school year, and the film explicitly staged what contemporaries called the "race problem" for a wide audience (Fenner 2011).

At first glance, Toxi seems progressive. The film asks viewers to sympathize with a Black child and criticizes obvious expressions of prejudice within the white German family that takes her in. In a society emerging from National Socialism, that was not meaningless. The film stages tolerance as a moral lesson and places racism on display as something embarrassing and backward. For that reason alone, it deserves to be taken seriously rather than dismissed.

Yet the film's limitations are just as revealing as its gestures toward empathy. Toxi is not presented as an ordinary German child with an unquestioned place in the family or nation. She instead serves as a moral test for white Germans. Much of the drama turns on the emotional and ethical development of the adults around her. The child is lovable, patient, and symbolically innocent - but she is also kept in the position of an object through which others discover their

humanity. That is what makes the film historically significant. It grants sympathy while withholding normality.

The ending is especially important. Toxi is not fully absorbed into German family life. Instead, the narrative resolves the tension by sending her elsewhere, with her American father. The plot thus softens exclusion through sentiment. Viewers are encouraged to feel compassionate, even enlightened, without having to imagine Blackness as a lasting and ordinary part of post-war German society. Angelica Fenner's study of the film is useful here because it situates Toxi within wider post-war attempts to narrate race in a democratizing Germany (Fenner 2011). The film did not simply reflect society; it participated in shaping the emotional limits of what could be accepted.

In that sense, Toxi condenses the argument of this paper in cultural form. The film does not advocate hatred. It offers something more subtle and, historically, more important: inclusion only on the condition that Black presence remain temporary, exceptional, and narratively manageable. The moral lesson is tolerance, but the social horizon remains separation.

Lived Experience, Memory, and Later Reframing

If policy debates and film show how Afro-German children were discussed from above, memoir and later Afro-German writing show how those structures were experienced and reinterpreted. Ika Hugel-Marshall's Invisible Woman is one of the most important texts here. As a retrospective account, it should not be treated as a transparent record of every Afro-German childhood in the 1950s. That is not a weakness. Its value lies in showing the emotional and social texture of racism, institutionalization, and unbelonging from the perspective of someone who lived through them (Hugel-Marshall 2001).

Hugel-Marshall describes a childhood shaped by racial isolation and by the stigma attached to illegitimacy. That combination matters. The marginalization of Afro-German children was not

reducible to skin color alone; it also intersected with family status, gender norms, and social class. Her account therefore supports the broader historiographical point that post-war exclusion operated through ordinary institutions and intimate settings as much as through public ideology. It was felt in school, in neighborhoods, in religious settings, and in the persistent message that one did not quite fit.

The later Afro-German movement is relevant here not because it belongs to the main period of the paper, but because it helps clarify what had been missing in the 1950s. By the 1980s, Afro-German writers and activists began to transform a history of silence into one of self-definition. The anthology Showing Our Colors was a landmark in that process, and later scholarship has emphasized its importance in the emergence of Afro-German political and cultural self-naming (Lennox 2016). It did not create the earlier experience, of course, but it gave it a new language. What had once been framed by experts as a welfare problem was reframed by Afro-Germans themselves as a history of racism, exclusion, and struggle for recognition.

That later reframing matters here because it sharpens a historical contrast. In the 1950s, Afro-German children were usually spoken about. By the late twentieth century, Afro-Germans were increasingly speaking for themselves as historical subjects. The transition does not erase the earlier structures of exclusion, but it does make them easier to see.

Conclusion

The history of Afro-German occupation children reveals a great deal about the social limits of democratization in early West Germany. The Federal Republic did not simply continue Nazi racial doctrine; the post-war shift in language and institutions was real. But the abandonment of

explicit biological racism did not produce a fully inclusive social order. Instead, racial difference was often translated into the softer language of welfare, pedagogy, and humanitarian concern. That language mattered politically because it allowed exclusion to persist in a morally respectable form.

The central finding of this paper is therefore that Afro-German children were rarely imagined as a normal part of post-war German society. Welfare institutions classified and supervised them as special cases. Adoption debates often treated departure from Germany as a plausible resolution. Popular culture, above all Toxi, could stage sympathy for a Black child while stopping short of imagining full incorporation. Memoir evidence later revealed the personal costs of that structure: shame, isolation, and a persistent uncertainty of belonging.

Seen in this way, the subject is not a marginal episode but a revealing social-historical lens on the 1950s. It shows how reconstruction, domestic normalization, and democratic self-presentation coexisted with narrower assumptions about who could count as fully German. The paper also has limits. It has focused mainly on West Germany and has relied largely on published scholarship, memoir, and film rather than archival case files. A fuller study could compare West and East Germany more systematically or examine regional differences in welfare practice. Even within those limits, Afro-German occupation children remain a strong case through which to study race, family, and belonging in post-war German history.

Bibliography

- Ayim, May, Katharina Oguntoye, and Dagmar Schultz, eds. Showing Our Colors: Afro-German Women Speak Out. Translated by Anne V. Adams. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1992.

- Hugel-Marshall, Ika. Invisible Woman: Growing Up Black in Germany. Translated by Elizabeth Gaffney. New York: Continuum, 2001.
- Toxi. Directed by Robert A. Stemmle. West Germany, 1952.
- Campt, Tina. Other Germans: Black Germans and the Politics of Race, Gender, and Memory in the Third Reich. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004.
- Fehrenbach, Heide. “Black Occupation Children and the Devolution of the Nazi Racial State.” In After the Nazi Racial State: Difference and Democracy in Germany and Europe, edited by Rita Chin, Heide Fehrenbach, Geoff Eley, and Atina Grossmann, 30-54. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2009.
- Fenner, Angelica. Race under Reconstruction in German Cinema: Robert Stemmle’s Toxi. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011.
- Lennox, Sara. Remapping Black Germany: New Perspectives on Afro-German History, Politics, and Culture. Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2016.
- Lindenberger, Thomas. “Everyday History: New Approaches to the History of the Post-War Germanys.” In The Divided Past: Rewriting Post-War German History, edited by Christoph Klessmann, 43-67. Oxford: Berg, 2001.
- Malanda, Azziza B. “I Had a Dark Skin Color, That Was a Problem”: Race and Racism in the Child Welfare System in Postwar West Germany. zeitgeschichte 48, no. 1 (2021): 73-90.
- Schildt, Axel, and Arnold Sywottek. “Reconstruction” and “Modernization”: West German Social History during the 1950s. In West Germany under Construction: Politics, Society, and Culture in the Adenauer Era, edited by Robert G. Moeller, 413-443. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997.