Blood and Homeland

Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe 1900–1940

Edited by Marius Turda and Paul J. Weindling

CEU PRESS

“Blood and Homeland”

“Blood and Homeland”

Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900–1940

Edited by
Marius Turda and Paul J. Weindling

Central European University Press
Budapest New York

Published in 2007 by

Central European University Press
An imprint of the
Central European University Share Company
Nádor utca 11, H-1051 Budapest, Hungary
Tel: +36-1-327-3138 or 327-3000
Fax: +36-1-327-3183
E-mail: ceupress@ceu.hu
Website: www.ceupress.com

400 West 59th Street, New York NY 10019, USA
Tel: +1-212-547-6932
Fax: +1-646-557-2416
E-mail: mgreenwald@sorosny.org

ISBN 963 7326 77 4 cloth
978-963-7326-77-6

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Blood and homeland : Eugenics and racial nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe,
1900-1940 / edited by Marius Turda and Paul J. Weindling.
p. cm.
Includes index.
ISBN-13: 978-9637326776
1. Eugenics—Europe, Central—History—20th century. 2. Eugenics—Balkan
Peninsula—History—20th century. 3. Racism—Europe, Central—History—20th century. 4. Racism—Balkan Peninsula—History—20th century.
5. Nationalism—Europe, Central—History—20th century. 6. Nationalism—Balkan
Peninsula—History—20th century. I. Turda, Marius. II. Weindling, Paul. III. Title.

HQ755.5E8B56 2006
363.9'2—dc22

2006031799

Printed in Hungary by
Akadémiai Nyomda, Martonvásár

Contents

Acknowledgments

The majority of the papers included in this volume were presented at the international workshop *Technologies of Race: Eugenics, Biopolitics and Nation-Building in Interwar Europe*, held at the Central European University in Budapest between 28 and 29 June 2004. The workshop was generously sponsored by Pasts, Inc. Centre for Historical Studies in Budapest, in collaboration with the History Department of the CEU, the Wellcome Trust, and the Department of History, Oxford Brookes University.

First and foremost, I should like to express my gratitude to Sorin Antohi, the director of Pasts, Inc., for his support, generosity and guidance before, during and after the workshop. Equally important, he is responsible for initiating the idea of the publication of this volume. His advice and encouragement of this project has proved invaluable.

Thanks are also due to László Kontler, the then head of the History Department at CEU, for his support. Without Zsuzsanna Macht, the administrative assistant in the History Department, and Dávid Marno, former assistant to the director of Pasts, Inc., the workshop would not have been a success.

I owe especial thanks to the copy-editor of this volume, Katya A. M. Kocourek from the School of Slavonic and East European Studies in London (SSEES), who graciously accepted the difficult, and at times seemingly insurmountable, task of copy-editing the first version of the manuscript. A generous grant from the Institute of Historical and Cultural Studies at Oxford Brookes University made Katya's editorial work possible. I should also like to express my gratitude to Elisabeth Jay, the Institute's director, for her assistance.

Matt Feldman deserves special gratitude for his careful reading of the final version of the manuscript. His suggestions and comments have helped to improve both the clarity and the quality of most papers included in this volume. I am also grateful to Diane B. Paul for her constructive criticisms and comments.

Linda Kunos, as Assistant Editor at CEU Press, deserves further gratitude for her patience and kindness during the publication.

Finally, I should like to acknowledge the generous financial support I have received as Marie Curie Fellow, which has enabled me to conduct research for this volume as well as to enjoy the intellectually stimulating environment at Oxford Brookes University.

Marius Turda
London, September 2006

List of Contributors

Margit Berner is Curator at the Department of Anthropology, Natural History Museum, Vienna.

Maria Bucur is Associate Professor and John V. Hill Chair in East European History, Indiana University.

Herwig Czech is a PhD candidate at the University of Vienna and a Researcher at the Documentation Center of Austrian Resistance.

Magdalena Gawin is Assistant Professor at the Institute of History, Polish Academy of Sciences.

Roger Griffin is Professor of Modern History, Department of History, Oxford Brookes University.

Aristotle Kallis is Senior Lecturer in European Studies, Lancaster University.

Ken Kalling is Lecturer in the History of Medicine, University of Tartu.

Egbert Klautke is Lecturer in Modern History at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University College London.

Monika Löscher is Researcher at the Institute of History, Vienna.

Răzvan Pârâianu is Junior Research Fellow at Pasts Inc. Centre for Historical Research, Central European University, Budapest.

Attila Pók is Deputy Director of the Institute of History, Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

Christian Promitzer is an Academic Assistant in the Department for Southeast European History, University of Graz.

Michal Šimůnek is a Research Assistant in the History of Biology, Charles University Prague.

Maria Teschler-Nicola is Associate Professor of Physical anthropology, University of Vienna, and Head of the Department of Anthropology, Natural History Museum, Vienna.

Sevasti Trubeta is a Researcher at the Institute of East European Studies, Free University of Berlin.

Marius Turda is Marie Curie Fellow and Academic Fellow in Central and Eastern European Bio-Medicine, Department of History, Oxford Brookes University.

Kamila Uzarczyk is Assistant Lecturer and Research Fellow, Medical University of Wroclaw.

Paul J. Weindling is Wellcome Trust Research Professor in the History of Medicine, Department of History, Oxford Brookes University.

Rory Yeomans is an independent scholar affiliated to the Centre for South East European Studies at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University College London.

Central and Eastern Europe, 1925
(*The Times Atlas of European History,* 1994, London, p. 173)

Eugenics, Race and Nation in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900–1940: A Historiographic Overview

Marius Turda and Paul J. Weindling

In the concluding chapter to *The Wellborn Science: Eugenics in Germany, France, Brazil and Russia* (1990), Mark B. Adams complained about the lack of diversity in the comparative history of eugenics: "We are beginning to know something of Russian eugenics, but what of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and Slavic eastern Europe—Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, and the Ukraine? As a Catholic Slavic country, Poland should be an especially intriguing test case. Lemaine, Schneider, Clark, and others are clarifying the character of eugenics in France; what of other Latin cultures of Europe, what of eugenics in Italy, Spain, Portugal, Romania?"[1] After the collapse of Communism in 1989, topics such as eugenics, anti-Semitism and racism were resurrected as scholarly areas of interest, and researchers were given access to materials previously controlled by Communist regimes. As a result, a number of recently published monographs have quickly become essential readings of eugenic movements in Romania, Austria and Poland.[2] Yet studies and monographs are still lacking on the history of eugenic movements in other Central and Southeast European countries.[3] However, as this volume demonstrates, substantial analytical effort has been recently devoted to compensate for the lack of historiographic interest in these topics.

It should not be assumed that comparative histories of eugenic movements in Central and Southeast Europe have never preoccupied eugenicists and scholars of eugenics. In 1921, the Hungarian eugenicist Géza von Hoffmann (1885–1921) wrote an article under the title "Eugenics in the Central Empires since 1914," which constitutes the first analysis of various eugenic movements in Central Europe. Hoffmann compared the activities of various eugenics societies, including the Berlin Society for Racial Hygiene; the German Society for Racial Hygiene in Munich; the International Society for Racial Hygiene; the Austrian Society for

the Study of the Science of Population; the Czech Society for Eugenics; and the Hungarian Society for Racial Hygiene and Population Policy.[4] In 1924, the American eugenicist Samuel J. Holmes (1868–1964), professor of zoology at the University of California, published *A Bibliography of Eugenics*, which is arguably the first attempt to produce a comprehensive review of the main themes related to eugenics since the late nineteenth century. In contrast to Hoffmann, Holmes offered a more technical perspective on the achievements of Central European eugenics. In addition to American, British, French and German eugenicists, he cited several Central European supporters of eugenics under the following subheadings: "Eugenics and Works of a General Character" (János Bársony, Ladislav Haškovec and Géza von Hoffmann); "Genealogy" (Géza von Hoffmann); "The Problem of Degeneracy" (Emil Mattauschek); "The Birthrate" (Géza Vitéz); "Selective Influence of War" (János Bársony); "Immigration and Emigration as Related to Racial Changes" (Géza von Hoffmann); and, finally, "Negative Eugenics, Sterilization, Segregation, etc." (Géza von Hoffmann).

Holmes' intention was to enumerate rather than to comment upon works on eugenics included in his anthology. With the exception of Hoffmann's *Die Rassenhygiene in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika* (Racial Hygiene in the United States of America), which was regarded as "the most comprehensive work on the subject," Holmes did not insist on any eugenic study from Central or Southeast Europe. Nevertheless, the thematic arrangement of his book meant that the general interests of Central European eugenicists were clearly identifiable. They were preoccupied not only with the historiography of eugenics, but also with critical social and medical issues, including degeneracy, decline in birthrates and sterilization.[5] One question, therefore, is appropriate: Did Holmes' comparative survey of eugenic literature reflect the practical objectives of the eugenics societies and organizations in Central and Southeast Europe?

Eugenics Societies and Programs of Social Hygiene

Following the precedent set by the Society for Racial Hygiene (1905) in Germany and the Eugenics Education Society (1907) in Britain, eugenics societies flourished in Central and Southeast Europe, starting with Prague and Vienna in 1913 and followed by Budapest in 1914.[6]

Towards the end of the First World War, such organizations increased in number and scope. The Hungarian Society for Racial Hygiene and Population Policy, and the Polish Society for the Struggle against Race Degeneration were both established in 1917 (the latter was renamed the Polish Eugenics Society in 1922).[7] After the war, eugenics and social hygiene received increased financial support. In 1919, an Institute of Hygiene and Social Hygiene was created in Romania. In 1923, the active Czech Society of Eugenics founded an Institute of Eugenics Research[8], while Austrian promoters of eugenics established societies for racial hygiene in Linz (1923) and Vienna (1925). The Bulgarian Society for Racial Hygiene, and the Austrian League for Racial Improvement and Heredity were both founded in 1928. As the case studies included in this volume demonstrate, the institutionalization of eugenics in Central and Southeast Europe may be understood as part of an international movement to establish eugenics societies and national research institutions.[9]

The eugenic programs advocated by these societies were largely influenced by national contexts; however, this national distinctiveness does not mean that individual countries pursued radically different social and medical policies. In the interwar period, the countries of Central and Southeast Europe faced similar problems in the fields of racial and social hygiene. In 1929, the Swiss eugenicist Marie-Thérèse Nisot discussed this convergence in eugenic methods, attitudes and policies in Central and Southeast Europe in the two-volume survey of eugenic movements *La Question Eugénique dans les divers pays* (The Eugenics Question in Various Countries).[10]

With respect to the eugenic movement in Austria, for instance, Nisot assessed different eugenic methods pursued by Austrian eugenicists and social hygienists, such as birth control, the legalization of abortion, the regulation of marriage, and various measures of social hygiene (including the protection of the infant and maternity, the struggle against tuberculosis, mental maladies, and venereal diseases), as well as methods to combat alcoholism.[11] On the other hand, Estonia, which had had a eugenics society since 1924,[12] received a less detailed analysis than Greece, which did not have a eugenics society but compensated with a strong social programme of medical protection.[13] Moreover, eugenicists in Hungary were preoccupied with concerns similar to their Austrian counterparts, most notably the supervision of birth control and the regulation of marriage.[14]

Among Central European countries, eugenic movements in Poland, Romania and Czechoslovakia were cited as exemplary. The assessment of Polish eugenics was, for example, divided into two chapters. The first chapter described the activities of the Polish Eugenic Society (its members, main goals and publications); the second focused on various eugenic measures introduced in Poland, including the protection of the infant and maternity; and prophylactic measures against tuberculosis, venereal diseases, mental maladies and alcoholism.[15]

The analysis of the eugenic movement in Romania was also divided into two chapters: one dealt with general issues like eugenics, and biometrical and statistical research promoted by the Institute of Hygiene and Social Hygiene in Cluj; the other highlighted social hygiene measures introduced in Romania, especially the struggle against tuberculosis and venereal diseases, and the rehabilitation of individuals with disabilities.[16]

In particular, Nisot praised the achievements of the eugenic movement in Czechoslovakia. First, she emphasized the role of Bohemia as the bastion of the Czechoslovak eugenic movement. Nisot then discussed eugenic organizations in Czechoslovakia, such as the Czechoslovak Eugenics Society, the Czechoslovak Institute of Eugenics, and the Eugenics Committee, the latter affiliated to the *Masaryk Work Academy*. Finally, the eugenic measures recommended by Czechoslovak eugenicists were described. In addition to the regulation of marriage, physical culture, social hygiene, and the rehabilitation of people with disabilities, special attention was devoted to the necessity of prenuptial medical certificates, which, according to Nisot, were considered as particularly important by Czechoslovak eugenicists.[17]

This comparative history of eugenics in Central and Southeast Europe can be usefully read in conjunction with studies on national eugenic movements written by the Central European eugenicists. In 1913, for example, in a short note published in *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie* (Journal of Racial and Social Biology), Géza von Hoffmann announced the creation of a Eugenics Committee in Hungary; he later also notified *The Journal of Heredity*.[18] Hoffmann's analysis of the Eugenics Committee in Hungary was expanded, and, in 1918, it became an article, "Rassenhygiene in Ungarn" (Racial Hygiene in Hungary), the first detailed study of the eugenic movement in Hungary.[19]

Ladislav Haškovec (1866–1944), the founder of Czech neurology and one of the most prominent Czech eugenicists, similarly outlined

the contribution of regional eugenic movements in Central Europe. In "The Eugenic Movement in the Czechoslovak Republic," a paper presented to the Second International Congress of Eugenics hosted by the American Museum of Natural History in New York in 1921, Haškovec described the state of eugenic research in Bohemia, which he dated "independently of American and English efforts, from the year 1900."[20] The Czech biologist Vladislav Růžička (1872–1934) reinforced Haškovec's analysis of eugenics in Czechoslovakia through his report to the Ninth Conference of the International Federation of Eugenics Organizations (1930).[21] Eventually, in 1935, the geneticist and secretary of the Czechoslovak Eugenics Society Bohumil Sekla (1901–1987) summarized these developments in a short review published in *The Eugenics Review*.[22] These reviews and articles shared one common denominator: eugenics was perceived as a symbol of the constructive process in building a modern nation-state.

Yet alongside these texts, less favourable analyses of eugenic movements in Central Europe were also published. One anonymous contributor to *The Eugenics Review* argued, for example, that in 1935 in Austria "the general Press shows no interest in eugenical problems; nor does there exist in the whole of Austria a single scientific or popular journal devoted totally or partially to eugenics."[23] The author of the review adopted a defensive strategy, one that would vindicate eugenics in Austria by marginalizing its importance rather than by exposing its fascination with the racial hygiene policies of the Nazi regime. The author was concerned that the relationship between Austrian and German racial hygiene movements, considered natural at the time, would, however, later stigmatize the scientific achievements of Austrian eugenics between the wars, creating the erroneous image of an inextricable and homogeneous Austro-German racial hygiene and eugenic movement. Key figures, like the racial hygienist Heinrich Reichel (1876–1943)—who made a significant contribution to the development of Austrian eugenics and then eschewed membership in the NSDAP—is one notable example of Austrian resistance to the model of Nazi racial hygiene.[24] As with the controversial, and at times complicated, relationship between Nazi racial policies and eugenics, a similar question should be posed when discussing the history of eugenics in Central and Southeast Europe between 1900 and 1940: Did eugenics follow a separate scientific agenda, or was it instead an instrument in various projects of national rejuvenation announced by racial nationalism?

New Locations, Old Ideas

It is customary for historians to trace the origins of the closely related ideological currents of Social Darwinism and eugenics to Britain, and especially to the visionary statistician Francis Galton (1822–1911). Since the American civil rights movement from the mid-1960s, and particularly from the 1980s—a period dominated by discussions about disability rights and the nature of totalitarian continuities after the Second World War—historians have focused on eugenics and sterilization in Britain, North America and Germany. New concerns with professionalism and social welfare meant that eugenics became more than a variation of anti-Semitism and racism. It is thus generally agreed in the scholarship that Britain, the USA and Germany provide the theoretical and practical models which other eugenic movements, directly or indirectly, emulated. Such stereotyping is common not only in those countries—notably Sweden, Norway and Switzerland—located in the academic vicinity of such traditional centres of eugenic thinking as Britain and Germany,[25] but also in histories of eugenics dealing with regions outside the orbit of European eugenics, such as Latin America and China.[26]

How does the diffusion of eugenic concepts impact the topics addressed by this volume? If the study of British, American and German eugenics serves as the barometer of "excellence" against which other eugenic movements continue to be evaluated, it is reasonable to assume that the hegemonic narratives developed for British, German and American eugenics provide powerful interpretative models for scholars dealing with this topic in Central and Southeast Europe. On the one hand, as some of the contributions to this volume clearly show, this hermeneutic strategy is used to help explain the dissemination of eugenics in these regions. On the other hand, however, if one focuses solely on the reception of foreign influences, it does not reveal much about the Central and Southeast European contribution to eugenics and racial thought between 1900 and 1940. Accordingly, the historiographic approach proposed here emphasizes four aspects: the creativity of local eugenic movements; the relationship between eugenicists and the nation-state; the role of professionals and expert knowledge on race; and, finally, the influence exercised by other eugenic movements, such as British eugenics and German racial hygiene.

First, racial anthropologists and eugenicists in Central and Southeast Europe utilized many channels in order to present their programs of

national rejuvenation and scientific success. Take, for instance, international congresses organized in Central Europe in the interwar period. Notable here are scholarly events like the International Health Conference organised in 1922 in Warsaw; the Anthropological Congress held in Prague in 1924 under the auspices of L'Institut International d'Anthropologie; the Second International Congress of Catholic Physicians, convened in 1936 in Vienna; or the XVIIe Congrès International d'Anthropologie et d'Archéologie Préhistorique organized in 1937 in Bucharest—all scientific gatherings used by Central and Southeast Europeans to inform outside observers about their achievements in eugenics and racial anthropology, as well as policies of public health and preventive medicine.

Second, the successes and failures of eugenic movements in Central and Southeast Europe were not characterized by the social experimentation of a liberal intelligentsia pursuing solutions to the crises brought about by modernity (Britain); the social change engendered by immigration and racial segregation (United States); and, generally, the traumatic human experiences generated by the First World War (France and Italy). Rather, eugenic movements in Central and Southeast Europe reflected the aspirations of a segment of trained professionals dependent upon the state for funding and legitimacy, and whose main goal was the strengthening of their newly created national states.

In the interwar period, the idea of a homogeneous national community figured prominently in Central and Southeast Europe. Many diverse solutions were proposed, including the creation of a liberal democracy based on the Western model; a peasant state, according to the indigenous nature of much of Central and Southeast European societies; or a corporatist state modelled on fascist ideology.[27] Diversity of opinion notwithstanding, all theories shared a common axiom: the state was a nation-state, and the ethnic majority therein represented the nation. Defining the nation in interwar Central and Southeast Europe became synonymous with justifying the domination of a given ethnic majority.[28]

In this context, eugenics and racial nationalism offered one of the most compelling definitions of the nation, one based on the biological laws of heredity. The state, eugenicists argued, should become modern not only in terms of infrastructure, economic performance and political institutions, but also in terms of health policies. These policies, however, should be conducted to preserve the "biological capital" of the nation. In turn, this appropriation of racial nationalism by eugenics changed

the way the nation-state was represented in eugenic discourses. Ultimately, eugenics and racial nationalism transformed the state from an indistinct entity governed by impersonal laws, to the guardian of the nation governed by biological laws. Eugenics, it was claimed, was the best strategy to achieve a "healthy body politic" and a strong nation-state. For example, the first treatise on eugenics published in Romania after 1918 was called *Igiena Naţiunii* (The Hygiene of the Nation) and subtitled *Eugenia* (Eugenics). The book encapsulated the essential relationship between eugenics and the protection of the nation; indeed, for its author Iuliu Moldovan (1882–1966), the most important Romanian eugenicist of the interwar period, the two were identical.

Third, in contrast to historical narratives postulating the analytical centrality of American, German and British eugenics, an alternative interpretation argues that eugenic movements in Central and Southeast Europe pursued research programmes and theoretical questions that arose locally, from indigenous intellectual and social conditions. To be sure, imitation of other eugenic paradigms did not lack supporters, but the momentum of eugenic movements was largely dictated by local realities rather than external developments, however similar their theoretical outlook. To give one example: in Poland, the first proposals to introduce compulsory sterilization of the mentally and physically handicapped were discussed as early as 1918, independent of other eugenic movements in Europe.

However, with the rise of Nazism in the late 1920s, many supporters of eugenics in Central and Southeast Europe favoured an orientation towards German racial hygiene. Eugenic regulations introduced by the Nazi regime, such as the sterilization laws of 1933, were often received sympathetically in Central and Southeast Europe. Bulgarian supporters of eugenic sterilization, for instance, were strongly encouraged by the introduction of sterilization laws into Germany in their own efforts to legalize sterilization in Bulgaria. Nevertheless, for many Central and Southeast Europeans, Nazi sterilization regulations confirmed the efficiency of the German eugenic movement instead of simply providing a stimulus for the introduction of similar legislation in their own countries. In Hungary, for example, the debate on eugenic sterilization occurred in the early 1930s and, as in the case of Romania, those who opposed it were victorious.[29]

The acceptance and introduction of eugenic sterilization in Central and Southeast Europe existed nevertheless. For instance, on 1 April 1937, a

sterilization law was introduced in Estonia. In Greece and Yugoslavia, on the other hand, most participants in the debate on sterilization embraced the idea of voluntary sterilization, although supporters of compulsory sterilization, such as Konstantinos Moutousis, holder of the chair of Hygiene at the University of Athens, and Stevan Ivanić, the director of the Central Institute for Hygiene in Belgrade, received significant academic and political support during the 1930s.

One should not assume, however, that the influence of German racial hygiene in Central and Southeast Europe was exclusively related to the fascination with Nazism.[30] In many cases, because of its association with Nazism, eugenicists in Central and Southeast Europe rejected German racial hygiene, as illustrated by the Czechoslovak and Polish cases discussed in this volume. At the same time, there was an established tradition of academic reciprocity between Germany and countries in Central and Southeast Europe that made the German model of racial hygiene particularly attractive. A majority of Central and Southeast eugenicists were educated in Germany and Austria, and some of them—like the Hungarian racial hygienists Géza von Hoffmann and Lajos Méhely; the Romanian eugenicists Iordache Făcăoaru and Petru Râmneanţu; the Greek anthropologist Ioannis Koumaris; and the Bulgarian eugenicist Stefan Konsulov—had strong connections with German racial hygiene. In 1926, for example, the founding program of the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Blutgruppenforschung* (German Society for the Research of Blood Groups) mentioned the following Central and Southeast Europeans as external members: Ioannis Koumaris, professor of Anthropology at the University of Athens; Frigyes Verzár, director of the Physiological Institute in Debrecen; Lajos Méhely, professor of Zoology at the University of Budapest; two Czechs, Oscar Bail and Jindrich Matiegka; and one Bulgarian, Vasil Mollov.[31]

As a new field of research in the emerging Central and Southeast European states, eugenics required an additional pillar of support in order to establish itself as a respected as well as an innovative, scientific discipline; and it found this pillar within the medical profession. It is not surprising, therefore, that racial scientists and eugenicists in Central and Southeast Europe were in most cases medical doctors or benefited from some degree of medical training in their education. In the name of traditional autochthonous racial values, a new medical interpretation of the national body was proposed. Eugenicists, for instance, argued that new medical services should be introduced as

part of the programme of national rejuvenation, a programme which should discourage the survival of the "unfit"—including not only the mentally disabled and other "defective" lineages of human breeding, but also those of different ethnic origin. To prevent the "degeneration" of the nation, eugenicists claimed additional rights over the proliferation of "genetically inferior individuals." It was suggested that only a eugenic state could save the nation from internal and external dangers.

How, then, did these internal developments in Central and Southeast Europe compare to the broader eugenic strategies envisioned by Western European states in interwar Europe? The victorious powers of the First World War, especially France, favoured the establishment of welfare states as a means of stabilizing the new post-war political entities created in Central and Southeast Europe. International agencies, such as the League of Nations Health Organization and the Rockefeller Foundation, offered financial support for the consolidation of health policies and medical systems. The Rockefeller Foundation, for example, was instrumental in developing public health administrations in Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia, which replaced German bacteriological methods with multifaceted forms of public health. In this context, eugenics became an integral part of public health in terms of strategies aimed at tackling chronic degenerative diseases, mental illness and sexually transmitted diseases. By and large, the endeavours of the Rockefeller Foundation in Central and Southeast Europe were motivated by American concepts of modernization and democratization, thus largely overlooking regional ethnic tensions. It was hoped that eugenicists in Central and Southeast Europe could create regional frameworks for collaboration in the sphere of public hygiene and preventive medicine.[32]

On the other hand, during the 1920s both Germany and the Soviet Union developed vigorous eugenic movements, and these states soon began to collaborate in areas of hygiene, social medicine and racial studies. The Kaiser Wilhelm Institute of Anthropology, Human Heredity and Eugenics, and the German-Soviet Racial Laboratory (*Forschungsstätte für Rassenforschung*) in Moscow, were both established in 1927.[33] For a while it seemed that ideological differences between the two centres of power in Central and Southeast Europe were disregarded as trivial in the name of science. The relationship between racial scientists and eugenicists in Central and Southeast Europe was nowhere near the level of German-Soviet collaboration, although regional sci-

entific projects were not altogether missing. *Rassen im Donauraum* (Races in the Danube Region), the short-lived journal edited in 1935 by the Hungarian doctor and anthropologist János Gáspár (1899–198?) is an exceptional example of regional collaboration. The scientific ambitions and the regional dimensions of the journal were reflected in its subtitle, "Beiträge zur Rassenkunde, Erbbiologie und Eugenik der Donauvölker" (Contributions to the Racial Studies, Hereditary Biology and Eugenics of Danubian Nations). The first issue concentrated on such topics as "Racial Research and Racial Care in Bulgaria;" "Racial Research in Yugoslavia;" "On the Racial Issue as a Cultural Problem;" "Contributions to the Racial History and Racial Biology of the Romanians;" and "Racial Research in Hungary," authored by leading eugenicists and racial anthropologists from Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Romania and Hungary.[34]

Although the German model of racial hygiene was one of the main sources of inspiration, eugenicists in Central and Southeast Europe did not neglect alternative scientific models. One was the French programme of pro-natalism and *puericulture*, terms denoting medical intervention in the case of maternal and infant health. Seen in binary "racial terms," the "Latin"—as opposed to the Nordic—model of "puericulture" and social assistance (practised in France and Fascist Italy) found supporters in Romania, as illustrated by Gheorghe Banu (1889–1957), the editor of *Revista de igienă socială* (Journal of Social Hygiene).[35] The "Latin" model of eugenics differed from racial selection and sterilization policies, which took their clearest forms in Scandinavia and Nazi Germany but were also encouraged in Switzerland.

Seen in terms of health and population policies, a conceptual and ideological divide separates the 1920s, when eugenic movements flourished in Europe, from the 1930s, when both Stalin, with his termination of programs for eugenic research and persecution of leading geneticists, and the papacy, with its encyclical *Casti Connubii*, "On Christian Marriage," took a clear ideological stance against eugenics. At the opposite end of the political spectrum was Nazi Germany, which viewed eugenics as the core of its racial and national policy.

The gradual transformation of eugenics from its initial, "positive," preoccupation with social and medical assistance, to the propagation of "negative" measures such as sterilization and clinical confinement, also marked the progress of eugenic thinking in Central and Southeast Europe. During the early 1920s, "racial hygiene" comprised the scien-

tific model of hygiene and public health. Two illustrative examples of this state of affairs are the immunology and blood-group analysis of the Polish bacteriologist Ludwik Hirszfeld (1884–1954), first pioneered in multiethnic Thessaloniki at the end of the First World War; and the attempts to extend bacteriology to the study of the inherited constitution by the Viennese social hygienist Julius Tandler (1869–1936).[36] These forms of hygiene greatly influenced the conceptualization of eugenics in Central and Southeast Europe, as illustrated by the Romanian and Bulgarian schools of social hygiene, for example.

The history of eugenics represents, however, just the first aspect of a broader research agenda endeavoured in this volume: racial nationalism constitutes the second. This volume aims not only to excavate hitherto unknown eugenic movements in Central and Southeast Europe, but also to explain their relationship with racism, nationalism and anti-Semitism. Both externally, in conjunction with similar developments in Western Europe, and internally, as a direct response to local conditions, eugenicists in Central and Southeast Europe campaigned for the implementation of a professionally controlled and biologically defined form of national belonging. Ultimately, the appropriation of eugenics by the state produced a new type of ideologue: the national scientist who wished not only to interfere in the life of the individual, but also to shape the physical *body* of the nation.

"Blood and Homeland": The Ethnic State

In 1943, a leading Romanian eugenicist of the interwar period, Petru Râmneanţu (1902–1981), delivered an inaugural speech to the faculty of medicine in Sibiu, under the title "Sânge şi glie" (Blood and Homeland).[37] Undoubtedly, the idea that biological concepts are necessary ingredients in shaping national identity and political phenomena received its strongest formulation in the interwar period. Accordingly, the nation was portrayed as a living organism, functioning in a biological fashion. Furthermore, the main characteristics of the national community were depicted in racial terms. In Central and Southeast Europe, the peasantry was considered the "racial repository" of the nation. The apparent contradiction between conservative (preservation of the peasantry) and technologically progressive (eugenics) ideas did not deter eugenicists like Râmneanţu from advocating the "ethno-biological uni-

ty of the nation." This formula, advocated by nationalist eugenicists and racial anthropologists in Central and Southeast Europe, was often transformed into the slogan "national revolution" by the political discourse of the extreme right.[38]

The "blood and soil" mythology, in addition to a whole range of modern techniques aimed at improving the health of the nation, helped to create a new political biology, whose purpose was to prepare the "chosen race" (Croats, Romanians, Hungarians, and so forth), at the expense of others (Serbs, Vlachs, Jews), for the onset of racial utopia: the ethnic state. The central theme here was not the attempt to define race in terms of "blood," as serological research has advocated, but rather in terms of the supposed racial value of blood groups.[39] As the Hungarian eugenicist and racial nationalist Lajos Méhely (1862–1953) noted in his 1934 study "Blut und Rasse" (Blood and Race), the national ideal should be "the strict protection of racial borders," according to the laws of heredity.[40] "Blood," as a symbol of national belonging, transcended science; it operated vertically, unifying the nation with its mythical projection into the future.

The most radical component of this political biology was undoubtedly the racial principle, upon which the nation should be restructured. Racial nationalism, combined with a scientific pretension to objectivity, aimed at purifying the nation of any "unworthy" or "dangerous" elements. As the Romanian eugenicist Iuliu Moldovan argued in *Statul etnic* (The Ethnic State), the new nationalist discourse should fuse the science of eugenics with nationalist assumptions about the existence of a "racial core," whose protection was deemed vital for the future of the nation.[41]

One feature revealing the extent of the relationship between racial nationalism and eugenics is the anthropometric debate about the "racial origin" of various ethnic groups in the multiethnic regions of Central and Southeast Europe. As ethnic minorities did not fit into the ideal picture of homogeneous national states, they were either treated as diasporas from the "mother nations," or simply as foreign groups in the regions they inhabited. Following the First World War, eugenicists and racial nacionalists debated the ethnic minority question and proposed various measures, including birth control and sterilization, as well as transfer of populations, as possible solutions.

Romanian eugenicists, for instance, devoted much of their activities to the issue of ethnicity. The case of Transylvania is typical of the conflict between these competing narratives on ethnicity. Before 1918,

Romanians used arguments of historical, cultural and linguistic continuity in order to justify claims on Transylvania. After the creation of Greater Romania in 1918, Romanian eugenicists in Transylvania refocused their arguments on what seemed a more irrefutable basis: science. Mathematical formulae, statistics, and lab analyses of blood groups formed a corpus of evidence that eugenicists hoped would demonstrate that most Hungarians in Transylvania were of Romanian descent.[42]

Interest in race and eugenics was, therefore, more widespread in Central and Southeast Europe than historians have recognized. In the interwar period, the concept of race became part of the vocabulary of most political groups, from the left to the right of the political spectrum. After all, many intellectuals in Central and Southeast Europe shared a common concern about the future of their nation and their ethnic belonging, and this was coupled with the expectation that their states were obliged to protect the "racial qualities" of the nation. The infusion of racial nationalism with eugenics between 1900 and 1940 is identifiable within three clusters of ideas and ideological commitments: a) the professionalization of medicine; b) the emergence of "scientific" versions of nationalism; and c) the fusion of *völkisch* biomedical ideology with anti-Semitism.

The final category poses additional problems of interpretation. In many respects, eugenicists and racial anthropologists concerned with the "Jewish Question" in Central and Southeast Europe reproduced social and biological schemes already implemented by Nazi Germany. However, they were also innovative and creative in the theories they suggested. As anti-Semitism and racial nationalism became inextricably linked in bio-political and eugenic discourses, the projection of the alleged "Jewish degeneracy" was understood in political as well as medical terms. The concept of degeneration became a central term in interwar racial anti-Semitism, not to mention the political and medical categorization of the Jews. The new medical and racial order advocated by anti-Semitic eugenicists was based upon the "purification of the nation," namely, the elimination of all Jews categorized as being "alien" and "degenerate."

As new theories of heredity gained influence in explaining the diverse causes of mental disorders and psycho-pathological phenomena, eugenic and psychiatric practices shifted from a progressive understanding of society to a reactionary, and even totalitarian, conception. As a result,

the notion of *kollektive Entartung* (collective degeneration) gradually became accepted in both nationalist and medical rhetoric during the interwar period. Degeneration supposedly threatened the "Volk," the "Race," and most importantly the "Nation." One example was the increasing attractiveness of concepts about "the degeneration of the Jewish race." In Romanian anti-Semitic discourse the notion of Jewish "racial decomposition" was graphically reiterated in numerous books, like *Degenerarea rasei evreieşti* (The Degeneration of the Jewish Race), published in 1928 by the Romanian pathologist Nicolae Paulescu (1869–1931).[43]

The scientific language supplied by eugenics was fused with a populist vocabulary and, ultimately, informed anti-Semitism. Medical terminology derived from the disciplines of psychiatry and pathology allowed for the characterization of ethnic minorities as physically and mentally distinct from national ethnic majorities. The political atmosphere of emerging authoritarian regimes in the late 1930s encouraged eugenicists to seek to prohibit mixed marriages between members of minority groups and those of the dominant ethnic groups. They also attempted to use new methods of medical research in their assessment of racial affiliation. [44]

The biological definition advocated by eugenics and racial nationalism thus became the norm, rather than the exception, in many countries in Central and Southeast Europe. Facing a world war, the biological rhetoric of the 1940s intensified in nationalist tone. Of prime importance were the survival of "genetic capital" and the maintenance of the potential of the nation, alongside instruments for eliminating the dysgenic groups, be they defined socially or ethnically.

Conclusions

Recent scholarship on eugenics and fascist movements has complemented the results of research into the history of eugenics and racial nationalism.[45] Moreover, a number of scholars, most prominently Roger Griffin and Emilio Gentile, have emphasized the *palingenetic* nature of fascist ideology as well as its modern character, and have convincingly demonstrated the multifarious relationship between racial nationalism, eugenics, and radical politics during the interwar period.[46] This volume abandons the monolithic interpretative model of

eugenics and racial nationalism, which, on the one hand, deals almost obsessively with the "uniqueness" of German racial hygiene and, on the other, views eugenics and racial movements in Central and Southeast Europe as insignificant imitations of German and, to some extent, British models.[47]

The time has come to reconsider the ways in which the histories of interwar Central and Southeast Europe are written. As this volume indicates, a new generation of scholars dealing with fascism, Nazism, racism and eugenics has emerged and acknowledged that the field of eugenics and racial nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe must be repositioned within a wider European perspective, which is itself, much like the academic profession, in the process of continuous transformation and thus subject to constant challenges from both comparative and national historiographies.

Endnotes:

[1] Mark B. Adams, ed., *The Wellborn Science: Eugenics in Germany, France, Brazil and Russia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 225.

[2] Maria Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization in Interwar Romania* (Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh University Press, 2002); Brigitte Fuchs, '*Rasse', 'Volk', 'Geschlecht'. Anthropologische Diskurse in Österreich, 1850–1960* (Frankfurt am-Main: Campus Verlag, 2003); Kamila Uzarczyk, *Podstawy ideologice higieny ras i ich realizacja na przykładzie Śląska w latach 1924–1944* (Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszatek, 2003); Magdalena Gawin, *Rasa i nowczesnoś ć. Historia polskiego ruchu eugenicznego, 1880–1952* (Warsaw: Wydawnicwo Neriton, 2003); Heinz Eberhard Gabriel, Wolfgang Neugebauer, eds., *Vorreiter der Vernichtung? Eugenik, Rassenhygiene und Euthanasie in der österreichischen Diskussion vor 1938* (Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2005); Gerhard Baader, Veronika Hofer, Thomas Mayer, eds., *Eugenik in Österreich: Biopolitischer Methoden und Strukturen vor 1900–1945* (Vienna: Czernin Verlag, forthcoming).

[3] Jean Gayon, Daniel Jacobi, eds., *L'éternel retour de l'eugénisme* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2006) provides an interesting comparison between past and present eugenic practices and discourses; Ruth Clifford Engs, *The Eugenics Movement: An Encyclopedia* (Westport, CT.: Greenwood Press, 2005), which focuses mainly on the United States, Britain and France. See also Peter Weingart, "Science and Political Culture: Eugenics in Comparative Perspective," *Scandinavian Journal of History* 24, 2 (1999), 163–177; and Deborah Barett and Charles Kurzman, "Globalizing Social Movement Theory: The Case of Eugenics," *Theory and Society* 33, 5 (2004), 487–527.

[4] Géza Hoffmann, "Eugenics in the Central Empires since 1914," *Social Hygiene* 7, 3 (1921), 285–296.

[5] Samuel J. Holmes, *A Bibliography of Eugenics* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1924).

[6] (Anonymous), "Eugenics in Austria," *The Eugenics Review* 5 (1913–1914), 387; and (Anonymous), "Eugenic Research in Bohemia," *The Journal of Heredity* 7, 4 (1916), 157.

[7] (Anonymous), "Eugenics in Poland," *Eugenical News* 19 (1934), 9–10.

[8] Bohumil Seckla, "Eugenics in Czechoslovakia," *Eugenical News* 20 (1935), 101–103.

[9] See Paul J. Weindling, "International Eugenics: Swedish Sterilization in Context," *Scandinavian Journal of History* 24, 2 (1999), 179–197.

[10] Marie-Thérèse Nisot, *La Question Eugénique dans les divers pays*, 2 vols. (Brussels: Libraire Falk Fils, 1927 and 1929). The first volume discusses the eugenic movement in Great Britain, USA and France.

[11] Nisot, *La Question Eugénique dans les divers pays*, vol. 2, 90–108.

[12] Nisot, *La Question Eugénique dans les divers pays*, vol. 2, 281–282. See also Theophil Laanes, "Eugenics in Estonia," *Eugenical News* 20 (1935), 103–104.

[13] Nisot, *La Question Eugénique dans les divers pays*, vol. 2, 291–296.

[14] Nisot, *La Question Eugénique dans les divers pays*, vol. 2, 298–304.

[15] Nisot, *La Question Eugénique dans les divers pays*, vol. 2, 418–437.

[16] Nisot, *La Question Eugénique dans les divers pays*, vol. 2, 433–437.

[17] Nisot, *La Question Eugénique dans les divers pays*, vol. 2, 526–553.

[18] Géza Hoffmann, "Ausschüsse für Rassenhygiene in Ungarn," *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie* 10, 6 (1913), 830–831; and Géza Hoffmann, "Eugenics in Hungary," *The Journal of Heredity* 7, 3 (1916), 105.

[19] Géza Hoffmann, "Rassenhygiene in Ungarn," *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie* 13, 1 (1918), 55–67.

[20] Ladislav Haškovec, "The Eugenic Movement in the Czechoslovak Republic," in Charles Davenport, et. al., eds., *Scientific Papers of the Second International Congress of Eugenics* (Held at the American Museum of Natural History, New York, September 22–28, 1921) (Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins Company, 1923), 435–436.

[21] Vladislav Růžička, "Czechoslovakia: Report on Eugenic Work and Advance in Various Countries Adhering to the Federation," in *Report of the Ninth Conference of the International Federation of Eugenic Organisations (Farnham, Dorset, September 11th to 15th 1930)* (London: I.F.E.O., 1930), 70–71.

[22] Bohumil Seckla, "Eugenics in Czechoslovakia," *The Eugenics Review* 28, 2 (1936), 115–117.

[23] (Anonymous), "Eugenics in Austria," *The Eugenics Review* 26, 4 (1935), 259–261.

[24] See, for example, Heinrich Reichel, *Die Hauptaufgaben der Rassenhygiene in der Gegenwart* (Vienna: Veröffentlichungen des deutschösterreichischen Staatsamtes für Volksgesundheit, 1922).

[25] See Gunnar Broberg and Nils Roll-Hansen, eds., *Eugenics and the Welfare State: Sterilization Policy in Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Finland* (East Lansing, Mich.: Michigan State University Press, 2005).

[26] See Nancy Stepan, *'The Hour of Eugenics.' Race, Gender and Nation in Latin America* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1991); and Frank Dikötter, *Imperfect Conceptions: Medical Knowledge, Birth Defects and Eugenics in China* (London: Hurst, 1998).

[27] Daniel Chirot, ed., *The Origins of Backwardness in Eastern Europe* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989); and Kenneth Jowitt, ed., *Social Change in Romania, 1860–1940. A Debate on Development in a European Nation* (Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, 1978).

[28] Katherine Verdery and Ivo Banac, eds., *National Character and National Ideology in Interwar Eastern Europe* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).

[29] (Anonymous), "Sterilization in Hungary," *Eugenical News* 19 (1934), 142. See also (Anonymous), "Sterilization in Poland," *Eugenical News* 20 (1935), 13.

[30] As suggested by the contributors to the lavishly illustrated and extremely interesting catalogue edited by the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, *Deadly Medicine. Creating the Master Race* (Washington: United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2004).

[31] (Anonymous), "Die Deutsche Gesellschaft für Blutgruppenforschung

(erläßt folgenden Aufruf)," *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie* 18, 4 (1926), 446–450.

[32] See Gábor Palló, "Make a Peak on the Plain: The Rockefeller Foundation's Szeged Project," in William H. Schneider, ed., *Rockefeller Philanthropy and Modern Biomedicine. International Initiatives from World War I to the Cold War* (Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2002), 87–105; Paul J. Weindling, "Public Health and Political Stabilization: Rockefeller Funding in Interwar Central and Eastern Europe," *Minerva* 31, 3 (1993), 253–267; Benjamin B. Page, "The Rockefeller Foundation and Central Europe: A Reconsideration," *Minerva* 40, 3 (2002), 265–287; and Željko Dugac, "New Public Health for a New State: Interwar Public Health in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes (Kingdom of Yugoslavia) and the Rockefeller Foundation," in Iris Borowy and Wolf D. Gruner, eds., *Facing Illness in Troubled Times. Health in Europe in the Interwar Years 1918–1939* (Frankfurt-am-Main: Peter Lang, 2005), 277–304.

[33] Loren Graham, "Science and Values: The Eugenic Movement in Germany and Russia in the 1920s," *American Historical Review* 82, 5 (1977), 1133–1164. See also Susan Gross Solomon, John F. Hutchinson, eds., *Health and Society in Revolutionary Russia* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990); Paul J. Weindling, "German-Soviet Medical Co-operation and the Institute for Racial Research, 1927–ca.1935," *German History* 10, 2 (1992), 177–206; Paul J. Weindling, *Epidemics and Genocide in Eastern Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); Mark B. Adams, Garland E. Allen, and Sheila Faith Weiss, "Human Heredity and Politics: A Comparative Institutional Study of the Eugenics Record Office at Cold Spring Harbor (United State), the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity, and Eugenics (Germany), and the Maxim Gorky Medical Genetics Institute (USSR)," *Osiris* 20, 1 (2005) 232–262; and Nikolai Krementsov, *International Science between the World Wars. The Case of Genetics* (London: Routledge, 2005).

[34] See Chr. Seisow, "Rassenforschung und Rassenpflege in Bulgarien," *Rassen in Donauraum* 1, 1 (1935), 3–7; Bozo Skerlj, "Rassenforschung in Jugoslawien," *Rassen in Donauraum* 1, 1 (1935), 8–11; Svetan Stefanovic, "Über die Rassenfrage als Kulturproblem," *Rassen in Donauraum* 1, 1 (1935), 12–15; George Banu, "Beiträge zur Rassengeschichte und Rassenbiologie der Rumänen," *Rassen in Donauraum* 1, 1 (1935), 16–20; and Emil Wiktorin, "Rassenforschung in Ungarn," *Rassen in Donauraum* 1, 1 (1935), 21–28.

[35] See also Virginie Alexandresco, "Enseignement officiel et particulier de la puericulture et vulgarisation de l'hygiène enfantile en Roumanie," *Annales de médecine et de chirurgie infantile* 2 (1907), 474–479.

[36] See Ludwig Hirschfeld and Hanka Hirschfeld, "Serological Differences between the Blood of Different Races," *The Lancet* 197, 2 (18 October 1919), 675–679; and Julius Tandler, *Ehe- und Bevölkerungspolitik* (Vienna: Perles, 1924).

[37] Petru Râmneanţu, "Sânge şi glie," *Buletin eugenic şi biopolitic* 14, 11–12 (1943), 370–392. Literally, *glie* means "soil," but in Romanian it is used to express figuratively the "homeland." Râmneanţu's idea of "Blood and Homeland" partly resembles the Nazi idea of "Blut und Boden" in that it fuses

the *völkisch* tradition of the nation with archaic mythologies of belonging. It also departs from the Nazi slogan in that it never promoted a policy of extermination of "less valuable" (*Minderwertigen*) races. See Richard Walther Darré, *Das Bauerntum als Lebensquell der nordischen Rasse* (Munich: J. F. Lehmanns Verlag, 1928); and Richard Walther Darré, *Neuadel aus Blut und Boden* (Munich: J. F. Lehmanns Verlag, 1930).

[38] See Emilio Gentile, "The Myth of National Regeneration in Italy: From Modernist Avant-Garde to Fascism," in Matthew Affron and Mark Antliff, eds., *Art and Ideology in France and Italy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 25–45.

[39] See Pauline M. H. Mazumdar, "Blood and Soil: The Serology of the Aryan Racial State," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 64 (1990), 187–219. Romanian and Hungarian eugenicists, Râmneanţu included, have produced numerous serological interpretations of the ethnic groups in Transylvania. See Petru Râmneanţu and Petru David, "Cercetări asupra originii entice a populaţiei din sud-estul Tranilvaniei pe baza compoziţiei serologice a sângelui," *Buletin eugenic şi biopolitic* 6, 1–3 (1935), 36–76; and Lajos Csík and Ernő Kállay, *Vércsoport vizsgálatok Kalotaszegi községekben* (Kolozsvár: Minerva, 1942).

[40] Lajos Méhely, "Blut und Rasse," *Zeitschrift für Morphologie und Anthropologie* 34 (1934), 244–257, especially 257.

[41] Iuliu Moldovan, *Statul etnic* (Sibiu: Tip. 'Cartea Românească din Cluj,' 1943).

[42] See Bucur, *Eugenics and Modernization in Interwar Romania*, 145–148.

[43] See Marius Turda, "Fantasies of Degeneration: Some Remarks on Racial Anti-Semitism in Interwar Romania," *Studia Iudaica* 3 (2003), 336–348.

[44] In 1940, with the adoption of a new constitution, the Minister of Justice, Ioan V. Gruia (1895–195?) declared: We consider Romanian blood as a fundamental element in the founding of the nation." See Ioan V. Gruia, "Expunere de motive la decretul lege nr. 2650/1940 privitor la reglementarea situaţiei juridice a evreilor din România," *Monitorul Official* 183 (9 August 1940). Reproduced in *Martiriul evreilor din Romania, 1940–1944. Documente şi mărturii* (Bucharest: Hasefer, 1991), 14–21.

[45] A good example of this new scholarship is Margit Szöllösi-Janze, ed., *Science in the Third Reich* (Oxford and New York: Berg, 2001).

[46] See Roger Griffin, *The Nature of Fascism* (London: Routledge, 1993); Emilio Gentile, *The Sacralization of Politics in Fascist Italy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1994); Paul J. Weindling, *Health, Race and German Politics between National Unification and Nazism, 1870–1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); and Edward Ross Dickinson, "Biopolitics, Fascism, Democracy: Some Reflections on Our Discourse about 'Modernity'," *Central European History* 37, 1 (2004), 1–48.

[47] For a similar endeavour, although conducted from a different analytical perspective, see Marek Kohn, *The Race Gallery. The Return of Racial Science* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1995). See also Amir Weiner, ed., *Landscaping the Human Garden. Twentieth-Century Population Management in a Comparative Framework* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003).

Part I

ETHNOGRAPHY AND RACIAL ANTHROPOLOGY

German "Race Psychology" and Its Implementation in Central Europe: Egon von Eickstedt and Rudolf Hippius

Egbert Klautke

"Race psychology" claims to explain the characteristics, cultural abilities, and mental traits of nations and peoples by analysing their racial composition. It postulates that these characteristics or mental traits are linked to races in a hereditary and naturally determined fashion, thus existing independently of "external," social factors. From this perspective, the physical characteristics of people, in which traditional physical anthropology was predominantly interested, are perceived as indicators of mental and intellectual qualities. For proponents of "race psychology," the specific mental quality of a nation constitutes its identity; at the same time, mental differences constitute the essential differences between nations. Thus defined, "race psychology" formed the core of scientific racism which dominated disciplines such as anthropology and psychology in the first half of the twentieth century. Fritz Lenz (1887–1976), who in 1923 became the first associate professor of racial hygiene in Germany at the University of Munich and later a departmental director of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Human Heredity, Anthropology, and Eugenics in Berlin, never described himself as a "race psychologist," and indeed rarely used the term at all. Yet in the most important German textbook on "Human Heredity" (*Menschliche Erblehre*), Lenz insisted that: "if it was only about physical racial differences (…) then the whole question of race would be meaningless."[1] In this text, Lenz dedicated a long chapter to the "inheritance of mental traits," thus demonstrating his belief that the main principles of "race psychology" were the core of all racial studies.

Lenz's position is indicative of the general attitude of academics towards the field of "race psychology" during the Third Reich. While its principles formed the basis of almost all academic and political theories of race—including those of the best-known Nazi ideologues—

most scholars and academics were reluctant to establish a new discipline under the banner of "race psychology" at university level. The institutionalization of "race psychology" made only slow progress during the 1930s. There were a number of individual attempts and pioneering studies which sought to establish "race psychology" as a discipline, but no "school of race psychology" was founded, and no chair established at a German university. At the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology in Berlin, one of the centres devoted to racial research in Nazi Germany, a Department for Hereditary Psychology under Kurt Gottschaldt (1902–1991) was created in 1935, but the research conducted there was concerned with individual heredity rather than the psychology of races.[2]

Instead, from the early 1920s, and increasingly so during the Third Reich, the formulation of theories of "race psychology" was left to two popular authors, Hans F. K. Günther (1891–1968) and Ludwig Ferdinand Clauss (1892–1974). Both were active in the "Nordic Movement" and, judging by the print-run of their books, became the most successful racial theorists in interwar Germany.[3] The justification of "race psychology" that Günther gave in his most comprehensive study of the racial makeup of the German people bears a strong similarity to Fritz Lenz's statement, quoted above: "If the human races differed only in their physical hereditary traits, then the study of racial appearances would be of much less interest. The mental hereditary differences of the human races cause the obvious differences in habit and appearance, in the deeds and works of individual peoples."[4]

With the help of the National Socialists, Günther and Clauss were able to pursue academic careers in the 1930s. Aided by the National Socialist state government of Thuringia, Günther was made professor at the University of Jena in 1930, and moved on to a chair at the University of Berlin in 1933. Clauss became a lecturer at the University of Berlin soon afterwards, but lost his job in 1943 because he had employed a Jewish research assistant (whom he saved from execution). Despite their academic careers under the Nazi regime, both Günther and Clauss remained outsiders in relation to the established scientific community. With backgrounds in the humanities—Günther had been a secondary-school teacher of German language and literature, and Clauss was a philosopher by training and onetime research assistant to Edmund Husserl (1859–1938) at the University of Freiburg—they were usually looked upon by anthropologists and psychologists with unease and suspicion.[5]

Both Günther and Clauss promoted the idea that the European nations were comprised of six distinct racial groups, each of which displayed typical physical and mental traits; they popularized typologies of these European racial groups based on photographs held to be typical representatives of these racial groups.[6] Although Günther claimed to work on a sound scientific basis and presented his writings as serious research, he relied almost entirely on secondary literature and the interpretation of rather arbitrarily chosen pictures, including paintings and drawings, alongside photographs. The Nordic race evidently constituted an ideal for him and served as the yardstick by which all other racial groups were to be judged: "If one studies the talents of different races by looking at the number of creative (*schöpferische*) individuals [they produced], then the Nordic race is exceptionally gifted."[7] In contrast to other anthropologists, Günther and Clauss made no qualms about calling their studies "race psychology"—or, in Clauss's case, *Rassenseelenkunde*, the term *Seelenkunde* being a means of avoiding the un-German term *Psychologie*. Their academic influence, however, was ambiguous and limited. Neither succeeded in establishing a school of race psychology, and despite the enormous success of their books, the scientific community adopted an ambivalent and awkward attitude towards their ideas.

Nevertheless, there were a number of "proper" academics who were convinced that "race psychology" was a desideratum to be developed further. These scholars attempted to strip race psychology of its political-populist character and introduce it into the scientific mainstream. One of these academics was Egon von Eickstedt (1892–1965), professor and director of the Institute of Anthropology and Ethnology at the University of Breslau from 1931 until 1945. Eickstedt was the head of the so-called Breslau school of anthropology that was in competition with the school of Eugen Fischer (1874–1967), based at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology in Berlin. Like most German anthropologists, Eickstedt had studied medicine, thereafter specializing in social anthropology as a student of Felix von Luschan (1854–1924). In the 1920s, he became an expert on ethnic groups in South Asia, and a member of the German expedition in South Asia organized by the Research Institute for Social Anthropology in Leipzig.[8] In 1934, he published a comprehensive *Rassenkunde und Rassengeschichte der Menschheit* (Racial Study and Racial History of Humanity) as well as the study *Die rassischen Grundlagen des deutschen Volkstums* (Racial

Foundations of the German People). From 1935, he edited the *Zeitschrift für Rassenkunde* (Journal for Racial Studies). In 1936, he published a programmatic research essay on the *Grundlagen der Rassenpsychologie* (Foundations of Race Psychology) that was meant to establish his version of anthropology as the general approach to the field.[9]

Eickstedt's ambition as head of the Breslau school was to define and establish anthropology as a "holistic" science. This new approach would provide explanations of the physical as well as the psychological characteristics of races by combining and integrating the findings of the humanities, the social sciences, and the disciplines of medicine and biology. In this way, Eickstedt believed, it would be possible to overcome the scientific "positivism" of the nineteenth century, which had "atomized" the sciences, thereby restricting, rather than advancing, scholarship. Anthropology, Eickstedt claimed, needed to shake off this negative legacy in order to adopt the findings of all disciplines engaged in the "research of man." To achieve this aim, Eickstedt called for more systematic research on the psychological aspects of anthropology: "Within races, the same causality operates as within individuals. So quite logically, the physical racial form finds its equivalent in a mental racial form."[10]

Eickstedt defined races as "those zoological and biological living groups of body forms whose members show similar normal and hereditary traits." In accordance with popular and academic definitions, he made a clear distinction between "race" and "people" (*Volk*) as a cultural-traditional community. Peoples were "based on races, and races represented themselves in peoples," but the two categories were not to be confused.[11] Similarly, Günther's starting point for his racial studies was the differentiation between "race" and "people," or "nation"; his main reason for introducing a conception of six European racial groups was to abolish the idea of a "Germanic," or a "Slavonic," race. According to Günther, all European nations were mixtures of the six racial groups that he had defined; hence the idea of a "Germanic race" was misleading, because it lumped together the ideas of race and nation.[12]

Eickstedt's study on the *Grundlagen der Rassenpsychologie* was meant to set the research programme of a "holistic" anthropology and establish "race psychology" as an integral part of it. He put special emphasis on the introduction of the so-called "race formula" that would enable the researcher to define the degree of mixtures of racial

groups in given populations. After 1939, the race experts of the Race and Settlement Main Office (RuSHA) of the SS used their own version of a "race formula" to determine which parts of the population in the territories occupied by the Germans were to be resettled. The SS' "race formula" resembled Eickstedt's proposal of 1936; whether the RuSHA was directly influenced or inspired by Eickstedt's proposals remains unclear.[13] Eickstedt believed that, by introducing the "race formula," he had developed sound scientific methods with which to prove common racial typologies. Hence, despite his criticism of the inadequacy of the methods employed in Hans F. K. Günther's studies, Eickstedt adhered to the racial typologies that Günther had popularized.[14]

Eickstedt's ambivalent attitude towards the work of Günther was representative of German academics in the Third Reich. Most anthropologists and psychologists applauded Günther for his intuitive insights into the racial composition of European nations and used varieties of his typology but criticized his intuitive and hermeneutic approach (*Wesensschau*), which, they contended, ought to be replaced by proper scientific methods. In his empirical work, Eickstedt followed this general attitude and applied Günther's typology, especially his nomenclature: Eickstedt's work was based on the assumption that a "Nordic race group" really existed alongside Eastern, Eastern-Baltic, Dinaric, and Western groups, albeit in mixed forms within a given population.[15]

Eickstedt's search for adequate scientific methods within race psychology drew him to the American version of race psychology. He showed particular interest in a comprehensive study published in 1931 by Thomas Russell Garth (1872–1939), under the title *Race psychology*.[16] Garth, a graduate of Yale University who had become professor of psychology at the University of Denver, had summarized the findings of more than one hundred empirical studies on the psychical differences between racial groups in the United States, conducted since the time of the First World War. Although the evidence of empirical material that Garth reported on had shaken his confidence in a close correlation between "race" and intelligence—a lack of confidence which Eickstedt did not share—the German professor showed a keen interest in the methods of American test psychologists. American "race psychology" had, he became convinced, found a means of proving beyond doubt the psychical differences between racial groups; it followed that German psychologists should make use of the American school of race psychology and adopt its quantitative methods. In his

own work, however, Eickstedt did not adopt the research methods developed by American psychologists; instead, he stuck to the traditional study of physical characteristics found in the anthropological variety.[17]

The most important research project conducted by Eickstedt's Breslau school in the 1930s was the *Rassenuntersuchung Schlesiens* (The Race Study of Silesia).[18] This study was a large-scale research project for the racial screening of the Silesian population. Eickstedt's and his co-workers' aim was to document the racial characteristics of the entire population of Silesia in order to prove the predominantly "Nordic" character of the population in this contested region. Crucially, however, Eickstedt's research team restricted their sample to "healthy and normally built male persons aged between 20 and 50 years." Thus the study excluded women and the urban population, since these would include "non-settled elements of the population which would obscure the racial picture of the local population." Despite these restrictions, the Breslau research team managed to diagnose about a tenth of the Silesian rural population, and by 1940 they had registered 65,000 persons in thirty-seven districts and eight hundred villages. The anthropologists measured their skulls, noses, height, and body stature, and categorized the color of their hair and eyes. Next, the physical characteristics of each person were correlated, resulting in Eickstedt's "race formula" for each tested individual. According to its inventor, the "race formula" proved a great success because it allowed the quantification of the data that had been collected: "The approach of the Breslau school is the racial diagnosis on the basis of the race formula. The essence of this race formula lies in the summary of an individual racial appearance by means of a short and unambiguous equation (*Ausdruck*). Instead of vague guessing, there is now controlled measurement. Its basis is the registration of single traits, its ultimate goal the exact knowledge of a living type."[19]

"The Race Study of Silesia" received funding from the German Research Association (*Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*); this can be seen as an indicator of the esteem in which the scientific community held Eickstedt's research.[20] At the same time, the study served a political purpose. Eickstedt and his team of researchers were encouraged and aided by the SS officer Fritz Arlt, the local representative of the "Reich's Commissar for the Stabilization of the German Nation" in Upper Silesia. Arlt had earned his doctorate with a study on race psy-

chology, and had also co-edited the publications of Eickstedt's research on Silesia.[21] The reasons for a study on the racial makeup of Silesia originated in the ethnic-political struggles between Germany and Poland after the First World War. Eickstedt tried to provide scientific evidence for the notion that the majority of the Silesian population were of "Nordic stock," and hence German. In the light of this, Eickstedt maintained, Polish claims to Silesia were unjustified. According to Eickstedt, "The Race Study of Silesia" had been successful in proving this point: "In Silesia, we find Nordic people in great numbers."[22] After the beginning of the Second World War and the German occupation of Poland, the data collected by Eickstedt's team proved to be of yet greater use for German politicians and administrators, insofar as it was used to support the implementation of German resettlement policies.[23] Eickstedt's research team joined an army of experts involved in the policies of ethnic cleansing in Central Europe during the Second World War.

Another academic race psychologist whose work was even more closely connected to these policies, and the academic institutions of the SS that supported them, was the psychologist Rudolf Hippius (1906–1945). As an ethnic German from Estonia, Hippius was personally affected by German attempts to redraw the ethnic map of Central and Eastern Europe. After graduating from the University of Dorpat (Tartu) in 1929, Hippius had worked as a postgraduate student of Felix Krüger (1874–1948), professor at the prestigious Institute of Psychology at the University of Leipzig. In 1934, Hippius received his doctorate from the University of Dorpat for a study in experimental psychology.[24] He then taught at the University of Dorpat as lecturer in psychology until 1939. During this time, he conducted so-called "character and ability studies" on the ethnic German population in Estonia and Lithuania. These studies, which served as a blueprint for his later research at the Reich University of Posen, already attracted the attention of the SS in Germany, and were subsequently sponsored by the Office for the Support of Ethnic Germans (VoMi, *Volksdeutsche Mittelstelle*).[25] In 1939, Hippius responded to the "call back home" from the German Reich after the occupation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union, in accordance with the German-Soviet non-aggression pact of 1939. After a short spell as a psychologist with the German army, in 1940 Hippius became lecturer in psychology at the recently established Reich University in Posen (Poznan). In 1942 he moved to

Prague, where he became professor of social and national psychology at the German Charles University, as well as deputy director of the Reinhard Heydrich Foundation.[26]

On his arrival in Germany, Hippius wasted no time in offering his services to the Nazi authorities. On 5 December 1939, he sent a letter to Professor Konrad Meyer (1901–1973), member of the SS and one of the authors of the *Generalplan Ost* (General Plan East), in which Hippius suggested conducting a psychological study to aid "demographic planning" in the Posen area. The letter included a draft proposal for a research project that would scrutinize the "human building material" in the annexed Polish territory, on the basis of its "ability to work, social attitudes, character structure, and suitability." The results of this study would provide the "raw material" for demographic policies "according to the principles of the National Socialist living order," and would make possible the "best exploitation of the human building material through adequate usage."[27] Hippius's draft proposal was forwarded to the office of Heinrich Himmler (1900–1945)—the "Reich's Commissar for the Stabilization of the German Nation" (*Reichssicherheitshauptamt*, RSHA)—where it caught the attention of the historian and SS *Obersturmführer*, Hans-Joachim Beyer (1908–1971). "The Race and Settlement Main Office" of the SS (RuSHA) agreed to fund Hippius's project with the sum of 2,500 Reichsmark so that he could test his methods. Beyer became, in due course, Hippius's closest collaborator and was responsible for his move to the University of Posen and, in 1942, to the Charles University and the Reinhard Heydrich Foundation in Prague. Hippius's proposed study was to provide much-welcomed expertise for local SS administrators in the Posen area.

Shortly after the occupation of the Western Polish provinces in September 1939, the German administrators were faced with a major obstacle to their plans for expelling the Polish population and replacing them with ethnic Germans from as yet unoccupied Eastern Europe. The administration of the annexed parts of Poland—especially Western Prussia (*Danzig*) and Posen (*Warthegau*)—encountered difficulties in distinguishing between ethnic Germans and Poles. In a detailed memorandum on the policies of ethnic cleansing in the area around Posen, the local representative of the Security Service (*Sicherheitsdienst*) of the SS, Herbert Strickner, described these difficulties: "After the introduction of a German administration (…) a number of difficulties arose, because no one was at all able to tell the difference between a German

and a Pole."[28] There was a general lack of reliable census data; moreover, a number of organizations of ethnic Germans had, according to Strickner, indiscriminately given out certificates to people who wanted to claim German citizenship, regardless of their "ethnic" origin and without much testing. As a result of this, the Security Service, in cooperation with the office of the *Gauleiter* in the Posen area, Arthur Greiser (1897–1946), created a "List of Ethnic Germans" (later to become the "German People's List"), which would provide a register of all ethnic Germans in the *Warthegau* to whom German citizenship would be granted.

The first version of this register introduced two categories as means of identifying ethnic Germans. Category A included those who had been members of German political organizations or cultural associations before 1939, and Category B consisted of people who were undoubtedly of German stock (that is, those who spoke German and were Protestants), but had been prohibited by "Polish terror" from showing their allegiance to the German nation. Applicants for the "German People's List" had to fill in a detailed questionnaire and undergo testing by a commission of German administrators and members of the SD. According to Strickner, this procedure made it possible to identify the "core group of ethnic Germans" (*Kerntruppe des Deutschtums*) which would be granted German citizenship.[29] This original version of the "German People's List" did not, however, resolve all problems facing the German administration. Despite Strickner's insistence that no German-Polish "Zwischenschicht" (a mixed "ethnic layer in-between") existed in the Posen area, the large number of mixed German-Polish marriages posed a threat to his clear distinction between "Germans" and "Poles" that underpinned the utopian idea of ethnic cleansing (*völkische Flurbereinigung*). Hence, in May 1940, the new Category C was added to the "German People's List" in Posen. This introduced the inclusion of people who were of German origin but "had slithered into the Polish nation," especially those from mixed German-Polish families. This category included ethnic Germans who, for personal and material reasons, had renounced their German heritage in the interwar period. These people, Strickner claimed, had to be considered traitors to their nation and people (*Gesinnungslumpen im volkspolitischen Sinne*). Nevertheless, since they were not yet completely Polonized and carried "German blood," they could not be allowed to strengthen the Polish nation with their Germanic stock, and thus had to be re-Ger-

manized. Finally, in January 1941, Category D was added to include "persons of German origin who have disappeared into the Polish nation but should be reclaimed for the German nation." This least favorable category would also include those Polish spouses of ethnic Germans who had been entered into Category C, to whom German citizenship would be granted on probation only. In March 1941, the procedure developed by the local administration in Posen (Poznan) for the "German People's List" provided the blueprint for a general law in the German Reich; categories A to D were simply renamed I to IV.[30]

Strickner's detailed report on the creation of the "German People's List" in the Posen area made explicit use of Rudolf Hippius's studies. Strickner's report referred to Hippius's work—and that of his colleague Hans-Joachim Beyer—as a "valuable contribution to the whole problem of Categories III and IV in the 'German People's List.'"[31] Hippius's work was especially helpful for Strickner and his colleagues, who had to rely on conventional, non-"racial" criteria, like language, religion, and national allegiance, in drawing up the "German People's List." Strickner was convinced that Hippius's study demonstrated that these cultural criteria were determined by racial factors, and consequently could be used as indicators for ethnicity. Strickner drew here upon a major empirical study on people of mixed Polish-German background that Hippius had conducted at the University of Posen (Poznan) in 1942. Shortly after his arrival in Posen (Poznan) in 1940, Hippius had drafted a memorandum on his proposed research project, which outlined the necessity and usefulness of such a study.[32] The main political purpose of the study was to provide greater knowledge of the least favourable and—in the eyes of the German occupiers—the most problematic categories, Categories III and IV, of the "German People's List." The studies were carried out with the aid of several teams of interviewers, who tested a total of 877 people. Of these, 262 persons belonged to Category III, 310 persons to Category IV, while 305 persons constituted Poles who had not been registered on the "German People's List."[33] Among the interviewers was the biologist Konrad Lorenz (1903–1989), who was later to win the Nobel Prize for his work in ethology.[34] The team concluded that there were "genetic values (*Erbwerte*) which are fixed according to peoples, and which undergo specific and regular changes when peoples interbreed." By testing and comparing the emotional behavior of separate groups, Hippius and his team tried to "shed light on the psychological background to national

character, namely as a hereditary condition as well as a *völkisch* sentiment."[35] While Hippius accepted that European nations were racially mixed, he maintained that these mixtures had been "stabilized" and could therefore be distinguished. Thus a "Polish genetic substance" was distinguished from a "German" one. It followed that the findings of the study were quite predictable. Hippius claimed to have proved that a mixture of the basic "mental," or psychological, structure of Germans and Poles would lead to negative results. The German basic structure (*Grundstruktur*) was characterized by "persistence, dependence, energetic dynamism, and aggravated dynamism." The Polish character, in contrast, showed "openness to the fullness of life, compulsive dynamism, and a poverty of vital roots."[36] The analysis of the productivity of people of German-Polish background concluded that "the German aptitude for working ability was largely lost in interbreeding," and that "substantial damages in an interbred population mean not only an irksome population difficult to guide, but a considerable defect also in practical and civil life."[37]

Hippius's approach to "race psychology"—or, as he preferred to call it, "ethnic (or national) psychology" (*Völkerpsychologie*)—was a cross between traditional and modern racial studies. The methods applied by Hippius and his team differed considerably from older forms of anthropology, like those of the "Breslau school" or Eugen Fischer's approach. Hippius, trained as a modern experimental psychologist, used association and aptitude tests, not unlike the American race psychologists in which Eickstedt had shown so much interest. He ignored the traditional approach of physical anthropology that measured skulls and categorized hair colors; similarly, he did not explicitly rely on Günther's or other popular typologies of European races. Implicitly, however, insofar as Hippius adopted the categories of the "German People's List" derived from such racial typologies, his study served not only to reaffirm these typologies, but also to establish them as scientific facts.

Hippius was not greatly concerned with the distinctions between "race" and "nation," or "people." He employed a range of extravagant neologisms and avoided the established language of racial studies, so that the racist nature of his approach emerges only upon close inspection and contextualization. On the one hand, the design and conduct of the study of Germans and Poles in Posen (Poznan) resembled modern empirical social-science research; but on the other, Hippius was engaged

in an already classical topic of scientific racism, *Mischlingsforschung*—that is, research on racially mixed people which had provided the impetus for Eugen Fischer's career. Hippius thus tried to prove, once and for all, the validity of the belief that interbreeding and the mixing of races had undesirable results and was to be avoided. It was not Hippius's methods that made his work racist, but rather the basic categories and assumptions that these methods were to prove, not least the political purposes of the "Posen study" and its ultimate implementation. Hippius worked at the heart of the scientific network that the SS had established in the occupied territories, and the data that his research team produced was immediately put to use by the German administration in occupied Poland in the service of the "Germanization of the land and the people."

Hippius's study of Germans and Poles in Posen (Poznan) remained his only major piece of research completed during the war. Plans were made for the continuation of this form of psychological research in the "Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia" in order to complete the Germanization of the Czech lands. The situation here had, however, posed yet greater difficulties than encountered in the annexed parts of Poland. According to Karl Hermann Frank (1898–1946), the "key idea" of the policy was the "complete Germanization of space and people" by means of the "racial integration of suitable Czechs," the expulsion of "racially indigestible Czechs," and the expulsion or "special treatment" of the Czech intelligentsia and "all other destructive elements."[38] A precondition for this aim, as Reinhard Heydrich (1904–1942) reminded his colleague Frank, was the complete racial screening of the population in Bohemia and Moravia. In October 1940, Adolf Hitler (1889–1945) issued an order legitimizing Heydrich's ideas.[39] Due to the importance of the Czech military industry to the German war effort, however, German administrators were cautious not to stir up protest among the Czech population, and thus proceeded in a much less open and less brutal way than in the Posen and Danzig areas. The completion of the "Germanization" of Bohemia and Moravia—the resettlement of large parts of the Czech population—was postponed until after the war. Hippius and his team arrived too late in Prague to conduct another major research project in support of these plans; he was subsequently killed during the Red Army occupation of Prague in 1945.[40]

Both Egon von Eickstedt and Rudolf Hippius sought to apply the

results of their research in the German borderlands of Central Europe: Eickstedt's major research project from the mid-1930s, the "Racial Study of Silesia," tried to show that, contrary to Polish claims, the Silesian population was of predominantly "Nordic" stock. The methods applied in this research project, Eickstedt claimed, had modernized older forms of physical anthropology and provided a basis by which the racial makeup of whole populations might be judged. Eickstedt's research, nevertheless, was more traditional than he pretended. He was aware of the shortcomings of popular typologies of race groups like Günther's, and wanted to turn them into proper scientific theories, but he remained wedded to traditional methods of physical anthropology, such as craniology and phrenology, that assumed that the physical appearance of people gave clues to their mentality and character.

The significance of the "Breslau school" lies less in its connection with Nazi policies during the Second World War than in the fact that Eickstedt and his team were able to survive the collapse of the Third Reich and re-establish themselves in the Federal Republic of Germany, at the newly founded University of Mainz. Here Eickstedt became professor of anthropology in 1947 and was able to continue his work in the Federal Republic of Germany. After the Second World War, he and his student Ilse Schwidetzky (1907–1997)—who had followed him to Mainz and would succeed him as professor of anthropology—made some semantic concessions to the new political circumstances.

Until the early 1960s, the term "race" was dropped and was replaced by less suspicious-sounding terminology. Schwidetzky, for instance, now wrote of *Völkerbiologie* (national biology) instead of racial studies; Eickstedt gave the completely revised and enlarged three-volume edition of his "Racial Study and Racial History of Humanity" the title *Forschung am Menschen* (Research on Man). *Zeitschrift für Rassenkunde* was renamed *Homo* and became the official journal of the German Association of Anthropology. Thus Eickstedt finally achieved his aim of establishing his "Breslau school" as the leading anthropological school in the Federal Republic of Germany, albeit only in a much-overlooked niche of the academic field.[41]

Compared to Eickstedt, Rudolf Hippius represented a particularly modern version of racial research in the Third Reich. He specialized in the "psychology of peoples" and developed his own method of "screening" populations and their racial composition. He used interviews and associations tests to study the mentality of racial groups.

Although Hippius avoided the terminology of traditional physical anthropology and racial theories (in fact he developed an inventive, if not esoteric, language of his own), and although he did not use the craniological and phrenological methods that Eickstedt had relied on, the purpose and the outcomes of his research proved to be no less racist than Eickstedt's more traditional approach: they helped to decide the national-ethnic classification of Poles according to the categories of the "German People's List," and hence were instrumental in the "resettlement" of large parts of the population in the occupied parts of Poland.

Endnotes:

[1] Erwin Baur, Eugen Fischer, Fritz Lenz, *Menschliche Erblehre*, vol. 1 (Munich: J. F. Lehmanns, 1936), 713. On Lenz, see Robert N. Proctor, *Racial Hygiene. Medicine under the Nazis* (Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press 1995), 46–63; Proctor relies heavily on Renate Rissom, *Fritz Lenz und die Rassenhygiene* (Husum: Matthiesen, 1983).

[2] See Mitchell G. Ash, *Gestaltpsychology in German Culture, 1890–1967: Holism and the Quest for Objectivity* (Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 356–360; on the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute in Berlin, see Peter Weingart, Kurt Bayertz, Jürgen Kroll, *Rasse, Blut und Gene. Geschichte der Eugenik und Rassenhygiene in Deutschland*, 2nd. ed. (Frankfurt-am-Main: Suhrkamp, 1996), 239–246, 396–424; Niels C. Lösch, *Rasse als Konstrukt. Leben und Werk Eugen Fischers* (Frankfurt-am-Main: Peter Lang, 1996); and Paul Weindling, *Health, Race and German Politics between National Unification and Nazism, 1870–1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 430–439.

[3] On Günther, see the problematic monograph by Hans-Jürgen Lutzhöft, *Der Nordische Gedanke in Deutschland, 1920–1940* (Stuttgart: Klett, 1971); on Clauss, see Peter Weingart, *Doppel-Leben. Ludwig Ferdinand Clauss: Zwischen Rassenforschung und Widerstand* (Frankfurt-am-Main: Campus, 1995).

[4] Hans F. K. Günther, *Rassenkunde des deutschen Volkes*, 17th ed. (Munich: J. F. Lehmanns, 1933 [first ed. 1922]), 190. See also Hans F. K. Günther, *Rassenkunde Europas* (Munich: J. F. Lehmanns, 1925); and Hans F. K. Günther, *Kleine Rassenkunde des deutschen Volkes* (Munich: J. F. Lehmanns, 1929).

[5] A typical and similar example is Friedrich Keiter, *Rassenpsychologie. Einführung in eine werdende Wissenschaft* (Leipzig: Reclam, 1941), 14. See also Wilhelm E. Mühlmann, *Rassen- und Völkerkunde* (Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1936); Bruno Petermann, *Das Problem der Rassenseele. Vorlesungen zur Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Rassenpsychologie* (Leipzig: Barth, 1935); Eduard Ortner, *Biologische Typen des Menschen und ihr Verhalten zu Rasse und Wert. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Clauss'schen Rassenpsychologie* (Leipzig: Thieme, 1937); Kurt Rau, *Untersuchungen zur Rassenpsychologie nach typologischer Methode* (Leipzig: Barth, 1936); and Ottmar Rutz, *Grundlagen einer psychologischen Rassenkunde* (Tübingen: Heine, 1934).

[6] Günther, *Rassenkunde des deutschen Volkes*; and Ludwig Ferdinand Clauss, *Rasse und Seele. Eine Einführung in den Sinn der leiblichen Gestalt*, 3rd ed. (Munich: J. F. Lehmanns, 1933).

[7] Günther, *Rassenkunde des deutschen Volkes*, 197.

[8] Egon Freiherr von Eickstedt, "Anthropologische Forschungen in Südindien," *Anthropologischer Anzeiger* 6, 1 (1929), 64–85; Egon Freiherr von Eickstedt, "Die Indien-Expedition des Staatlichen Forschungsinstituts für Völkerkunde zu Leipzig. Erster ethnographischer Bericht," *Ethnologischer Anzeiger* 1 (1927), 277–285; and Egon Freiherr von Eickstedt, *Untersuchungen an philipinischen Negrito-Skeletten. Ein Beitrag zum Pygmäenproblem und zur osteomorphologischen Methodik* (Stuttgart: Schweizerbart, 1931).