

Egbert Klautke, University College London, School of Slavonic and East  
European Studies

German “Race Psychology” and its Implementation in Central Europe:  
Egon von Eickstedt and Rudolf Hippius

“Race psychology” claims to explain the characteristics, cultural abilities, and mental traits of nations and peoples by analysing their racial make-up. It postulates that these characteristics or mental traits are linked to races in a hereditary and naturally determined fashion and thus exist independently of “external”, social factors. From this perspective, the physical characteristics of people, in which traditional physical anthropology was predominantly interested, are taken merely 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 the 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 Professor of Racial Hygiene in Germany at the University of Munich and later on a director of the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institute for Human Heredity, Anthropology, and Eugenics in Berlin, never described himself as a “race psychologist” and rarely used the term at all. Yet in the most important German textbook on “Human Heredity”, Lenz insisted that “if it was only about physical racial differences, (...) then the whole question of race would be meaningless”.<sup>1</sup> In this text, Lenz dedicated a long chapter to

the “inheritance of mental traits”, thus demonstrating his belief in the main the principles of race psychology as 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. Whilst 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 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.<sup>2</sup>

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 - judged by the print-run of their books - became the most successful racial theorists in Germany in the interwar period.<sup>3</sup> The justification of “race psychology” that Günther gave in his most comprehensive study of the racial make-up 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”.<sup>4</sup>

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 of Edmund Husserl (1859-1938) at the University of Freiburg - they were usually looked upon by anthropologists and psychologists with unease and suspicion.<sup>5</sup>

Both Günther and Clauss promoted the idea that the European nations were made up 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 of typical representatives of these racial groups.<sup>6</sup> 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”.<sup>7</sup> 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. They did not succeed in establishing a school of race psychology, despite the enormous success of their books, and 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) who was 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 in Berlin. Like most German anthropologists, Eickstedt had studied medicine and had then specialized in social anthropology as a student of Felix Luschan (1854-1934). In the 1920s, he became an expert on ethnic groups in South Asia and was a member of the German South-Asia-Expedition organized by the Research Institute for Social Anthropology in Leipzig.<sup>8</sup> In 1934, he published a comprehensive “Racial Study and Racial History of Humanity” as well as a study of the “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 the Breslau school’s version of anthropology as the general approach to the field.<sup>9</sup>

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 and adopt the findings of all disciplines engaged in the "research of man". To achieve this aim, Eickstedt called for more systematic research on 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".<sup>10</sup>

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 the "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.<sup>11</sup> Günther's starting point for his racial studies was this same differentiation between "race" and "people" or "nation"; the main reason for his 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.<sup>12</sup>

Eickstedt's study on the "Foundations of Race Psychology" 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. This “race formula” of the SS resembled Eickstedt’s own proposal of 1936; whether the RuSHA was directly influenced or inspired by Eickstedt’s proposals remains unclear.<sup>13</sup> Eickstedt believed that by introducing the “race formula” he had developed sound scientific methods with which to prove the 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.<sup>14</sup>

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 make-up of the European nations and used varieties of his typology, but criticized his intuitive and hermeneutic approach (*Wesensschau*) which they contended should 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, Faelic race group really existed alongside Eastern, Eastern-Baltic, Dinaric, and Western groups, albeit in mixed forms within a given population.<sup>15</sup> 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), entitled *Race Psychology*.<sup>16</sup> Garth, a graduate from Yale University who had become a professor

of psychology at the University of Denver, had summarized the findings of more than one hundred empirical studies on the psychological differences between racial groups in the United States which had been conducted since the time of the First World War.

Although the evidence of the 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 doubts the psychological 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 of the anthropological variety.<sup>17</sup>

The most important research project conducted by Eickstedt’s Breslau-school in the 1930s was the so-called *Rassenuntersuchung Schlesiens* (“Race study of Silesia”).<sup>18</sup> This study was a large-scale research project of 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 of 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”. 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 65000 persons in thirty-seven districts and

eight hundred villages. The anthropologists measured their skulls, noses, height, and body stature, and categorized the colour 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".<sup>19</sup>

The "Race Study of Silesia" received funding from the German Research Community; this can be seen as an indicator of the esteem in which the scientific community held Eickstedt's research.<sup>20</sup> 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 himself earned his PhD with a study on race psychology and co-edited the publications of Eickstedt's research on Silesia.<sup>21</sup> The reasons for a study on the racial make-up 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", hence German. In the light of this, Eickstedt maintained, Polish claims to Silesia were unjustified. According to Eickstedt, "Race Study" had been successful in proving this point: "In Silesia, we find Nordic people in great numbers".<sup>22</sup> 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.<sup>23</sup>

Eickstedt's research team was amongst a large army of experts who were 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 himself 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.<sup>24</sup> 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 Mediation of Ethnic Germans (VoMi, *Volksdeutsche Mittelstelle*).<sup>25</sup> In 1939 Hippius responded to the "call back home" to 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 he became Lecturer in Psychology at the recently established Reich-University in Posen. In 1942, he moved on to Prague where he became professor of social and national psychology at the German Charles University and Deputy Director of the Reinhard-Heydrich-Foundation.<sup>26</sup>

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 “General Plan East”, in which Hippius suggested conducting a psychological study which would help “demographic planning” in the Posen area. The letter included a draft proposal for a research project that would scrutinise the “human building material” in the annexed Polish territory according to 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”.<sup>27</sup> 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”, 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 2500 Reichsmark so that he could test his methods. Beyer became, in due course, Hippius’s closest collaborator and was responsible for his moves 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 the local SS administrators in the Posen area.<sup>28</sup>

Shortly after the occupation of the Western Polish provinces, the German administrators were faced with a major obstacle to their plans of expelling the Polish population and replacing them with ethnic Germans from as yet unoccupied Eastern Europe. The administration of the annexed parts of Poland, 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 (SD, *Sicherheitsdienst*) of the SS, Dr 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.”<sup>29</sup> 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 people 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 Security Service of the SS. 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.<sup>30</sup> This original version of the “German People’s List” did not, however, resolve all the 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 the notion of a clear distinction between “Germans” and “Poles” that underpinned the utopian idea of ethnic cleansing (*völkische Flurbereinigung*). Hence, in May 1940, a new category C was added to the German People’s List in Posen. It was introduced to include 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 of their nation and people (*Gesinnungslumpen im volkspolitischen Sinne*). Nevertheless, since they were yet not completely polonized and carried “German blood”, they could not be allowed to strengthen the Polish nation with their Germanic stock but had to be re-Germanized. Finally, in January 1941 a category D was added that would include “persons of German origin who have disappeared into the Polish nation but should be reclaimed for the German nation”. This least favourable 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 the Posen for the “German People’s List” provided the blueprint for a general law of the German Reich; the categories A-D were simply renamed I-IV.<sup>31</sup>

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 the categories III and IV of the German People’s List”.<sup>32</sup> 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 could be used as indicators for ethnicity. Strickner drew here on a major empirical study of people of mixed Polish-German background which Hippius had conducted at the University of Posen in 1942. Shortly after his arrival in Posen in 1940, Hippius had drafted a memorandum on his proposed research project which outlined the necessity and usefulness of such a study.<sup>33</sup> 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. 262 persons belonged to category III, 310 persons to category IV of the German People's List, whilst 305 persons were Polish people who had not been registered on the list.<sup>34</sup> Amongst the interviewers of Hippius' research team was the biologist Konrad Lorenz (1903-1989), later to win the Nobel Prize for his work in ethology.<sup>35</sup> 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 behaviour of the 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".<sup>36</sup> Whilst Hippius accepted that the European nations were racially mixed, he maintained that these mixtures had been "stabilized" and could 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", 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 an “openness to the fullness of life, compulsive dynamism, and a poverty of vital roots”.<sup>37</sup> 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”.<sup>38</sup>

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 such as the Breslau school’s 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 colours; similarly, he did not rely explicitly on Günther’s or other popular typologies of European races. Implicitly, however, insofar as Hippius adopted the categories of the “German People’s List” which were derived from such racial typologies, his study served to reaffirm these typologies and 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 on close inspection and contextualization. On the one hand, the design and conduct of the “Posen study” resembled modern empirical social-science research. On the other hand, Hippius was engaged on 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, and 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' "Posen study" remained the only major piece of research that he 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 in the Czech lands had, however, posed yet greater difficulties than the situation 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".<sup>39</sup> 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 legitimising Heydrich's ideas.<sup>40</sup> Because of the importance of the Czech arms industry to the German war effort, however, German administrators were cautious not to stir up protest amongst 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. Hippus 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.<sup>41</sup>

Both Egon von Eickstedt and Rudolf Hippus sought to apply the results of their research in the German borderlands in Central Europe: Eickstedt’s major research project from the mid-1930s, the *Rassenuntersuchung Schlesiens*, 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 sound basis by which the racial make-up 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. Eickstedt became professor of anthropology here 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 entitled the completely revised and enlarged, three-volume edition of his “Racial Study and Racial History of Humanity”, *Forschung am Menschen* (“Research on Man”). The “Journal for Racial Studies” 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 in the rapidly liberalizing Federal Republic.<sup>42</sup>

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 make-up. 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 neologisms), 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: it helped to decide the national-ethnic classification of Poles according to the categories of the “German People’s List”, and hence was instrumental in the “resettlement” of large parts of the population in the occupied parts of Poland.

#### **Endnotes:**

<sup>1</sup> Erwin Baur, Eugen Fischer, Fritz Lenz, *Menschliche Erblehre*. Vol 1. (München: 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).

<sup>2</sup> 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*, 2<sup>nd</sup>. ed. (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1996), 239-246, 396-424; Niels C. Lösche, *Rasse als Konstrukt. Leben und Werk Eugen Fischers*. (Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang, 1996); Paul Weindling, *Health, Race and German Politics between National Unification and Nazism, 1870-1945*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 430-439.

<sup>3</sup> On Günther see the problematic monograph by Hans-Jürgen Lützhöft, *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 a. M.-New York: Campus, 1995).

<sup>4</sup> Hans F. K. Günther, *Rassenkunde des deutschen Volkes*. 17<sup>th</sup> edition. (München: J. F. Lehmanns, 1933 [1922]), 190. See also idem, *Rassenkunde Europas*. (München: J. F. Lehmanns, 1925); idem, *Kleine Rassenkunde des deutschen Volkes*. (München: J. F. Lehmanns, 1929).

<sup>5</sup> A typical and similar example is Friedrich Keiter, *Rassenpsychologie. Einführung in eine werdende Wissenschaft*. (Leipzig: Reclam, 1941), 14. See 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); Ottmar Rutz, *Grundlagen einer psychologischen Rassenkunde*. (Tübingen: Heine, 1934).

<sup>6</sup> Günther, *Rassenkunde des deutschen Volkes*; Ludwig Ferdinand Clauss, *Rasse und Seele. Eine Einführung in den Sinn der leiblichen Gestalt*, 3<sup>rd</sup> new edition. (München: J. F. Lehmanns, 1933).

<sup>7</sup> Günther, *Rassenkunde des deutschen Volkes*, 197.

<sup>8</sup> Egon Freiherr von Eickstedt, “Anthropologische Forschungen in Südindien”, *Anthropologischer Anzeiger* 6, no. 1 (1929), 64-85; idem, “Die Indien-Expedition des Staatlichen Forschungsinstituts für Völkerkunde zu Leipzig. Erster ethnographischer Bericht”, *Ethnologischer Anzeiger* 1 (1927), 277-285; idem, *Untersuchungen an philipinischen Negrito-Skeletten. Ein Beitrag zum Pygmäenproblem und zur osteomorphologischen Methodik*. (Stuttgart: Schweizerbart, 1931).

<sup>9</sup> Egon Freiherr von Eickstedt, *Rassenkunde und Rassengeschichte der Menschheit*. (Stuttgart: Enke, 1934); idem, *Die rassischen Grundlagen des deutschen Volkstums*. (Köln: Schaffstein, 1934); idem, *Grundlagen der Rassenpsychologie*. (Stuttgart: Enke, 1936).

<sup>10</sup> Eickstedt, *Rassenpsychologie*, 11.

<sup>11</sup> Eickstedt, *Rassenpsychologie*, 12.

<sup>12</sup> Günther, *Rassenkunde*, 1-15.

<sup>13</sup> Isabel Heinemann, ‘Rasse, Siedlung, deutsches Blut’. *Das Rasse- und Siedlungshauptamt der SS un die rassenpolitische Neuordnung Europas*. (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2003), 233.

<sup>14</sup> Eickstedt, *Rassenpsychologie*, 109.

<sup>15</sup> Egon Freiherr von Eickstedt, “Verfahren der Forschung am schlesischen Menschen”, in Egon Freiherr von Eickstedt and Ilse Schwidetzky, *Die Rassenuntersuchung Schlesiens. Eine Einführung in ihre Aufgaben und Methoden*. (Breslau: Priebatsch, 1940), 1-46, here 8-10. See the work by Eickstedt’s student and research assistant Ilse Schwidetzky, “Methoden zur Kontrolle der v. Eickstedtschen Rasseformeln”, *Zeitschrift für Rassenkunde* 2 (1935), 33-40.

<sup>16</sup> Thomas Russell Garth, *Race Psychology. A Study of Racial Mental Differences*. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1931).

<sup>17</sup> Eickstedt, *Rassenpsychologie*, 22, 108. On Garth see Graham Richards, ‘Race’, *Racism and Psychology. Towards a Reflexive History* (London, New York: Routledge, 1997), 65; idem, “Reconceptualizing the History of Race Psychology: Thomas Russell Garth (1872-1939) and How He Changed his Mind,” *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 34 no. 1 (1998), 15-32; Stephen J. Gould, *The Mismeasure of Man* (New York: Norton, 1981).

<sup>18</sup> Eickstedt and Schwidetzky, *Die Rassenuntersuchung Schlesiens*; Fritz Arlt, Egon von Eickstedt, eds., *Rasse, Volk, Erbgut in Schlesien*. 15 volumes (Breslau: Priebatsch, 1939-42)

<sup>19</sup> Eickstedt, *Verfahren der Forschung am schlesischen Menschen*, 16, 19. See Benoît Massin, “Anthropologie und Humangenetik im Nationalsozialismus oder: Wie schreiben deutsche Wissenschaftler ihre eigene Wissenschaftsgeschichte?“, in Heidrun Kaupen-Haas, Christian Saller, eds., *Wissenschaftlicher Rassismus. Analysen einer Kontinuität in den Human- und Naturwissenschaften*. (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 1999), 23.

<sup>20</sup> Notker Hammerstein, *Die Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft in der Weimarer Republik und im Dritten Reich. Wissenschaftspolitik in Republik und Diktatur 1920-1945*. (München: C. H. Beck, 1999), 353.

<sup>21</sup> Fritz Arlt, *Die Frauen der altisländischen Bauernsagen und die Frauen der vorexilischen Bücher des Alten Testaments, verglichen nach ihren Handlungswerten, ihrer Bewertung, ihrer Erscheinungsweise, ihrer Behandlung. Ein Beitrag zur Rassenpsychologie*. (Leipzig: Jordan & Gramberg, 1936). On Arlt see Götz Aly, Susanne Heim, *Vordenker der Vernichtung. Auschwitz und die deutschen Pläne für eine neue europäische Ordnung*. (Frankfurt a. M.: Fischer, 1993), 168-176, 207-220; Michael Burleigh, *Germany Turns Eastwards. A Study of Ostforschung in the Third Reich*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 214, 266.

<sup>22</sup> Eickstedt, *Verfahren*, 12, 29.

<sup>23</sup> See Martin Broszat, *Nationalsozialistische Polenpolitik, 1939-1945*. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1961); Heinemann, ‘Rasse’, 187-303; Mechtild Rössler, Sabine Schleiermacher, eds., *Der ‘Generalplan Ost’. Hauptlinien der nationalsozialistischen Planungs- und Vernichtungspolitik*. (Berlin: Akademie, 1993); Götz Aly, ‘Final Solution.’ *Nazi Population Policy and the Murder of the European Jews*. (London: Arnold 1999).

<sup>24</sup> Rudolf Hippius, *Erkennendes Tasten als Wahrnehmung und Erkenntnisvorgang*. (München: Beck, 1934).

<sup>25</sup> Subsequently published as Rudolf Hippius, *Die Umsiedlergruppe aus Estland. Ihre soziale, geistige und seelische Struktur*. (Posen: Jacob, 1940).

<sup>26</sup> See on Rudolf Hippius’s biography Ulfried Geuter, *Die Professionalisierung der deutschen Psychologie im Nationalsozialismus*. (Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1988), 571; Burleigh, *Germany*, 291; Frank-Rutger Hausmann, ‘*Deutsche Geisteswissenschaft im Zweiten Weltkrieg. Die Aktion Ritterbusch (1940-1945)*’, (Dresden: Dresden University Press, 1998), 267f; Karl-Heinz Roth, “Heydrichs Professor. Historiographie des ‘Volkstums’ und der Massenvernichtungen: Der Fall Hans Joachim Beyer” in Peter

Schöttler, ed., *Geschichtsschreibung als Legitimationswissenschaft 1918-1945*. (Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1997), 299, 304-307; Andreas Wiedemann, *Die Reinhard-Heydrich-Stiftung in Prag (1942-1945)*. (Dresden: Hannah-Arendt-Institut für Totalitarismusforschung, 2000), 61.

<sup>27</sup> 'Entwurf über die Aufgaben und Wege einer Bevölkerungsplanung im Warthegau'. Letter Hippius to Konrad Meyer, 5 December 1939, attachment, in Bundesarchiv Berlin, former Berlin Document Center (BDC), File Rudolf Hippius.

<sup>28</sup> File Rudolf Hippius.

<sup>29</sup> See the memorandum on the German People's List by Dr Herbert Strickner, a member of the Einsatzgruppe VI of the Sipo in Poznan, printed in Karol Mariam Pospieszalski, ed., *Niemiecka Lista Narodowa w 'Kraju Warty'*. *Documenta Occupationis Teutonicae*, vol IV, (Poznan: Institutu Zachodniego, 1949), 19-130, here 36.

<sup>30</sup> Pospieszalski, ed., *Niemiecka Lista Narodowa w 'Kraju Warty'*, 55-65.

<sup>31</sup> Pospieszalski, ed., *Niemiecka Lista Narodowa w 'Kraju Warty'*, 66-70.

<sup>32</sup> Pospieszalski, ed., *Niemiecka Lista Narodowa w 'Kraju Warty'*, 124-125. See Hans-Joachim Beyer, *Das Schicksal der Polen. Rasse, Volkscharakter, Stammesart*. (Leipzig: Teubner, 1942).

<sup>33</sup> The memorandum is printed in Rudi Goguel, *Über die Mitwirkung deutscher Wissenschaftler am Okkupationsregime in Polen im Zweiten Weltkrieg, untersucht an drei Institutionen der deutschen Ostforschung*. (PhD Dissertation: University of Berlin, 1964), Appendix, 46-49.

<sup>34</sup> See the internal report on the research project by Hippius, Bundesarchiv Berlin, BDC, Hippius File.

<sup>35</sup> Theodora Kalikow, "Die ethologische Theorie von Konrad Lorenz: Erklärung und Ideologie, 1938 bis 1943." in Herbert Mehrtens, Stefan Richter, eds., *Naturwissenschaft, Technik und NS-Ideologie. Beiträge zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte des Dritten Reiches* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1980), 189-214; Ute Deichmann, *Biologists under Hitler*. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996), 179-205; Benedikt Föger, Klaus Taschwer, *Die andere Seite des Spiegels. Konrad Lorenz und der Nationalsozialismus* (Vienna: Czernin, 2001), 148-153.

<sup>36</sup> Rudolf Hippius, I.G. Feldmann, K. Jelinek, K. Leider, *Volkstum, Gesinnung und Charakter. Bericht über psychologische Untersuchungen an Posener deutsch-polnischen Mischlingen und Polen, Sommer 1942*. (Stuttgart, Prag: Kohlhammer, 1943), 16.

<sup>37</sup> Hippius et al., *Volkstum, Gesinnung und Charakter*, 64.

<sup>38</sup> Hippus et al., *Volkstum, Gesinnung und Charakter*, 112, 114. See Deichmann, *Biologists*, 193-196.

<sup>39</sup> Memorandum by Karl Hermann Frank, 28 August 1940, in Václav Král, ed., *Die Deutschen in der Tschechoslowakei 1933-1947. Acta Occupationis Bohemiae et Moraviae*. (Prag: Nak. Československé akademie věd, 1964), document 315, 417-421, here 419.

<sup>40</sup> Král, ed., *Die Deutschen in der Tschechoslowakei 1933-1947*. Document 318, letter from Heydrich to Frank, 14 September 1940; document 320, order by Hitler, 5 October 1940.

<sup>41</sup> On the German occupation policies in the 'Protectorate' see Heinemann, *Rasse*, 127-186, Detlef Brandes, *Die Tschechen unter deutschem Protektorat. Vol 1: Besatzungspolitik, Kollaboration und Widerstand im Protektorat Böhmen und Mähren bis Heydrichs Tod (1939-1942)*. (München: Oldenbourg, 1969); Vojtěch Mastný, *The Czechs under Nazi Rule: The Failure of National Resistance, 1939-1942*. (New York, London: Columbia University Press, 1971).

<sup>42</sup> Egon Freiherr von Eickstedt, *Die Forschung am Menschen*. 3 vols. (Stuttgart: Enke, 1963); Ilse Schwidetzky, *Einführung in die Völkerbiologie*. (Stuttgart: Gustav Fischer, 1950).