Science behind the Lines: The Effects of World War I on Anthropology in Germany[1]

Andrew D. Evans

Just days after the outbreak of war in August 1914, the anthropologist Felix von Luschan arrived in Australia, a country that had become Germany's enemy during his steamship journey from Europe. As a prominent professor of anthropology at the University of Berlin, Luschan planned to attend the international conference of the British Association for the Advancement of Sciences as an honored guest, along with several of his German colleagues. His stay in Australia was to be the first stop on a larger anthropological research trip to New Zealand, India, and Indonesia.[2] For an anthropologist like Luschan, the conference was a major event; leading figures in the British field, such as W. H. R. Rivers, were scheduled to present papers.[3] The meeting of the British Association proceeded normally at first, and the attitude toward the German participants was open and friendly. The various speakers, including the president of the British Association, emphasized the international character of all science, even during wartime, and praised German contributions

1 I would like to thank Monique Scheer, Reinhard Johler, and Christian Marchetti for their insightful comments and useful suggestions during the preparation of this chapter. I am also grateful to the University of Chicago Press for giving permission to use material from my book, *Anthropology at War: World War I and the Science of Race in Germany,* in this chapter.

2 Felix von Luschan to the Rektor of the Handelshochschule in Berlin, May 22, 1914, Archiv der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin [HU], F. v. Luschan Personal-Akten, UK-L252, Bd. 1, Bl. 5.

3 "Proceedings of Societies: Anthropology at the British Association for the Advancement of Science, 1914," *Man* 14 (1914): 171–175.

to learning.[4] In Adelaide, Luschan was even awarded an honorary doctorate, after which he "was cheered as never before in my life."[5]

This friendly mood did not last for long, however. Luschan complained of having to stand and remove his hat for the national anthems of England, France, Russia, and Belgium several times a day during the conference.[6] "If those people had had the Serbian and Montenegrin anthems, they would have served those four or five times daily too."[7] Official friendliness also abruptly ceased. Luschan was not allowed to travel to New Zealand, and an initial offer for him to conduct scientific work in Australian museums was rescinded. Eventually, the authorities became more interested in the scientists. One of the German academics, Fritz Gräbner, was arrested and imprisoned on the charge of smuggling documents.[8] Another scientist, Albrecht Penck, was taken into custody and shipped to London, where he spent the first several months of the war under a loose form of house arrest.[9] Three weeks after his arrival in Australia, Luschan and his wife managed to escape on an American steamer bound for Honolulu, where they spent several weeks before finally traveling to San Francisco and then to New York. Over the next ten months, Luschan struggled unsuccessfully to find passage back to Germany.

Under the influence of war, the initially open and international tone of the British conference in Australia rapidly deteriorated. The experiences of Luschan, Penck, and Gräbner in Australia illustrate the direct and immediate impact of World War I on the wider scientific community, and, more specifically, on the discipline of anthropology in Germany. In Luschan's case, the outbreak of war disrupted his plans for anthropological research abroad, poisoned the atmosphere of national cooperation at an international conference, and put him under suspicion as a spy.[10] Perhaps more importantly, the

4 Felix von Luschan, "In Australien und Amerika," *Berlin Vossische Zeitung,* January 31, 1915.

5 Ibid.

6 Felix von Luschan to "Herr Rechnungsrat," "Am Sedantag" [September 2], 1914, Archiv des Museum für Völkerkunde, Berlin [MfVB], I/MfV 193, IIIc, Band 21. It is significant that Luschan dated his letter "Sedan day." That date, which marked the anniversary of the Prussian victory over France in 1870, was one of the most patriotic Prussian holidays.

7 Idem, "In Australien und Amerika."

8 "Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 47 (1915): 242–270.

9 Albrecht Penck to Felix von Luschan, Feb. 8, 1915, File Penck, Nachlaß Felix Luschans, Handschriftenabteilung, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preußischer Kulturbesitz [NL Luschan].

10 German-speaking anthropologists were not alone in this regard. Bronislav Malinowski, a Polish subject of the Austrian Empire who had lived for four years in Great Britain, remained in Australia as an "enemy alien" after the

atmosphere of extreme nationalism that Luschan noted in Australia was also peaking in European countries in the fall of 1914, as a surge of national feeling swept across nations like Germany. As Luschan fled Australia, German academics back home were rallying to the German flag with an intense fervor, mobilizing themselves and their disciplines for the war effort.[11] Beginning in the fall of 1914, German science, including Luschan's discipline of anthropology, now operated in a new environment, defined by the realities of war and framed by nationalistic mentalities.

The goal of this chapter is to examine how this new wartime context affected the institutional circumstances and ideological orientation of physical anthropology in Germany. As one might expect, any examination of anthropology during World War I plunges the scholar into larger debates about continuity and discontinuity in the history of the discipline. A central disagreement in recent scholarship is whether or not anthropology in Germany changed fundamentally between the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Andrew Zimmerman has argued that clear lines of continuity connect the German anthropology of the late nineteenth century with the race science of the 1920s and 1930s. As anthropology in Germany institutionalized during the late nineteenth century, he maintains, it offered an "anti-humanist" alternative to the humanist and historicist paradigms that dominated the German academy. In the process, it also approached colonial subjects with a basic inhumanity that laid the foundations for National Socialist race science.[12] Robert Proctor, Benoit Massin, and Woodruff Smith, however, have argued that a major shift occurred in German-speaking anthropology and ethnology sometime in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. In these narratives of discontinuity, the discipline abandoned a pluralistic and liberal brand of anthropology championed by the renowned pathologist Rudolf Virchow and the ethnologist Adolf Bastian sometime around the turn of the century, replacing it with a racist and narrowly nationalist racial science (or *Rassenkunde*) designed to serve

British Association Conference. Despite this status, he managed to conduct his groundbreaking fieldwork in Papua and the Trobriand Islands. In 1915, Malinowski was briefly arrested by the Australian authorities when he failed to report to the local authorities in Melbourne. See Michael W. Young, *Malinowski: Odyssey of an Anthropologist, 1884–1920* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004), 289–307, 364–366.

11 Wolfgang Mommsen, "German Artists, Writers, and Intellectuals and the Meaning of War," in *State, Society, and Mobilization in Europe during the First World War,* ed. John Horne (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 21–38.

12 Andrew Zimmerman, *Anthropology and Anti-Humanism in Imperial Germany* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2001).

the interests of the state and nation.[13] One problem with many of these analyses, however, is that they fail to connect the history of the discipline in the late nineteenth century with developments in the field in the 1920s. As H. Glenn Penny and Matti Bunzl have remarked, "we continue to know very little about what clearly was the contested road from liberal to Nazi anthropology."[14]

This chapter contends that World War I facilitated a final break with the liberal anthropology that had dominated the late nineteenth century. In the atmosphere of total war, German anthropologists sought to make their science more relevant to the nation and the state by mobilizing their disciplinary authority as experts on the world's peoples and applying their disciplinary tools to the war effort.[15] The result was a more politically instrumentalized and narrowly nationalistic anthropology that broke with the liberal tradition and paved the way for postwar forays into *Rassenkunde*. The war marked a decisive move away from critical elements that characterized anthropology under Virchow: internationalism within the discipline, prohibitions on engaging anthropology in politics, and liberal distinctions between the key concepts of race, nation, and *Volk* (or people). These currents were strengthened by the extreme institutional distress experienced by the anthropological community after the war. In the aftermath of the conflict in the early 1920s, anthropologists fashioned their discipline into a nationalist race science designed to counter Germany's postwar weakness. Deeply nationalist and desperate to attract the attention of the state, a growing number of younger anthropologists, many

13 Robert Proctor was among the first to identify a shift in German anthropology from Virchow's medical and physicalist *Anthropologie,* which held that race was a purely physical concept, to the racist and eugenicist *Rassenkunde* of the 1920s. Woodruff Smith and Benoit Massin see the central change as a shift from a liberal to an illiberal anthropology. See Robert Proctor, "From Anthropologie to Rassenkunde in the German Anthropological Tradition," in *Bones, Bodies, Behavior: Essays on Biological Anthropology,* ed. George W. Stocking (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988), 138–179. Also see Benoit Massin, "From Virchow to Fischer: Physical Anthropology and Modern Race Theories in Wilhelmine Germany," in *Volksgeist as Method and Ethic: Essays on Boasian Ethnography and the German Anthropological Tradition,* ed. George W. Stocking, Jr. (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996), 79–154; Woodruff Smith, *Politics and the Sciences of Culture in Germany, 1840–1920* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991). For a description of the growing consensus on the shift, see Matti Bunzl and H. Glenn Penny, "Introduction: Rethinking German Anthropology, Colonialism, and Race," in *Worldly Provincialism: German Anthropology in the Age of Empire,* eds. H. Glenn Penny and Matti Bunzl (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2003), 17–22.

14 Idem, "Introduction," 29.

15 Throughout this chapter, I use the term "anthropologist" to refer to physical anthropologists and "ethnologist" to refer to cultural anthropologists.

of whom had the war experience in common, focused on conducting racial surveys of Germans and pursuing eugenics as a means of building a stronger nation. These disciplinary interests and directions grew, in large part, out of the wartime and postwar experience.

The Liberal Tradition in German Anthropology before World War I

In the late nineteenth century, German-speaking anthropology encompassed multiple traditions and directions, but the most dominant strand was a self-consciously liberal and resolutely empirical science associated with the leading figures of the discipline: Rudolf Virchow, professor of pathology at the University of Berlin, *Reichstag* deputy, and prominent member of the left-liberal Progressive Party *[Deutsche Fortschrittspartei];* Johannes Ranke, professor of anthropology at the University of Munich; Adolf Bastian, head of the Berlin Museum für *Völkerkunde;* Julius Kollman, anatomist and anthropologist at the University of Basel; Rudolf Martin, professor of anthropology in Zurich and later Munich; and Felix von Luschan, professor of anthropology in Berlin after 1908. From their positions of influence at universities and anthropological societies, these men enforced a methodological and ideological framework for how anthropological research was to be conducted.

What made the anthropology of these men "liberal," however, was not a strict adherence to a progressive political program, but an approach to humanity that drew on liberal concepts of universalism.[16] Adopting a monogenist perspective on the origins of humankind, they consistently argued for the "unity of the human species," maintaining that physical and cultural differences among peoples were merely variations on the common of theme of humanity, and that dissimilarities were of minimal importance next to the elements that bound humanity together. All people, in other words, were united on a fundamental level by their similarities and had the capacity for intellectual improvement.[17] Virchow wrote, "I have a certain tendency […] to be enthusiastic for the idea of the unity of the human species. I admit that behind it lies a traditional, even sentimental idea […] that we really are brothers and

16 Andrew D. Evans, "A Liberal Paradigm? Race and Ideology in Late Nineteenth Century German Physical Anthropology," *Ab Imperio* 8, no. 1 (2007): 113–138; Andre Gingrich, "Liberalism in Imperial Anthropology: Notes on an Implicit Paradigm in Continental European Anthropology before World War I," *Ab Imperio* 8, no. 1 (2007): 224–239. Also see Smith, *Politics and the Sciences of Culture,* 100–114.

17 Ibid., 103.

sisters."[18] Ranke, like Virchow, considered the differences separating mankind to be minimal compared to what united them. At meetings of the German Anthropological Society, Ranke emphasized the "equality of feelings and mental life of all humanity."[19]

The liberal perspective adopted by Virchow and his colleagues influenced their views on race. They championed a brand of anthropology that depended upon a distinction between the categories of race, nation, and *Volk*. Imbued with liberal ideals of progress, leading anthropologists readily accepted the idea that some societies were more advanced than others (an assumption embodied by the division between "natural peoples" *[Naturvölker]* and "cultured peoples" *[Kulturvölker]* in German-speaking anthropology), but they refused to connect race to mental faculty or cultural ability. As liberals, they were reluctant to argue that one's capacity for improvement was constrained by biology. Indeed, a critical assumption of the anthropometric anthropology practiced by Virchow and his colleagues was that races were little more than physical variations unconnected to culture or mental characteristics. Virchow argued that physical anthropology had "nothing to do with culture" and called races "nothing more than hereditary variations."[20] Following these principles, race could not be connected to mental ability or levels of cultural achievement. In Virchow's view, race did not indicate superiority or inferiority.[21] Furthermore, groups that shared a common language or set of customs did not necessarily share a common physical type, and, therefore, race, language, and culture did not coincide. It followed that racial classifications were in no way linked to ethnic groups *[Völker]* or nations, which were determined by language, customs, geography, and politics, rather than physical characteristics. In his influential anthropological textbook of 1914, Martin made this very point:

The ethnological word "*Volk*" is to be sharply distinguished from the zoological and anthropological term "variety" or "race." Whole units of smaller or larger

18 Cited in Johannes Ranke, *Der Mensch,* vol. 2 (Leipzig: Verlag des Bibliographischen Institutes, 1887), 233. Also quoted in Massin, "From Virchow to Fischer," 87.

19 Quoted in ibid., 87.

20 Statement about culture quoted in ibid., 82. On race, see Rudolf Virchow, "Rassenbildung und Erblichkeit," in *Festschrift für Adolf Bastian zu seinem 70. Geburtstag, 26 June 1896* (Berlin: Reimer, 1896), 43.

21 George W. Stocking, Jr., *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968), 166–167. Also see Paul Weindling, *Health, Race, and German Politics between National Unification and Nazism, 1870–1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 55; Smith, *Politics and the Sciences of Culture,* 103; Erwin Ackerknecht, *Rudolf Virchow: Doctor, Statesman, Anthropologist* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1953), 215.

groupings (tribe, clan, *Volk,* nation) are racial aggregates or racial pluralities that have fused into ethnic unions. The deciding factor [in these cases] is not, as with race, morphological agreement, blood relationship, or common ancestry. Rather, what binds the members of a *Volk [people]* together is a common language and culture, a national feeling developed over time, a common government, political boundaries, etc. In anthropology, the term *Volk* has no place.[22]

In no uncertain terms, liberal anthropologists argued against investing categories like nation and *Volk* with racial meaning.

Virchow's brand of anthropology was also defined by a positivist commitment to inductive empiricism, which favored careful data collection and forbade any direct engagement with politics in scientific pursuits. Drawing on a scientific model stretching back to Sir Francis Bacon, empiricists rejected deduction and arguments by analogy, instead upholding specific facts as the foundation on which to build larger conclusions. The drive in the anthropological disciplines was to accumulate as much objective data as possible, to move very slowly from the specific to the general, rather than to propose unsupported theories. In German anthropological circles, the adherence to the inductive method enshrined the pursuit of the empirically verifiable fact as the central goal. Colleagues described how Virchow remained "cool, even ironic, toward every rash conclusion. For him [anthropology] was primarily about the researching and securing of facts."[23] It was on the basis of empirical induction that Virchow, Bastian, and Ranke, and others in the German anthropological establishment objected to Darwin's theory of evolution as unproven.[24] The positivist commitment to empirical induction also meant that anthropologists sought to avoid the influence of political considerations and events in the practice of their science. Their devotion to inductive method was bound up with a claim of conducting a science above politics. Ranke directly linked the two ideas on the very first page of his influential anthropological textbook. Following inductive principles, he argued, "hypotheses belong only in the laboratory of the researcher," and, furthermore, "the tradition of exact anthropology in Germany" necessitated the "avoidance of all overlap with politics, philosophy, and religion."[25] In his view, the "dignity of science" did not allow "piquant side glances into [such] foreign areas."[26] After Ranke's death in 1916, his obituary emphasized his "position against tugging anthropological research into the realm of politics until his death, despite many

22 Rudolf Martin, *Lehrbuch der Anthropologie in systematischer Darstellung* (Jena: Fischer, 1914), 9.

23 "Gedächtniss-Feier für Rudolf Virchow," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 34 (1902): 327.

24 Zimmerman, *Anthropology and Anti-Humanism,* 116–117; Massin, "From Virchow to Fischer," 114–118.

25 Johannes Ranke, *Der Mensch,* vol. 1 (Leipzig: Verlag des Bibliographischen Institutes, 1887), v.

26 Ibid., (1887), vi.

attacks."[27] Claims to be practicing a "political anthropology" were met with scorn and derision by the leaders of the anthropological community.

Anthropologists with a liberal perspective also emphasized the international character of their science. The Berlin anatomist and anthropologist Wilhelm von Waldeyer spoke for many within the discipline in 1909 when he called anthropology "an international brotherhood" and claimed: "A science, like anthropology, that wants to be of use to humanity, must be international by necessity."[28] Martin likewise continued to maintain in 1915 that "the question, 'national or international science' is superfluous. All science is by nature international."[29] Shared methodologies and theoretical approaches helped forge connections between anthropologists in Germany and abroad. Members of the anthropological community expressed their internationalism by studying and working in foreign countries (Luschan studied under Paul Broca in Paris; Martin also worked in France) and cultivating close ties with foreign colleagues, as demonstrated by the large numbers of international "corresponding members" on the membership rolls of the Berlin Anthropological Society. Nationalism was a presence in liberal anthropology, but it was usually expressed in terms of scientific competition between national communities, rather than in the content of the science itself.

After Virchow's death in 1902, the liberal consensus in German anthropology began to erode. New fossil discoveries weakened the resistance to Darwinism within the anthropological community and, as a result, the disciplinary commitment to empirical induction waned. Greater acceptance of Darwinism in anthropological circles also undermined liberal notions about the fundamental similarities of humankind. Because the mechanism of natural selection was based on struggle and the creation of biological inequality, it seemed to justify the assumption of inequality among peoples as well.[30] The rediscovery of Gregor Mendel's laws of inheritance by the scientific community around the turn of the century also had an impact on the discipline. Younger anthropologists, such as Eugen Fischer, then a relatively unknown scientist working at the Anatomical Institute in Freiburg, set out to apply genetic principles to anthropology, thus allowing researchers to conceive of race as more than simply a physical category.[31] After Virchow's death, Fischer, the

27 F. Birkner, "Johannes Ranke," *Correspondenz-Blatt der Deutschen Anthropologischen Gesellschaft* 47 (1916): 39.

28 "40. Allgemeine Versammlung der Deutschen Anthropologischen Gesellschaft," *Posener Tageblatt,* August 3, 1909.

29 Rudolf Martin, "Nationale oder internationale Wissenschaft," *Die Umschau* 14 (1915): 306.

30 Massin, "From Virchow to Fischer," 114–120.

31 Proctor, "From Anthropologie to Rassenkunde," 145–148; Massin, "From Virchow to Fischer," 120–126.

Strasbourg anatomist Gustav Schwalbe, and the young anthropologist Otto Reche also indicated their support for *völkisch* racial typologies that emphasized a superior northern European or "Nordic" race that possessed a specific psychology in contrast to others.[32] Such classificatory systems violated the liberal prohibition against combining questions of race and with judgments on culture and ability. Eugenics, or "racial hygiene," also gained popularity in anthropological circles as a means of combating a wide variety of social ills through the "rational" administration of reproduction. In the years leading up to World War I, however, these departures were still relatively new, and liberal ideas continued to be championed by the leaders of the discipline, especially Ranke, Martin, and, despite his growing acceptance of Darwinism, Luschan. Despite the retreat from the principles associated with Virchow in the first decade of the twentieth century, liberal elements still had a prominent place within the field when the war broke out in 1914.

Institutional Hardships in Wartime

The realities of war quickly changed the financial and practical landscape in which the institutions of German anthropology operated. From the outset, the European conflict imposed hardships on the main sites where anthropological work took place, particularly anthropological societies, ethnographic museums, and German universities. The chief problems involved shortages of money and personnel, the very resources necessary to keep these institutions in operation. Moreover, the worldwide nature of the conflict severed international contacts and disrupted the ability to travel. In the years following the declaration of war, opportunities for anthropological work both at home and abroad were severely limited by wartime realities, causing some anthropologists to seek new avenues of activity.

Anthropological societies and institutions did not shut down as war broke out, but they recognized from the outset that the conflict would severely affect their normal operations. After the declaration of hostilities in August, the Berlin Anthropological Society did not meet until October, and, when it did, its president Eduard Seler frankly admitted that the war was already having a negative effect on the institution: "The dreadful war that rages around us and

32 Gustav Schwalbe, "Ueber eine umfassende Untersuchung der physisch-anthropologischen Beschaffenheit der jetzigen Bevölkerung des Deutschen Reiches," *Correspondenz-Blatt der Deutschen Anthropologischen Gesellschaft* 34 (1903): 73–74; Otto Reche, "Längen-Breitenindex und Schädellänge," *Archiv für Anthropologie* 38 (1911): 90; on Fischer, see Niels C. Lösch, *Rasse als Konstrukt: Leben und Werk Eugen Fischers* (Frankfurt a. M: Lang, 1997), 101.

reaches deep into all relationships has of course also affected our Society."[33] Younger members of the societies left for the front, while others canceled their memberships, because they could no longer pay their dues under the financial pressure of war. Beginning in 1915, the number of members in the Berlin Society steadily decreased until the end of the conflict.[34] Still more serious was that many members still listed as active were not able to pay their dues. This was especially true of foreign members of the Society, with whom contact was now largely impossible.[35]

Perhaps even more significant was the lack of funding for anthropological research and disruption of travel abroad. A chief source of backing before the war had been the Rudolf Virchow Foundation, an endowment connected to the Berlin Society that was designed to support research, especially involving travel, in all the subfields of anthropology.[36] During the war, the activities of the foundation nearly came to a complete stop; it only provided small sums for limited research, usually for archeological digs in Germany and other accessible parts of Europe.[37] Like Luschan in Australia, other anthropologists who were already in the field also did not escape the influence of the war. Martin, who was conducting research in Paris when the war broke out, was forced to flee the city as quickly as possible, abandoning his personal library in his haste to leave.[38] In

33 "Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 46 (1914): 746.

34 Christian Andree, "Geschichte der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte, 1869–1969," in *Festschrift zum Hundertjährigen Bestehen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte,* eds. Hermann Pohle and Gustav Mahr (Berlin: Verlag Bruno Hessling, 1969), 113.

35 Seler summarized these problems in 1915: "In this new year the number of members has fallen off dramatically because of deaths, departures (as a result of diminished ability to work), and the small number of new applications. And above all, the war has interrupted our connections to our foreign members, especially those overseas, so that a good third of our membership dues were not collected. The society finds itself in serious financial distress." Vorsitzende der Berliner Gesellschaft to Minister der geistlichen, Unterrichts- und Medizinal-Angelegenheiten, September 23, 1915, Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin [GStA PK], I HA, Rep 76 Vc, Sekt. 1, Tit. 11, Teil I, Nr 4 Band 4, Bl. 105.

36 Hans Virchow to Polizei-Präsidenten von Berlin, Herr von Borries, June 20, 1903, GStA PK, I HA, Rep 76 Vc, Sekt. 1, Tit. 8, Nr. 5.

37 Andree, "Geschichte der Berliner Gesellschaft," 113. See also "Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 50 (1918): 258–259.

38 Ferdinand Birkner, Nachruf für Rudolf Martin, July 7, 1925, Ludwig-Maximilian Universitätsarchiv München [LMU], E-II-N, Personalakte Rudolf Martin, Bl. 4.

1914, Richard Thurnwald, an Austrian ethnologist who had been conducting fieldwork in New Guinea before the outbreak of hostilities, found his research disrupted by Australian troops, who plundered his camp.[39] The hardships that the discipline faced during the war could not be ignored, and the limitations of wartime academic life affected the activities of individual anthropologists and anthropological institutions. From 1914 onward, the war was a palpable presence within German anthropology.

Anthropology in Wartime

The conflict did more than simply disrupt the work of anthropologists; it also stoked nationalist feelings within the discipline. Internationalism within the anthropological community quickly receded from view as German anthropologists eagerly asserted their patriotism. As younger members of the discipline left for the front, older anthropologists propagandized for the war effort, giving talks on war-related topics, defending Germany's honor in public venues, and commenting favorably on wartime activities through their popular scientific writings. Despite his prewar rhetoric about "international brotherhood," Waldeyer joined ninety-three other prominent German professors and intellectuals in signing the patriotic manifesto, *"Aufruf 'An die Kulturwelt',"* which denied that the German army had committed atrocities in Belgium and asserted that Germany had not been responsible for the outbreak of war.[40] Although many of the original signers distanced themselves from the document once the truth about Belgium emerged, including Waldeyer, the *"Aufruf"* represented a fateful step away from internationalism in the German academy and created a rift between German academics and their foreign colleagues.[41] Less surprising was

39 "Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 48 (1916): 94.

40 Jürgen von Ungern-Sternberg and Wolfgang von Ungern-Sternberg, *Der Aufruf "An die Kulturwelt": Das Manifest der 93 und die Anfänge der Kriegspropaganda im Ersten Weltkrieg* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1996): 156–164.

41 Bernhard von Brocke, "Wissenschaft und Militarismus: Der Aufruf der 93 'An die Kulturwelt!' und der Zusammenbruch der internationalen Gelehrtenrepublik im Ersten Weltkrieg," in *Wilamowitz nach 50 Jahren,* eds. William M. Calder III, Hellmut Flashar, and Theodor Lindken (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1985) 649–719, esp. 664–678. Waldeyer remained decidedly nationalistic throughout the war and served as president of the ad hoc propagandistic organization that grew out of the "manifesto," the "Cultural Association of German Artists and Professors" *[Kulturbund deutscher Künstler und Gelehrter],* which sought to "combat the systematic lies and incitements spread by our enemies." See ibid., 664.

that the increasingly *völkisch* anthropologist Schwalbe signed a similar document and formally renounced the English academic honors that he had received during his lifetime.[42] Echoing such manifestos, other anthropologists joined the chorus of voices condemning the supposed greed and duplicity of Germany's enemies. At the first wartime meeting of the Berlin Anthropological Society, Seler expressed hopes for peace and the reestablishment of healthy international relationships, but he also maintained that the war had been "forced on us in a dastardly manner through the hatred and jealousy of our enemies […]."[43]

Nationalist fervor ran so high in anthropological circles that when Luschan did not immediately return from the United States during the initial months of the war, members of the Berlin Anthropological Society questioned his patriotism.[44] Luschan was originally from Austria, and his background may have raised questions about his attachment to the German Empire. August Brauer, a professor of zoology in Berlin, starting a whispering campaign against Luschan and the scientists who had attended the conference in Australia, charging that they had maintained relations with their hosts even after the war had started. Gestures of internationalism at the Australian conference in the first weeks of the war were now enough to bring the patriotism of the men into question. Upon his return in 1915, Luschan loudly and publicly defended German militarism and the Hollenzollern monarchy.[45] In a further rejection of internationalism, he mocked his colleagues in England by relating a story about how one of them, while on a trip to Berlin before the war, had supposedly exclaimed, "Yes, […] your Kaiser! If we only had a Kaiser. We would gladly trade you for our king."[46] Great pressure to display nationalist sentiment clearly existed in anthropological circles.

Wartime nationalism soon crept into the content of anthropological science itself, as prominent anthropologists used their position as experts on the "world's peoples" to engage political questions and to present a racialized view of Germany's enemies and allies. In the process, they broke with liberal principles by overtly politicizing their science and mixing the categories of

42 Hermann Kellermann, ed., *Der Krieg der Geister: Eine Auslese deutscher und ausländischer Stimmen zum Weltkriege 1914* (Weimar: Alexander Duncker Verlag, 1915), 28–29.

43 "Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 46 (1914): 747.

44 Albrecht Penck to Felix von Luschan, Feb. 8, 1915, NL Luschan.

45 Felix von Luschan, "Rassen und Völker," in *Deutsche Reden in schwerer Zeit: Gehalten von den Professoren an der Universität Berlin,* vol. 3, eds. Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff et al. and Zentralstelle für Volkswohlfahrt und dem Verein für volkstümliche Kurse von Berliner Hochschullehrern (Berlin: Heymann, 1914), 349–381, quote from p. 366.

46 Ibid.

race, nation, and *Volk*. For anthropologists who had already converted to a Nordic or *völkisch* perspective, such as Fischer, this was not a great leap. In 1914, Fischer wrote an article for a popular science magazine about the ancestry of the South African Boers, arguing that the events of the war made it "worthwhile to examine how close the Boers stand to us in their ancestry."[47] He concluded that the Boers were much more German than Dutch in their descent, and this connection had relevance in the current conflict: "So we want to consider, that when our magnificent 'Southwestern' [settlers] fight shoulder to shoulder with the Boers, that 'German' blood stands against 'English'—and hopefully soon German victory against English defeat!"[48] The clear distinction between the blood of the Germans and the English portrayed them as two separate groups with two separate racial ancestries. Such references to "blood" confused the category of race and skirted the boundaries of *völkisch* ideology, which underscored the mystical blood bond between members of the same national community as a central theme.

Luschan, who remained generally liberal in his anthropology, also argued for "blood" connections between Germany and its allies upon his return from the United States. In this case, the ally in question was the Ottoman Empire. In 1916, Luschan gave a public lecture in which he claimed that the Germans and the Turks were related "not only by the brotherhood of arms, but also by a blood relationship."[49] The venue—the Württemberg Anthropological Society—made the comment even more significant, because it was aimed at individuals with working knowledge of anthropology. In addition, Luschan asserted that blond northern Europeans had migrated east and south in the prehistorical period and that, as a result, blond and blue-eyed Kurds could still be found in areas where they had remained "pure and unmixed."[50] (The Kurds were a minority in the Ottoman Empire, but well represented in the Ottoman military during the war.)[51] Luschan also claimed that evidence of blond and blue-eyed peoples had been found during excavations of medieval

47 Eugen Fischer, "Die Herkunft der Buren," *Die Umschau* 18 (1914): 1053.

48 Ibid., 1053–1054.

49 "Württembergischer Anthropologischer Verein: Bericht über 1914 (zweite Hälfte) bis 1916," *Correspondenz-Blatt der Deutschen Anthropologischen Gesellschaft* 47 (1916/17): 6–8.

50 Felix von Luschan, untitled handwritten manuscript, in file "Allgemeine Phys. Anthropologie," NL Luschan. There is a great likelihood that this manuscript is the text of the talk that Luschan gave at the Württemberg Anthropological Society. It contains some of the same phrasing as the report on the talk in the *Correspondenz-Blatt,* and Luschan's mention of the Turks as allies of Germany in the text indicates that it was written during the war.

51 Jwaideh, Wadie, *The Kurdish National Movement: Its Origins and Development* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2006), 125–126.

sites in Asia Minor. In short, he was anxious to show a biological relationship between Germany and the peoples of the Ottoman Empire, and, in the process, he evoked several physical characteristics that were considered the hallmarks of race, such as eye and hair color. Luschan did not directly mention a racial relationship between Germans and Turks or Kurds, but his mention of blood and his discussion of physical characteristics certainly implied it. In the highly nationalistic context of war, even Luschan was willing to blur liberal distinctions between race, nation, and *Volk*.

Waldeyer provided perhaps the most conspicuous example of such rhetoric in 1915 when he spoke on "The Peoples of the World War in Anthropological Perspective" for a popular patriotic lecture series in Berlin. The talk represented an instance in which an anthropologist used the tools of his discipline to present a racialized portrait of the enemy. Noting that Germany was "at war with half the inhabited planet" and that "from all parts of the world, from all races and peoples, enemies are intruding on us," Waldeyer portrayed anthropology as a practical instrument that could shed light on the current conflict. Throughout his talk, he was careful on the topic of race and initially drew a sharp distinction between race and *Volk*. The content of his lecture, however, often contradicted this stance. He claimed, for example, that the purpose of anthropology was to investigate the "classification of humanity into races, peoples, and states *[Rassen, Völker und Staaten],*" thereby implying that the makeup of both "peoples" and "states" was a focus of anthropological inquiry. This was a far cry from Martin's admonition that "in anthropology, the term *Volk* has no place," or Virchow's statement that "anthropology really cannot address the question of nationality that is continually raised."[52]

Moreover, Waldeyer's portrayals of warring peoples described each as if it were distinct in its racial and bodily constitution, thereby creating the impression that each group did indeed possess a distinct racial character in comparison to others. His comments on each group combined physical and racial descriptions with stereotypes of character and psychological qualities. He noted the "outstanding physical development of the English, Scots, and Irish" and the "tiny, dainty bodies and physical agility" of the Italians and French, which "reminds one of the Japanese."[53] His description of the Serbs was typical of his mixture of essentialized racial descriptions with stereotypes of character and links to wartime politics:

52 Martin, *Lehrbuch,* 9; Rudolf Virchow, "Meinungen und Thatsachen in der Anthropologie," *Correspondenz-Blatt der Deutschen Anthropologischen Gesellschaft* 30 (1899): 82.

53 Wilhelm von Waldeyer, "Die im Weltkriege stehenden Völker in anthropologischer Betrachtung," in Wilamowitz-Moellendorff et al. *Deutsche Reden in schwerer Zeit,* 339–340, quote from p. 330.

By race, they belong to the European-Westasian, are light-skinned but mostly dark-haired, very short-skulled, high in growth, a powerful lineage. Mentally they are on average well equipped […]. Long and in part bitter wars with the Goths, Huns, and Turks […] steeled this people, but also awoke the frequent violence and unscrupulousness that gave rise to the current World War.[54]

Here, Waldeyer not only described the Serbs as a distinct physical type, but also used the opportunity to blame their national character for the war. At the conclusion of the talk, Waldeyer praised the peoples arrayed against Germany as its "equal in physical ability, bravery, courage," but there remained little doubt that the nations arrayed against Germany were racially and even psychologically "other." In its political engagement and purposeful overlap of race and nation, his talk violated the principles of the liberal tradition in German anthropology.

At the other end of the spectrum, the war saw a number of efforts to mobilize anthropology and ethnology that did not directly employ race, but still represented instances in which science was utilized to rally support for the nation and to emphasize the themes of wartime propaganda. One example was Leo Frobenius, a freelance explorer and ethnographer known for his privately funded journeys to Africa. Frobenius was a controversial figure in the German anthropological community who did not possess a professional position in the field, but who was one of the founders of *Kulturkreis* theory.[55] During the war, Frobenius used his position as an ethnologist to condemn the use of colonial troops by the Allied Powers and to refute negative images of Africans, even while he suggested that Germany might make a superior imperial master for the colonized peoples of the world. He visited African soldiers in various POW camps throughout Germany and gave public lectures denouncing the colonial policies of the Entente Powers. At a public lecture about African POWs in Berlin in 1917, he condemned popular stereotypes of Africans as "black dogs" and denounced those European powers who would use colonials as cannon fodder, while also providing an alternative (and equally paternalistic) imperial vision that focused on "cultivating" and aiding colonials.[56] Germany was the nation to take up this task, since it was clearly the "most able" to solve the problems of middle Africa.[57] Frobenius's voice was shriller still in a 1916 popular publication on the use of colonial troops in the war, provocatively entitled

54 Ibid., 326.

55 On Frobenius, see Dewitt Clinton Durham, "Leo Frobenius and the Reorientation of German Ethnology, 1890–1930" (PhD thesis, Stanford University, 1985); Suzanne Marchand, "Leo Frobenius and the Revolt against the West," *Journal of Contemporary History* 32, no. 2 (1997): 153–170.

56 "Unsere farbigen Gefangenen, Vortrag von Leo Frobenius," *Berlin Vossische Zeitung,* May 2, 1917.

57 Ibid.

Our Enemies' Circus of Peoples [Der Völkerzirkus unserer Feinde]. The book, which included photographs of colonial troops, amounted to a blistering denunciation of the British, whom he accused of acting like veritable circus trainers and treating Africans and other colonials as wild animals. Germany, he argued, had always been the last line of defense against the imperial abuses of the British.[58] Frobenius unabashedly wielded his authority as a scientist as a weapon in the propaganda wars against the Entente Powers.

The influence of the war on the work of Martin was even more direct, drawing him away from the tradition of a nonpolitical and "value free" science that Ranke and Virchow had championed. After Ranke's death in 1916, Martin was offered the chair in anthropology at the University of Munich, the premier position in the field. Once there, Martin launched a major anthropological study of nutritional levels and physical development among Munich schoolchildren. The project was explicitly designed to determine the effects of the Allied blockade on the German school-age population. According to his assistant at the institute, Ferdinand Birkner, the initial motivation for the studies was to "supply exact proof of in what measure the health of German children had been harmed by the hunger blockade of the enemy powers" in order to qualify for charitable relief from outside the country.[59] After years of work, Martin found that German children were significantly smaller than their counterparts in other countries like the United States.[60] He concluded that poor nutrition resulting from the Allied blockade was to blame. Race, in his view, played no role, since all the groups in the study were of "Anglo-Saxon descent." The political message of Martin's study, however, was clear: The wartime policies of the Entente Powers had warped the bodies of German children. Martin's methods during the studies remained empirical, but the project represented a foray into a brand of anthropology designed to serve political and patriotic purposes.

The most prominent anthropological project launched during the war was the study of POWs in German and Austrian POW camps.[61] As the camps

58 Leo Frobenius, *Der Völkerzirkus unserer Feinde* (Berlin: Eckhart-Verlag, 1916), 13.

59 Ferdinand Birkner, "Nachruf für Rudolf Martin," July 7, 1925, LMU, E-II-N, Personalakte Rudolf Martin.

60 Rudolf Martin, "Die Körperentwicklung Münchener Volksschulkinder in den Jahren 1921, 1922, und 1923," *Sonderdruck aus dem Anthropologischen Anzeiger* I (1924): 85.

61 See Andrew D. Evans, "Anthropology at War: Racial Studies of POWs during World War I," in Penny and Bunzl, *Worldly Provincialism*, 198–229. See also Margit Berner, "Forschungs-'Material' Kriegsgefangene: Die Massenuntersuchungen der Wiener Anthropologen an gefangenen Soldaten, 1915–1918," in *Vorreiter der Vernichtung? Eugenik, Rassenhygiene, und Euthanasie in der*

filled with colonial soldiers from Africa, India, and East Asia, anthropologists and ethnologists alike became more and more excited about the rare chance of studying colonial subjects on European soil. With the aid of government and military officials, scientists in Germany and Austria launched a series of expeditions to investigate the language, culture, and physical makeup of the prisoners. Once there, however, physical anthropologists focused increasingly on the peoples of Central and eastern Europe. The setting of the camp served to collapse the distinction between African and Asian colonial troops and European soldiers, replacing it with a dynamic that underscored the divide between captors and prisoners, enemies and allies. The physical circumstances and lopsided power relationships drastically altered the subject positions of the European prisoners, highlighting their difference from Germans. Before the war, by contrast, anthropologists commonly claimed that there was little physical difference between Germanic, Slavic, and Celtic groups.[62] During the war, anthropologists enjoyed an unprecedented degree of power over their subjects, measuring Russian, French, British, Serb, and other European groups alongside Senegalese, Algerian, and Indian.

Fueled by wartime nationalism, younger researchers, such as Egon von Eickstedt and Otto Reche, began selecting subjects and organizing their data on the basis of national and political affiliation. Following the advice of Luschan, Eickstedt initially set out to investigate the physical characteristics "of an anthropologically interesting group: Indians, Turks, or inner Asians," eventually settling on the racial characteristics of the Sikhs as the topic for his dissertation.[63] As time wore on in the camps, however, he became increasingly interested in measuring select European POWs and organized his lists of subjects according to national citizenship, thereby suggesting that he implicitly sought to investigate the racial makeup of nations. He conducted studies on groups from eastern Europe, Russia, and southern France, but avoided the investigation of peoples who were in any way associated, however tangentially, with "Germanness," such as those considered to be descended from Germanic tribes, particularly the English and peoples from northern France.[64] The term "Germanic" had no place in the liberal tradition, because it described a language group, but Eickstedt's selection of subjects demonstrated that a

österreichischen Diskussion vor 1938, eds. Heinz Eberhard Gabriel and Wolfgang Neugebauer (Vienna: Böhlau, 2005), 167–198.

62 Felix von Luschan, "Zur Anthropologie der Preußen," *Berliner Tageblatt,* June 7, 1914. See also Rudolf Martin, "Germanen, Kelten, und Slaven," *Die Umschau* 20 (1916): 201.

63 Luschan to Eickstedt, July 30, 1915, NL Luschan, File Eickstedt. For Eickstedt's dissertation, see Egon von Eickstedt, "Rassenelemente der Sikh," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 52 (1920/21): 317–394.

64 Eickstedt to Luschan, Dec. 6, 1916, NL Luschan, File Eickstedt.

connection to "Germanic" background functioned as the standard against which racial otherness was judged. Reche, meanwhile, had already begun to move decisively toward *völkisch* and Nordic racial theories before 1914, but the war encouraged him to fashion his science into an explicitly nationalist and political instrument. In the POW camps, he focused on peoples who lived in areas already occupied by German forces, arguing that those who "as a result of the war may come into tighter political connection with us" deserved "special attention."[65] He purposely sought to determine the racial makeup of the peoples who would come under the control of the German Empire after the war was over in order to determine their relationship to Germans and the Nordic racial group. The overall result of the POW studies was a politically motivated anthropology that investigated national enemies as "racial others" and blurred the boundaries between nation, *Volk,* and race. By the time the war ended in 1918, the pattern of mobilizing anthropology as both a scientific and political tool in the service of the nation had been firmly established.

Anthropology in the Aftermath

The effects of World War I did not end with the armistice in 1918. The political and economic crisis that followed severely limited the ability of anthropological institutions to function. Anthropological societies like the Berlin organization continued to meet, but overall activity remained at a minimum, new journal issues were radically reduced in size, and members conducted scientific work only with great difficulty.[66] Shortages of state and private funds also combined to bring work at Germany's university institutes to a standstill. In 1919, Martin expressed fears that the anthropological institute in Munich would not survive, because of minimal funding from the state.[67] The hyperinflation of the early 1920s wiped out the remaining assets of the Rudolf Virchow Foundation, so that it essentially existed in name only by 1924.[68] Moreover, the economic and political dislocation of the immediate postwar period also meant that paying positions for scientists were extremely rare. Writing to Franz Boas in the hopes of securing a job in the United States, Egon von Eickstedt described the situation this way:

65 Reche to Hamburg Oberschulbehörde, March 13, 1918, Staatsarchiv der Freien und Hansestadt Hamburg [HAS] 361-5 II Hochschulwesen II W a 8, Bl. 31–32.

66 Andree, "Geschichte der Berliner Gesellschaft," 114.

67 Rudolf Martin to Franz Boas, November 28, 1919, Franz Boas Collections [FBC], American Philosophical Society.

68 Andree, "Geschichte der Berliner Gesellschaft," 121.

Modern Germany does not want at all men of science. More or less it is a socialistic state, where culture is considered to be perhaps agreeable, but at any rate a very superfluous thing: men of culture are in a certain degree outcasts, are economically uprooted and, as the greater part of the middle classes, left to their fate.[69]

Postwar disruption reinforced the wartime trend of making anthropological science relevant to state and society, this time in order to secure its survival.

The wartime erosion of internationalism within the discipline also continued after the defeat, despite the desire of some liberal anthropologists to rebuild relationships with academics abroad. German scientists tended to place the blame for poor relations on their foreign colleagues, rather than on their own rhetoric or actions during the war, even when they desired renewed contact. In 1919, Luschan remarked in correspondence with the American anthropologist Boas that the "future connections between German academics and colleagues in enemy lands" remained "uncertain." "The great majority of Frenchmen will naturally remain crazy for a very long time, and I fear that the English will remain unfriendly for a long period as well."[70] Martin maintained that German science could only be revived when the "academic circles abroad move away from their unjustified and unfounded tone of hatred toward German science […]."[71] Boas organized emergency funds to aid in the continued publication of German anthropological journals, but, in general, German-speaking anthropologists felt increasingly cut off from the their colleagues abroad. The 1920 creation of an International Union of Academics in Paris that excluded members of the Central Powers highlighted this feeling.[72]

Increasingly isolated, desperate for support from the new Weimar government and nursing wounded national pride, anthropologists began to turn their scientific energies inward, toward Germany and its problems. The ruinous human cost of the conflict fanned fears of population decline, and the economic and political dislocations after 1918 fostered the sense that German society was in crisis. In eugenics, anthropologists found a means of addressing what they saw as a broken and ailing society while also demonstrating the practical uses of their discipline to the state. Eugenics—also called *Sozialanthropologie*—had been a serious object of interest before 1914, but, after the war, it moved to the absolute center of the anthropological project as a means of healing a nation enervated and damaged by war. Luschan, who had been a proponent of eugenics before the war, considered it his patriotic duty as an anthropologist to promote racial hygiene as a means of supporting the country's "physical, mental, and

69 Egon von Eickstedt to Franz Boas, May 7, 1920, FBC.
70 Luschan to Boas, January 18, 1920, FBC.
71 Rudolf Martin to Boas, November 28, 1919, FBC.
72 Rudolf Martin to Boas, February 10, 1920, FBC.

moral recovery" after the "deepest humiliation of our fatherland."[73] Members of the discipline consistently emphasized the usefulness of eugenics to the state. In 1919, Fischer argued that the "youngest branch of anthropology, *Sozialanthropologie*" had "won eminent meaning for the state in recent times," because it had "placed itself next to national economics, sociology, and others."[74] Eickstedt claimed that racial hygiene could address economic problems by improving the quality of the population and therefore increasing national efficiency.[75] In the postwar context, anthropologists eagerly cast aside earlier prohibitions against engaging anthropology in politics and crafted a eugenicist racial science designed to attract the attention of the state.

For Martin, the postwar period saw a growing interest in the health of the German nation that eventually shaded into an engagement with eugenics. He continued his studies of German schoolchildren, arguing that they represented "an overview of the bodily development of our youth for the entire Reich" and could be used to encourage health on a national scale. In the early 1920s, he also began to take measurements of German athletes and gymnasts. He maintained that physical training and exercise were a means of improving the "toughness" of the German people, who had been weakened by years of war and malnutrition. Moreover, in 1923, Martin's anthropological institute in Munich opened a "consultation station for biological and family research," designed to provide information about one's genetic inheritance, ostensibly for use in decisions about marriage and thus reproduction. This was a clear foray into the realm of eugenics. All of these measures were designed to strengthen the nation and attract the attention of the state. Martin maintained that the Reich Public Health Office might be interested in the data from the studies on schoolchildren, for example, arguing that the research possessed meaning "not only for the individual but for the state."[76]

Another avenue of displaying anthropology's worth was to focus on anthropological studies of Germans. After 1918, anthropologists increasingly sought to make distinctions between the racial makeup of the German *Volk* and the rest of Europe. Germanicized and Nordic racial concepts, which had achieved growing acceptance in the prewar period, now became the norm within German anthropological circles. Moreover, in a marked shift in the

73 Felix von Luschan, "Einige Aufgaben der Sozial-Anthropologie," *Die Schwester* 4 (Jan. 1921): 1.

74 Eugen Fischer, "Die Notwendigkeit anthropologischer Lehrstühle an den Universitäten," *Correspondenz-Blatt der Deutschen Anthropologischen Gesellschaft* 50 (1919): 38.

75 Egon von Eickstedt, "Menschenkundliche Zeitforderungen," *Die Deutsche Politik VI* (1921): 576.

76 Rudolf Martin to Rektorat der Universität München, Feb. 22, 1924 and Nov. 28, 1921, Bayerische Hauptstadtsarchiv, MK 11820.

focus of inquiry from the prewar period, postwar anthropology took the racial classification of Europeans, and especially Germans, as a central task. Anthropologists and anthropological institutions alike called for government-funded racial surveys, arguing that such studies would not only have military application, but would also aid in preserving "German" qualities. In 1919, Fischer called for more chairs in anthropology, heralding the discipline as a tool that could not only solve the "problem of the racial makeup of our *Volk*," but also answer questions about "the military capabilities of our *Volk*."[77] In 1919, the German Anthropological Society also requested more professorships in anthropology on the grounds that a wide-ranging anthropological study of Germany was necessary for the country. Without such a survey, it argued, "[…] we will never learn in the face of increasing internationalism which races make up the German *Volk* […]."[78] After World War I, the anthropological community feared the dilution of "Germanness," arguing that the races within the German population would soon be mixed to the point where they could not be determined. Such proposals not only blurred the distinctions between race, nation, and *Volk,* but also demonstrated the desire of anthropologists to make their discipline more relevant to state and nation.

These trends were aided by the completion of a generational shift within anthropological circles during and after the war. Virchow died in 1902 and Bastian in 1905. The other major representatives of the liberal tradition began to pass from the scene during and after the war. Ranke died in 1916, Kollman in 1918, Luschan in 1924, and Martin in 1925. In their place rose a younger generation of anthropologists who consistently worked toward a nationalist and *völkisch* brand of anthropology that took an increasingly racialized version of eugenics as its central direction and the anthropological investigation of Germans as a major goal. Many of these men had been shaped by experiences in the German colonies or during the Great War, sometimes both.

The leader of this new group was of course Fischer, who had made his name with a study of race mixing between Dutch settlers and native Hottentots in German Southwest Africa, which he published in 1913.[79] Fischer succeeded Luschan at the University of Berlin in 1924. In Munich, Martin was replaced by Theodor Mollison, who embraced *Rassenkunde* as the future of anthropology, and joined the National Socialist party in 1937.[80] When he occupied the Munich chair in 1926, he argued for the continuation of Martin's studies

77 Fischer, "Die Notwendigkeit anthropologischer Lehrstühle," 38.

78 "An die deutschen Universitäten," *Correspondenz-Blatt der Deutschen Anthropologischen Gesellschaft* 50 (1919): 37.

79 Eugen Fischer, *Die Rehobother Bastards und das Bastardierungsproblem beim Menschen* (Jena: Fischer, 1913).

80 Proctor, "From Anthropologie to Rassenkunde," 158.

of schoolchildren on the grounds that they served "social-anthropological" (i. e., eugenic) purposes and later launched a series of racial studies of Bavarians.[81] Reche, who had participated in the German South Sea expedition of 1908–1910, served as an infantry officer at the front during World War I and participated in the wartime studies of foreign POWs, succeeded Rudolf Pöch to the prestigious chair of anthropology at the University of Vienna in 1924 and became professor of anthropology in Leipzig in 1927. Throughout the 1920s, he championed a *völkisch* brand of anthropological science, arguing that race and language actually coincided with one another and pursuing research into blood groups as a means of determining the distribution and value of different racial classifications.[82] Walter Scheidt, a former student of Rudolf Martin in Munich, replaced Reche as the resident physical anthropologist at the Hamburg Museum für Völkerkunde. Having served on the eastern front during the war, he brought a nationalist perspective to *Rassenkunde*, which he saw as a eugenic means of countering postwar German weakness and encouraging "Germany's renewal."[83] In his view, race and nationality were linked, and once in Hamburg, he set out to explore the racial makeup of Germans in surveys of local populations.[84] Eickstedt, who had served on the western front as a doctor in a mobile X-ray unit and taken part in the POW studies, argued for more racial studies of Germans in the early 1920s, as well as greater support for racial hygiene as a means to solve Germany's problems.[85] He became a full professor of anthropology at Breslau in 1933 and achieved success during the

81 On continuing Martin's studies of schoolchildren, see Mollison to Bayerisches Staatsministerium für Unterricht und Kultus and Staatsrat Dr. Hauptmann, Jan. 28, 1926, Bayerische Hauptstadtsarchiv, Munich [Bay. HSTA], MK/V 1366. "Universität München, Philosophische Fakultät, Ordentliche Professor für Anthropologie, 1925–1971" [no folio numbers]. On racial studies of the Bavarian populations, see Mollison to Bayerisches Staatsministierum für Unterricht und Kultus. Oct. 2, 1928. Bay. HSTA. MK 11723. "Anthropologie und Archäologie in genere" [no folio numbers].

82 For Reche's views on race and language, see Otto Reche, "Rasse und Sprache," *Archiv für Anthropologie* 46 (1921): 218. On his work with blood groups, 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, esp. 191–198.

83 Walter Scheidt, "Rassenbiologie und Familienanthropologie," *Deutschlands Erneuerung* 7 (1923): 47.

84 On race and nation, see idem, "Rasse, Volkstum, und Landesgrenzen," *Der Auslandsdeutsche* 6 (1923): 485. On racial surveys around Hamburg, see idem, *Die Elbinsel Finkenwärder: Veröffentlichung des Werkbundes für Deutsche Volkstums- und Rassenforschung* (Munich: J. F. Lehmann Verlag, 1927).

85 Egon von Eickstedt, "Menschenkundliche Zeitforderungen," *Die Deutsche Politik* VI (1921): 572–576.

1930s as the editor of premier anthropological journal of the National Socialist period, the *Zeitschrift für Rassenkunde und ihre Nachbargebiete*.[86]

The culmination of wartime and postwar trends in German anthropology arrived in 1927 with the foundation of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, a government-funded institution headed by Fischer. From the outset, the institute was dedicated to a racist form of eugenics in the service of the state and nation. In his 1926 proposal for the institute, Fischer argued that the state and the German people in general had an overwhelming self-interest in eugenic questions.

> The state has the utmost interest, the whole *Volk* the truly vital interest, in gaining flawless information about the inheritance of healthy and sick, physical and mental structures, about the de- or regeneration of parts of the population with possible racial differences, the meaning of inbreeding, mixture, increase and decrease in children and all the other questions of social anthropology.[87]

This passage implied that eugenics or social anthropology was crucial to the future of Germany, but it also incorporated race into the eugenic equation. The country that solved these problems, Fischer claimed, would "have the future."[88] It is not surprising that the first project launched by the Institute was a comprehensive racial survey of the German population. The foundation of the Institute not only represented resolution of the institutional insecurity of the immediate postwar period, but also signaled the victory of a highly politicized and nationalist anthropology that repudiated liberal concepts.

Conclusion

Historians of anthropology have long been aware of the need to examine how anthropologists functioned within multiple and often overlapping contexts—political, cultural, institutional, and colonial—in order to understand how disciplinary change occurred over time. One critical context that has largely been ignored in the history of discipline, however, is war. World War I was the central event of the early twentieth century, an all-consuming conflict that fundamentally altered the circumstances in which anthropolo-

86 Proctor, "From Anthropologie to Rassenkunde," 161–162.

87 Eugen Fischer, "Ein Forschungsinstitut für Anthropologie und menschliche Erblichkeitslehre," May 15, 1926, GStA PK, I HA, Rep 76 Vc Sekt. 2, Tit. 23A, Nr. 144, Bd. 1, Bl. 22.

88 Idem, "Zweck und Aufgaben eines Forschungsinstituts für Anthropologie, menschliche Erblichkeitslehre und Eugenik," GStA PK, I HA, Rep 76 Vc Sekt. 2, Tit. 23A, Nr. 144, Bd. 1, Bl. 57.

gists operated, not only between 1914 and 1918, but also in the years that followed. In its most obvious manifestation, the war changed the ideological context of anthropological work in Germany by encouraging a wave of nationalism within anthropological circles. Although nationalism had been on the rise in the discipline before 1914, the conflict encouraged anthropologists to define their own roles and the aims of their scientific work in strictly nationalist terms. Members of the discipline fully mobilized their science for war, putting their science at the service of the nation and the state, thereby breaking from a long disciplinary tradition of remaining aloof from expressly political topics. The mobilization of anthropology was also partly motivated by the persistent feeling of institutional uncertainty that gripped the field during and after the war. Hoping for more government support, and in the thrall of surging nationalism, anthropologists quickly utilized their science to swing support behind the state. Members of the discipline provided anthropological profiles of the enemy, investigated nutritional levels among German schoolchildren, and increasingly turned their attention to eugenics as a means of aiding a nation in crisis.

In order to chart the "contested road from liberal to Nazi anthropology," scholars must incorporate the story of wartime anthropology. The wider shift in German anthropology from the anthropology of the late nineteenth century to the racial science of the 1920s and 1930s clearly had multiple causes, both internal and external, but studies of the field that end in 1914 miss a critical part of the picture. The war had a profound impact on the discipline. From the lecture hall to the POW camp, changes in the direction of German anthropology were at least partially contingent on the wider wartime political and ideological contexts in which anthropologists did their work. The war led to the increasing international isolation of German anthropology, the turn to a narrowly nationalistic and highly politicized science, and the abandonment of the concepts at the heart of the liberal tradition. It is evident that no history of anthropology in Germany—or in Europe, for that matter—can be complete without attention to the Great War, which had a profound impact on the world of science, just as it did on the realms of politics, society, and culture.