

Bone & Soul: Physical Anthropology, the Great War and Nationalism in Eastern Europe

Maciej GÓRNY

Instytut Historii im. Tadeusza Manteuffla PAN
Deutsches Historisches Institut Warschau
gorny@dhi.waw.pl

Recibido: 12/02/2014

Aceptado: 09/06/2014

ABSTRACT

During and after the First World War the scientific discourse of racial anthropology served as a tool of ethnic definitions of one's own and the enemy nations. In the Austrian and German racial anthropology, the notion of *Mongolisation* was popularly used to represent the Russian enemy as an alien race. This way of thought found its main empirical expression in German and Austro-Hungarian anthropological research on POW's. Górný shows how active the anthropologists in East-Central Europe have been, not only reacting to the German intellectual currents but also influencing anthropologists of the Central Powers with their own racial theories. This racial discourse found its continuation in post-war East-Central Europe and the Balkans, legitimizing the newly created states.

Key words: Racial Anthropology, Mongolisation, First World War in East Central Europe, Nationalism, Prisoners of War.

Alma y hueso: La antropología física, la Gran Guerra y el nacionalismo en Europa Oriental

RESUMEN

Durante y después de la Primera Guerra Mundial, el discurso científico de la antropología racial sirvió como una herramienta de las definiciones étnicas de la propia nación y de las naciones enemigas. En la antropología racial austriaca y alemana, la noción de *Mongolización* fue usada popularmente para representar al enemigo ruso como una raza extraña. Esta forma de pensamiento encontró su principal expresión empírica en la investigación antropológica alemana y austro-húngara sobre los prisioneros de guerra. Górný muestra cuán activos fueron los antropólogos en Europa central y oriental, no sólo reaccionando a las corrientes intelectuales alemanas, sino también influyendo en los antropólogos de las potencias centrales con sus propias teorías raciales. Este discurso racial encontró su continuación en la Europa de posguerra Centro-Oriental y los Balcanes en la legitimación de los Estados recién creados.

Palabras clave: antropología racial, mongolización, Primera Guerra Mundial en Europa Centro-Oriental, nacionalismo, prisioneros de guerra.

Referencia normalizada: Górný, M. (2014). "Bone & Soul: Physical Anthropology, the Great War and Nationalism in Eastern Europe". *Cuadernos de historia contemporánea*, Vol.36: 239-258.

Sumario: Introduction 1. War as a catalyst to scholarship and professionalization 2. Mongolisation. Race as stigma. 3. 'War of the races'. 4. New pretenders in the hierarchy of races. 5. Toward one's own – the inclusive use of racial anthropology. 6. Conclusion.

Introduction

The Great War was not restricted solely to battlefields. On August 8th, 1914, Henri Bergson delivered the first of his speeches describing war as a clash between civilisation (represented by France and England) and German barbarianism. On September 18th of the same year, *The Times* published an address by British scholars and writers, criticising Germany. The address emphasised the supposedly aggressive character of German culture and its penchant for self-admiration.¹ A German response of a comparable calibre was not long in the making. In September 1914, 93 professors signed an *Address to the World of Culture*. In October, three thousand German academics affixed their signatures to an even more radical *Position of the Academic Teachers of the German Reich*. Understandably, such statements made by luminaries of science throughout the war's first few months draw the most interest from historians. This seems hardly avoidable given the calibre of figures involved, such as Émile Durkheim, Bergson, Gerhart Hauptmann or Thomas Mann.

Already during the war, the name 'Krieg der Geister' was commonly applied to this phenomenon. It aptly captures the character of the political engagement of the intellectuals. However, it also plays down two of its more important dimensions. First of all, as a subject of historiography, 'Krieg der Geister' seems even more thoroughly confined to the western theatre than the military history of World War I.² Eastern European intellectuals typically remain outside of the focus, even while – as Wolfgang J. Mommsen observes – historians recognise the necessity of altering this state of affairs.³ Second, the term 'Krieg der Geister' describes a phenomenon which is exceptional, surprising and unusual. This phenomenon consisted in the mobilisation of talents of a host of notable figures – often of an outstanding renown, and of pacifist or, more commonly, liberal persuasion – for the war effort. From the perspective of a less troubled time, indications of such engagement tend toward the pathetic and are clearly distinguished from the intellectual achievements which preceded the war, as well as those that followed. From the perspective of the history of culture or science, this period can be seen as a gap rather than a logical part of a whole.

The observations that follow constitute a 'case study' concerning these two forgotten aspects of the 'Krieg der Geister.' The radicalisation of attitudes characteristic of this phenomenon was not peculiar only to intellectuals of Western Europe. The movement was also joined by men of culture and science in Central and Eastern Europe. It will also be seen that they often continued to partake in it far longer than those who fired the first salvos of the spiritual war, just as war in the east continued well after it

¹ MOMMSEN, Wolfgang J.: *Bürgerliche Kultur und politische Ordnung. Künstler, Schriftsteller und Intellektuelle in der deutschen Geschichte 1830-1933*. Frankfurt am Main, 2000, pp. 196-215, here p. 201.

² KRAMER, John Horne/ Alan: *German atrocities, 1914. A history of denial*, New Haven, CT, 2001.

³ MOMMSEN, Wolfgang J.: *Der große Krieg und die Historiker. Neue Wege der Geschichtsschreibung über den Ersten Weltkrieg*. Essen, 2002 [= Stuttgarter Vorträge zur Zeitgeschichte, 6], p. 6.

ceased in the west. For inhabitants of the Balkans and East Central Europe 1918 does not constitute neither an end of the war nor even the rupture in fighting.⁴ Furthermore, from the perspective of the history of science, the radicalisation of attitudes did not always constitute an exception and neither was it always commensurate with an abandonment of previous scientific or artistic activities. The political implications of historiography are all too familiar and need not be invoked. Instead, it is far more useful to consider the specific group of sciences whose institutional character was not settled yet or was secured shortly before the outbreak of World War I. The ‘Krieg der Geister’ saw boundlessly fascinating (and rather seldom noted by scholars) input from representatives of sciences such as psychology, psychiatry or geography. However, it was physical anthropology that developed a particularly powerful bond with the Great War. Especially in East Central Europe and in the Balkans the racial anthropology’s ‘golden age’ starts in the eve of the continental conflict but goes far beyond its end. This article’s thesis is that the professional activities of anthropology experts at least up to mid 1920s should be looked at in the context of the ‘Krieg der Geister’ thus corresponding to the belated beginnings of the peace in that region.

1. War as a catalyst to scholarship and professionalization

In 1914, racial anthropology still endured a debatable status as science of questionable usefulness for the war effort and next to no prestige. Its institutionalisation has not been accomplished yet.⁵ The scientific standing of anthropology was in no way improved by its use in politics. In scientific milieus still dominated by liberals, such as in Russia, the state approached the new science with suspicion, wary of its possible oppositional potential.⁶ Meanwhile, in countries where the notion of race came to be exploited by the radical right, it met with criticism from liberals.

Reacting to the insufficiency of professionalism, proponents of the science sought to organise the basic tenets and techniques of anthropology and to cleanse it of at least some of the ideological taint. This task was taken up in two fundamental works published in the last year of peace. At that point in time, Eugen Fischer released the results of several years of research on the Rehoboth Bastards – the offspring of blacks and Boers inhabiting territories of today’s Namibia.⁷ Fischer’s main assump-

⁴ EICHENBERG, Julia, NEWMAN, John Paul: “Introduction: Aftershocks: Violence in Dissolving Empires after the First World War”, *Contemporary European History*, 19 (2010), 3, pp. 183-194; SANBORN, Joshua: “The Genesis of Russian Warlordism: Violence and Governance during the First World War and the Civil War”, *Contemporary European History*, 19 (2010), 3, pp. 195-213; BÖHLER, Jochen: “Generals and Warlords, Revolutionaries and Nation-State Builders: The First World War and its Aftermath in Central and Eastern Europe”, in: BÖHLER, Jochen, BORODZIEJ, Włodzimierz & VON PUTTKAMER, Joachim (eds.) *Legacies of Violence. Eastern Europe’s First World War*. München, 2014, pp. 51-66.

⁵ WEINDLING, Paul Julian: *Health, Race and German Politics between National Unification and Nazism, 1870-1945*, Cambridge, 1989, pp. 53-55.

⁶ See MOGILNER, Marina: “Russian Physical Anthropology in Search of ‘Imperial Race’: Liberalism and Modern Scientific Imagination in the Imperial Situation”, *Ab Imperio*, 1 (2007), pp. 191-223, here p. 195.

⁷ FISCHER, Eugen: *Die Rehobother Bastards und das Bastardisierungsproblem beim Menschen. Anthropologische und ethnographische Studien am Rehobother Bastardvolk in Deutsch-Südwest-Afrika*, Graz, 1961.

tion was that biological traits were inherited in accordance with the laws formulated by Mendel. The year 1914 saw the publication of the first, very extensive handbook of anthropology written by Rudolf Martin.⁸ The Swiss anthropologist patently rejected a popular tendency to identify race with nation.⁹ But it is, in fact, the account of techniques of collecting biometric data that forms the core of Martin's work. Among other things, it includes a description of the way in which gypsum casts of heads of living people should be made, as well as the most commonly accepted scales of assessment of the colouring of the eyes, skin and hair.

Institutional and intellectual feebleness aside, anthropologists were also badly served by an apparent dearth of any practical application of their work for the military. In reality, the armies had no use for anthropologists, it was the latter who were dependent upon the former. Already years before the war, fresh recruits constituted the most common object of study and measurement, next to students. A conflict on a massive scale set the stage for the scientists to meet the demand put forward by Martin. Interestingly, representatives of leading Western European scholarly institutions were by no means the first to exploit this opportunity, that honour being claimed by Niko Županić, a Slovenian student of geographer Albrecht Penck, based in Berlin (and Vienna). In 1913, Županić conducted measurements on well over a hundred Turkish prisoners of war, held in Belgrade since the First Balkan War. He managed to publish his observations in Serbia in the same year; soon afterwards, he did the same with the results of measurements he conducted shortly thereafter on Bulgarian prisoners of war of the Second Balkan War.¹⁰ The conclusions of both these pioneering undertakings were set to be presented at the German anthropological congress in August 1914. However, the outbreak of yet another war hampered Županić's plans, and his research eventually did not attract significant attention.¹¹

A far greater range was achieved in the German and Austro-Hungarian studies of prisoners of war, inaugurated in 1915. Scholars from both countries became conscious of an arising opportunity at exactly the same time. In 1915, the German anthropologist, Georg Buschan published an address to his peers in the *Deutsche Medizinische Wochenschrift*: "Under their banners, our enemies collected such a colourful mixture of peoples that nearly all races of the world can be found to be represented in it. ... Perhaps we may never again be granted such an opportunity of finding so many tribes, especially those from Eastern Europe, in the same place and at the same time, as we have now in our prisoner of war camps."¹² Making use of a short leave from the front, Buschan examined 75 prisoners from the camp in Stettin (nowadays Szczecin) and testified to the necessity of state support for similar endeavours in other locations.

⁸ MARTIN, Rudolf: *Lehrbuch der Anthropologie in systematischer Darstellung mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der anthropologischen Methoden*. Jena, 1914.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

¹⁰ ŽUPANIĆ, Niko: *Pontijski bugari (Les Bulgares pontiques)*, sep. print from Prosvetni Glasnik, 1913.

¹¹ See PROMITZER, Christian: "Betwixt and Between": Physical Anthropology in Bulgaria and Serbia until the End of the First World War," in: JOHLER, R., MARCHETTI, C. & SCHEER, M. (eds.): *Doing Anthropology in Wartime and War Zones. World War I and the Cultural Sciences in Europe*, Bielefeld, 2010, pp. 141-168, here pp. 157-159.

¹² BUSCHAN, [Georg]: "Krieg und Anthropologie", *Deutsche Medizinische Wochenschrift*, 41, (1915), 26, p. 773.

Austrian anthropologists, Rudolf Pöch and Eugen Oberhummer, reached similar conclusions during their visit to the Wegscheid camp near Linz. Oberhummer recounted that even a passing acquaintance with the wealth of racial types collected therein led the scholars to acknowledge “the enormity of the possible rewards anthropological study could reap there.”¹³

In the rivalry for precedence in the exploitation of the rising opportunity, Austrian and Hungarian anthropologists significantly outpaced their German colleagues. From the outset, they were also granted the privilege of more extensive support from the authorities, especially the military hierarchies. The whole undertaking had a propaganda value, well recorded in numerous communiques approvingly noting the triumph of Austro-Hungarian science.

Pöch oversaw measurements conducted by a team of scientists supported by soldiers specifically assigned to the task. Several thousands of prisoners of war were examined, chiefly from Russia. The director of this gargantuan project published extensive reports while it was in progress, both describing the techniques in use and suggesting early conclusions. The work began with measurements of arm span, and head and body size. Following that, naked prisoners were subjected to analysis of skin and hair colour, as well as the extent of body hair. The instruments and reference tables used for assessment were selected in accordance with Rudolf Martin’s guidelines. Some of the objects of study were also photographed, always in the nude, in a separate, well-lighted room. Gypsum casts of heads of chosen specimen were made. In the case of particularly ‘exotic’ nationalities, linguists from Budapest, also employed in the project, recorded short tales and folk songs. Films were also shot, depicting prisoners carving in wood, engaged in folk dances, and even engrossed in Muslim prayer.¹⁴

Indeed, Pöch’s research became a source of inspiration for anthropologists throughout the monarchy. During the winter of 1915-1916, Georg Kyrle, a member of Pöch’s research team, conducted measurements on prisoners of war in immediate proximity to the frontline, even before they were delivered to camps.¹⁵ Viktor Lebzelter examined several hundred Serbian prisoners held at the Kraków prison camp, and several Serbian Roma prisoners from the Dąbie camp.¹⁶ Kraków was also the sphere of activity of a Polish anthropologist, Adam Wrzosek, one of whose postwar achievements was the founding of the *Przeгляд Antropologiczny* [Anthropological Review]. In his research, Wrzosek cited measurements conducted on nearly a thousand Russian and

¹³ OBERHUMMER, Eugen: “Rudolf Pöch (gestorben am 4. März 1921)”, *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien*, LI, (1921), 4-5, pp. 96-102, here p. 100. See also TESCHLER-NICOLA, Maria: “Rudolf Pöch’s osteologische Lehr- und Forschungssammlung im Spannungsfeld von Wissenschaft und Ethik”, *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien*, 141, (2011), pp. 51-66.

¹⁴ PÖCH, Rudolf: “Bericht über die von der Wiener Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in den k.u.k. Kriegsgefangenenlagern veranlaßten Studien” *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien*, XLV, (1915), 6, pp. 219-231.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 99.

¹⁶ LEBZELTER, Viktor: “Beiträge zur physischen Anthropologie der Balkanhalbinsel”, *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien*, LIII, (1923), 1-2, pp. 3-22 & “Anthropologische Untersuchungen an serbischen Zigeunern”, *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien*, LII, (1922), 1-3, pp. 22-35.

Serbian prisoners.¹⁷ Pöch's assistant, Josef Weninger, concentrated on measuring black soldiers.

The same methods and techniques were also applied to other groups. Rudolf Pöch's wife (and doctoral student), Hella, born Schürer, 'supplemented' the data collected at prisoner-of-war camps with analyses of refugees from Volhynia, mainly women and children, interned at camp Niederalm near Salzburg.¹⁸ Due to having access to entire families, her observations focused in particular on the question of heredity. After the capture of Serbia, Lebzelter and Arthur Haberlandt conducted similar research on Albanians who joined volunteer units supporting the Austro-Hungarian army.¹⁹ Projects based directly on the Austro-Hungarian research were also conducted after the war. One of the greatest undertakings of that kind were the Polish measurements of several tens of thousands recruits, conducted in the early 1920s. 'Anthropological photography' was in this instance overseen by a former officer of the Austro-Hungarian army, Jan Mydlarski; the same course of action was accepted and identical procedures – also taken from Martin – followed.²⁰ The only significant addition to the methodology of measurement was the introduction of serological tests, based on the research Hanna and Ludwik Hirschfeld conducted in Serbian military field hospitals.²¹ From the perspective of the creators of racial hierarchies, the major virtue of the tests they established was furthering the connotation between blood type and race.²²

The Austro-Hungarian successes elicited admiration and jealousy of German anthropologists. Prestige was very much at stake in Felix von Luschan's pursuit of the possibility of engaging in a similar undertaking in the German Reich's prisoner-of-war camps. Measurements conducted by his pupil, Egon von Eickstedt, among others, were quantitatively less impressive, and concentrated thematically not on the nationalities of the Russian empire, but on non-European soldiers of the Entente. Eickstedt's study, concerned with the racial characteristics of the Sikhs, saw print already after the war.²³ Luschan, hailing from Austria and well-connected among her anthropological milieus, achieved a unification of the measurement methods employed in the two states. Thanks to him, the Austrians gained access to German prisoner-of-war camps, much richer in representatives of exotic nationalities.²⁴ The research, endowed by the Imperial Academy of Sciences, greatly extended the col-

¹⁷ WILLEROWA, Olga: "Spostrzeżenia nad barwą oczów i skóry u Tatarów, Ormian, Gruzinów, Mołdawjan, Serbów i Macedończyków" *Przegląd Antropologiczny* I, (1926), 2, pp. 84-91.

¹⁸ PÖCH-SCHÜRER: "Beiträge zur Anthropologie der ukrainischen Wolhynier" *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien*, LVI, (1926).

¹⁹ HABERLANDT/LEBZELTER, V[iktor]: "Zur physischen Anthropologie der Albanesen", *Archiv für Anthropologie*, XVII, nf (1919), pp. 123-143.

²⁰ MYDLARSKI, Jan: "Sprawozdanie z wojskowego zdjęcia antropologicznego Polski", *Kosmos*, 50, (1925) 2-3, pp. 530-583.

²¹ HIRSCHFELD/ HIRSCHFELD, Hanna: "Essai d'application des méthodes sérologiques au problème des races", *L'Anthropologie*, XXIX, (1918-1919), pp. 504-537.

²² See TURDA, Marius: "The Nation as Object: Race, Blood, and Biopolitics in Interwar Romania", *Slavic Review*, 66, (2007) 3, pp. 413-441.

²³ VON EICKSTEDT, Egon: "Rassenelemente der Sikh", *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, 52-53, (1920-1921), pp. 317-394.

²⁴ D. EVANS, Andrew: *Anthropology at War: World War I and the Science of Race in Germany*, Chicago, 2010, pp. 141-145.

lections of data, photographs and gypsum casts. Some of them were handed over to Luschan and other German colleagues, as a token of appreciation.²⁵

Evidently, the Great War became a catalyst for the professionalization of physical anthropology. The mass scale of the conflict helped solve one of the key research problems, that is, the insufficient opportunities of access to ‘research material.’ Prisoner-of-war and refugee camps provided ample material. More importantly, anthropologists in Austro-Hungary and the German Reich managed to convince the authorities that their research had a bearing on the military effort. Though the claim seems dubious, at best, to a closer inspection (if anything, it was the anthropologists who depended on the army, not the other way around), the discursive connection of anthropometric studies with national defence took root in Central and Eastern European way of thinking for a longer while. As proof of that, one can consider, for instance, the Polish ‘anthropological photography’ of the interwar period.

2. Mongolisation. Race as stigma

The term that became the focus of the wartime debates about race in Eastern Europe was ‘Mongolisation.’ From its inception, Pöch’s research was aimed at capturing the particular features of anatomy which were identified as Mongolian. Attention was drawn, e.g., to bowed legs and to the ‘Mongolian fold’ (on the eyelids). In the scheme approved by scholars for recording the collected data, a plus sign was put next to those features that were deemed characteristic of the Mongolian race, and a minus sign by all the others.²⁶ In accordance with his starting assumptions, Pöch planned to focus on the peoples of Caucasus, Siberia and Mongolians of South-Eastern Russia. However, already in 1916, the number of Russians, Belarusians and – to a smaller extent – Ukrainians among the examinees began to rise.²⁷ Concurrently, the latter were submitted to a propaganda campaign devised to spread the conviction that Ukrainians were totally unrelated to the Great Russians.²⁸ After all, ethnic Russians comprised only about 20 per cent of prisoners examined in Austro-Hungary.²⁹ Characteristically, Pöch’s analyses leave those nationalities of the Tsar’s empire that inhabited Austro-Hungary as well out of the discussion almost entirely. The sole exception were the ‘Little Russians,’ whose national identity remained unresolved. As Evans observes,

²⁵ AÖAW, Subventionen der math.-nat. Klasse 1914-1919 - Karton 6, 461/1917, Ansuchen um eine Subvention von K 8000 für anthropologische Untersuchungen exotischer Völkerschaften in den deutschen Kriegsgefangenenlagern, prof. dr. R. Pöch, 4 VII 1917.

²⁶ PÖCH: “Bericht...” p. 224.

²⁷ PÖCH: “II. Bericht über die von der Wiener Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in den k. u. k. Kriegsgefangenenlagern veranlaßten Studien”, *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien*, XLVI, (1916), 4-5, pp. 109-131.

²⁸ LEIDINGER & MORITZ, Verena: “Verwaltete Massen. Kriegsgefangene in der Donaumonarchie 1914-1918” OLTMER, J. (ed.): *Kriegsgefangene im Europa der Ersten Weltkriegs*, Paderborn, 2006, pp. 35-61, here pp. 60-61.

²⁹ PÖCH, R[udolf]: “IV. Bericht über die von der Wiener Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in den k. u. k. Kriegsgefangenenlagern veranlaßten Studien”, *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien*, XLIX-L, (1919-1920), 1-3, p. 150.

one could see this as anthropology's contribution to the national integration of the monarchy. In spite of linguistic and racial diversity, as well as numerous mutual conflicts, these nationalities consistently maintained unity in the face of the 'Mongolised' enemy.³⁰

Attempts at forging national unity on an image of a 'racial' enemy were, however, encumbered by certain risks. Claims of Russia's Asiatic character, it seemed, needed no particular explanation. They thoroughly agreed with the dominant tropes of its wartime stereotyping, with only a sprinkling of new elements and a veneer of professional terminology. The anonymous author of an article about the Mongolisation of Russia, which saw print in the *Zeitschrift für Socialwissenschaft*, compared the process to the mixing of Slavic and Ural-Altai elements, which resulted in the emergence of a Finnish nation, concluding that while Finns achieved a high level of civilisation, Russians were actually degrading, with a growing number of 'somatic and psychic' mongoloid elements showing through. They were reportedly possessed of a tendency to adopting traits typical of peoples of lower racial standing. As proof, scientists cited the phenomenon of 'Yakutisation' of Siberian Russians.³¹ At the margins of this line of thinking emerged a related problem: the question of the effect centuries of living side-by-side with Tartar nomads had on Ukrainians in terms of their Mongolisation.³² This notion was furthered in a work by Hella Pöch, published already after her husband's death. Rejecting wholesale the paradigm of Austrian wartime anthropology identified by Evans, she concluded that Ukrainian refugees from Volhynia were, in fact, deeply Mongolised.³³

In 1924, Hella Pöch and Josef Weninger, a former assistant to Rudolf Pöch, published a methodological article concerned with the methods of anthropological evaluation of facial features and the build of the skull. The change in the evaluation of the racial worth of Ukrainians by Austrian scientists were borne out even in the choice of photographs which accompanied the text. Next to a picture of a Ukrainian, the authors placed images of 'typical' Vietnamese, Hindu, Senegalese and Georgian specimen.³⁴ One could hardly be surprised that the problem of Mongolisation deeply affected the activists of the Ukrainian national movement. It also became the focal point of a peculiar Polish-Ukrainian front of the European 'spiritual war.'

In this struggle, the Ukrainian geographer and anthropologist, Stepan Rudnytskyi, packed the biggest punch. His work from 1914, written in German, included an entire chapter devoted to the racial make-up of Ukrainians. While he agreed that – like any other nation – Ukrainians were of mixed origin, he stressed that the racial mixture particular to them differed decisively from either the Russian or the Polish one. He also vehemently rejected the conjecture that the country was forced into the

³⁰ EVANS: *Anthropology...*, p. 149.

³¹ "Die Mongolisierung Rußlands" *Zeitschrift für Socialwissenschaft*, VI, nf (1915), 2, pp. 126-132, here pp. 129-131.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 129.

³³ PÖCH-SCHÜRER: "Beiträge...", p. 35.

³⁴ WENIGER & PÖCH, Hella: "Leitlinien zur Beobachtung der somatischen Merkmale des Kopfes und Gesichtes am Menschen", *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien*, LIV, (1924), 6, pp. 232-270.

Mongolian sphere of influence by history. In general – he claimed, casually questioning an almost universally accepted view – Eastern Europe is far less racially heterogeneous than the west. Invaders remained in Ukraine only briefly, at most, not affecting the local inhabitants in any way.³⁵ For Rudnytskyi, claims to any kinship between Ukrainians and Poles, Russians or Mongols were univocally invalidated by the biometric data gleaned from publications devoted to the Russian Ukraine. He put even more stress on this claim in the Ukrainian version of his book, published in 1916. Commenting on an uncommonly austere table, which set together basic statistical data concerning the body build of Poles, Ukrainians and Russians, he stated:

These three rows of numbers, acquired through the application of exact and natural sciences, tell us more than any thick volume would. ... These few numbers prove in the plainest possible manner that we, Ukrainians, are an independent nation, neither Polonised Muscovites nor Russified Poles, but a nation independent also in its racial make-up, a statement that could not be made with respect to either Poles, or Muscovites.³⁶

To reiterate, Rudnytskyi's claim of racial independence did not mean that he defined Ukrainians as a separate race outright. The procedure to which he submitted the previous findings of anthropologists – primarily the most recent works of a Ukrainian scholar from Russia, Khvedir Vovk – consisted in a rather subtle shifting of accents, without discarding the norms of scientific objectivism. Rudnytskyi did not warp the data he used as grounds for his argumentation, choosing rather to qualify them with commentaries. Uncommented, the numbers he brings up in his book could well have been understood to illustrate a racial kinship between Ukrainians and their neighbours. Neither was Rudnytskyi original in his description of the physical attributes of the dominant anthropological type in Ukraine. Vovk also believed that Ukrainians were comparably homogeneous: “dark-haired, dark-eyed, of medium ... height, brachycephalous ... with straight noses,” relatively long legs and short arms.³⁷ In his view, however, their contemporary features could only lead to the formation of a hypothetical notion of the outward appearance of the primordial inhabitants of the land in a period when they still formed a single ethnographic entity with Belarusians and Russians. In the 20th century, he wrote, those familiar with the history of Ukraine would never expect its citizen to exhibit any particularly clear ethnic type.³⁸

Rudnytskyi's assertion that Ukrainians represented the Dinaric (or Adriatic) race did not contradict the state of knowledge at the time. His statements were a direct reference to claims put forward by the French anthropologist, Joseph Deniker, in the early 20th century.³⁹ Again, all he did was, in effect, to shift the accents, making Ukraine the central and relatively racially homogeneous kernel of a type Deniker located primarily in the Balkans. Another novelty was the association of the Dinaric

³⁵ RUDNYCKYJ, Stefan: *Ukraina und die Ukrainer*, Wien, 1914, pp. 12-13.

³⁶ Рудницький, Степан: *Чому ми хочемо самостійної України*, Львів, 1994, (2nd ed.), p. 47.

³⁷ BOEK, Хведір: “Антропологічні особливості українського народу (1916)”, *Студії з української етнографії та антропології*, Прага, no date, pp. 31-32.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 32 & 3.

³⁹ DENIKER, J[oseph]: *Les races et les peuples de la terre. Éléments d'anthropologie et d'ethnographie*, Paris, 1900.

race with the primordial Slavs. A similar edge was given to another of Deniker's theses, concerned with the occurrence of the so-called Vistulian type (*race Vistulienne*) among Poles and, to a far lesser extent, Russians. The type differed from the Dinaric race in exhibiting a significant admixture of Mongolian blood. The Ukrainian anthropologist also cited measurement data which, in his view, documented the similarity between Poles and Russians.

Rudnytskyi's theses were wholeheartedly embraced by Ukrainian nationalist activists of the first few decades of the 20th century, especially insofar as they reflected on the proximities between Ukrainians, Poles and Russians. For the same reasons, the claims were vehemently rejected by Polish authors. Stanisław Głąbiński, who named Rudnytskyi's works "an anthropological swindle," offered the following response:

After all, we are taught by history that the territories currently inhabited by the Little Russians were previously the dwelling place for numerous divergent peoples, which mixed with many incoming tribes and alien races (Mongols, Tartars, Vallachians) Therefore, there is no way for us to seriously consider treating 'Ukrainians' as a specific racial type. ... Hence, Ukrainians do not belong to a distinct race, neither do they share ... a common past, a common culture; therein lies the reason for the absence of a singular name for the tribe.⁴⁰

However, the most potent weapon in the Polish-Ukrainian 'spiritual war' was the ability to affect foreign opinion. In this regard, Rudnytskyi achieved a commanding victory in Germany, where his theses were eagerly published, while also – even more importantly – earning inclusion into the more general arguments penned by German anthropologists and geographers.⁴¹ This reception finds an interesting proof in articles published in the state-supported organ of German proponents of the 'Ukrainian cause,' *Osteuropäische Zukunft*. Already its first yearbook included a piece by Rudnytskyi, briefly describing his previous findings, with particular focus on the Dinaric character of Ukrainians. Another portion of his thesis opened the second yearbook.⁴² One of the following issues of the journal featured a more general article by anthropologist, and one of the most important German exponents of the racial hygiene movement, Fritz Lenz, devoted to the subject of Nordic elements in the 'blood' of East European nationalities.⁴³ Russians were said to have only retained remnants of Nordic traits at the frontiers of their ethnic territories. Meanwhile, the centre succumbed to a 'Tartarisation.' Lenz devoted slightly more room to Poles, believed – as he claimed, wrongly – to enjoy closer ties to Germans than did, e.g., Estonians, on linguistic grounds.

⁴⁰ [Głąbiński, Stanisław]: *Die Ukraina. Ein Problem oder ein Phantom? Von einem österreichischen Polen*, Wien, 1918, p. 18.

⁴¹ See FRIEDERICHSEN, Max: *Die Grenzmarken des Europäischen Rußlands. Ihre geographische Eigenart und ihre Bedeutung für den Weltkrieg*, Hamburg, 1915, pp. 89-90; OBERHUMMER, Eugen: *Die Türken und das Osmanische Reich*, Leipzig – Berlin, 1917, p. 21.

⁴² RUDNYCKYJ, Stephan: "Zur Landes- und Volkskunde der Ukraine" *Osteuropäische Zukunft*, 1, (1916), 22, pp. 347-351 & *Osteuropäische Zukunft*, 2, (1917), 1, pp. 1-6. See KURAEV, Oleksyj: *Der Verband „Freie Ukraine“ in Kontext der deutschen Ukraine-Politik des Ersten Weltkriegs*, Osteuropa-Institut München, Mitteilungen, 35/2000.

⁴³ LENZ, Fritz: "Die nordische Rasse in der Blutmischung unserer östlichen Nachbarn", *Osteuropäische Zukunft*, 2, (1917), 2, pp. 17-24.

In racial terms, this claim is incorrect. Thus, Poles have decidedly less Nordic blood than do Germans. They exhibit significant traces of the Turan and – interestingly – also Mediterranean type, the sources of the latter being unclear. Perhaps these traits derive from the influence of the southern (Crimean) Tartars, who, contrary to the northern (Kazan) Tartars, typically belong to the Mediterranean race.⁴⁴

Lenz fully agreed with Rudnytskyi also with respect to the latter's evaluation of Ukrainians. While he did not support their ascription to the Nordic race, he acquiesced that they belonged to the Dinaric type, with traces of Mediterranean origin. In this case, no mention of any Tartar roots was made.⁴⁵

3. 'War of the races'

Rudnytskyi's claims met with approval from the practitioners and amateurs of racial anthropology in Germany primarily because they perfectly suited a particular racial historiography which enjoyed huge popularity at the time. Considerations on the character and psychology of one's own and one's enemies often relied on an image of war as a clash between races, pitting the Nordic-Aryan Germanics against a variety of different, less deserving anthropological types. Scientific studies provided a major distinction in that regard – the classification of human skulls as dolichocephalic and brachycephalic (with intermediary types in between). The former were identified as a marker of a Nordic origin. Brachycephaly, on the other hand, became a feature ascribed to numerous anthropological types, and – as we shall see further – did not exclude the possibility of forming positive identity concepts, a fact illustrated by Rudnytskyi's theory, among others.

Indeed, German publications addressing the subject of racial origins of nations engaged in the war quite seldom accepted the notion of sharing the dignity of Aryan roots with anybody other than one's own folk, even when the writers were professional craniologists. The wartime edition of Ludwig Wilser's popular *Die Überlegenheit der germanischen Rasse* interpreted the conflict as a result of the aggression of racially worthless elements against the Reich.⁴⁶ In the eyes of this and many other authors, the whole human culture was of Aryan making, and Aryans themselves were direct ancestors of contemporary Germans. Other nations could not call up such an exquisite genealogy, and besides, they are given to perilous influences of the so-called civilisation. Even where some anthropologists stressed the racially mixed character of nations and the impact of environment on the evolution of primary, 'clean' racial types, the results of their ruminations did not deviate significantly from the established pattern: Germans, even if racially mixed, turned out always to have been far more homogeneous than the southerners or Slavs, and hence also more talented and

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 20.

⁴⁵ Ibid. pp. 20-21.

⁴⁶ WILSER, Ludwig: *Die Überlegenheit der germanischen Rasse. Zeitgemäße Betrachtungen*, Stuttgart, 1915, p. VI.

intelligent.⁴⁷ Interestingly, even the eventual, humiliating defeat of Germany did not induce a retreat from these racial claims. Instead, German authors set out to locate Aryan-Germanic racial types among the military and political leaders of the victorious powers. As a result, after 1918, it suddenly became apparent that a purely Aryan heritage and a long, narrow, noble skull were attributes characteristic not only of Hindenburg or Ludendorff, but also Joffre, Foch, Lloyd George and Wilson.⁴⁸

The perception of war as a struggle between races was not exclusive to Germany. Both during the war, and immediately thereafter, Finland proved an incredibly fascinating test ground for racial theories. According to a belief shared almost universally among well-educated Europeans, the country was inhabited by a Mongoloid people. Though this claim was put to task in Germany already in Rudolf Virchow's research from the 1870s, the most widespread interpretation among Germans focussed on a racial conflict between the Nordic type, bred in Sweden, and a primordial Mongol type. Neither was this contention abandoned by professionals after 1918, being referenced quite often in public statements by experts on Finland.

According to a young, Swedish scholar, Artur Eklund, Mongolian Finns were characterised by slowness, melancholy and absence of culture, features which marked them apart from their compatriots of Swedish stock – active, creative and cultured.⁴⁹ In 1918, Finland saw the eruption of a civil war between 'whites' and 'reds,' with the former emerging victorious. Clashes were neither extensive (the war lasted about three months and a half, in all) nor bloody, particularly in the context of the continuing Great War and the Russian Revolution. For some observers, the conflict was not so much a symptom of a class struggle, as of a race war. According to a simplified view of the conflict, the oppressed, primitive Finnish folk rose in rebellion against its Swedish masters. The claim was fitted into a racial theory by Lars Ringbom, who stated that the war broke out between two distinct nationalities inhabiting Finland. The western part of the country was populated by those who claimed an admixture of Germanic blood, while the east was the dwelling of Finnish-Slavic mongrels. The former were individualists, the latter – primitive collectivists.⁵⁰ Another scholar researching the same question concluded that the conflict grew out of the fact that Finns were racially mixed, which, in turn, made Swedish domination unavoidable.⁵¹ In the pages of the *Politisch-Anthropologische Monatsschrift*, the following racist interpretation was accepted: "The civil war, in the end, was nothing more than a war between races, with the whites reliant on Swedish backing, and the reds unable to mobilise

⁴⁷ CLASSEN, Karl: "Beiträge zum Indogermanenproblem", *Korrespondenz-Blatt der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte*, XLIX, (1918), 1/4, p. 7.

⁴⁸ HAUSER, Otto: *Rasse und Politik*, Weimar, 1922, p. 111. See BAUR, Erwin, FISCHER, Eugen, LENZ, Fritz: *Menschliche Erblichkeitslehre*, München, 1921, p. 293.

⁴⁹ EKLUND, Artur: *Svenskt i Finland*, Helsingfors, 1914, pp. 1-22.

⁵⁰ RINGBORM, Lars: *Inbördeskriget i Finland. Psychologiska anteckningar*, Helsingfors, 1918, quoted in: KEMILÄINEN, Aira: *Finns in the shadow of the „Aryans“*. *Race theories and racism*, Helsinki, 1998, p. 150.

⁵¹ VON WENDT, Georg: *Suomen molemmat kausat, suomalaiset ja itärnotsalaiset. Piirteitä kehityksestä ja tulevaisunden mahdollisuuksista*, Helsinki, 1919, see KEMILÄINEN: *Finns*, p. 151.

more than a passive support among Swedes.”⁵² The eventual victory of the whites was sometimes treated as a form of atonement – limited, but still soothing – for the German failure in the Great War. According to this interpretation, the heroism of “the Swedish youth, the core of the yeoman class,” made victory over the “Asiatic hordes” advancing from the east possible, which meant that “Baltic became a German interior sea!”⁵³

4. New pretenders in the hierarchy of races

The intellectual structure based on the division of peoples into dolicocephalic and brachycephalic types, operating by means of the disqualifying notion of ‘Mongolisation,’ owed its attraction, for the most part, to its consistency with the state of contemporary anthropology. As a result, the discourse that grew so exponentially in Germany drew in authors from other countries, looking for the most elevated station available for ‘their’ racial types. Such an operation hardly caused any trouble to Swedes, who enjoyed the status of the most Nordic of all Nordics. However, representatives of other nations could play that game as well, a fact proved by Stepan Rudnytskyi. In his racial theory, the Ukrainian anthropologist and geographer also made good use of a term successfully applied in other contexts. The Dinaric race, though viewed as inferior to the Nordic race by most French and German anthropologists, was typically seen as more elevated than other brachycephalous types. Already the body build associated with it suggested that it stood – literally – taller than the others: the rotund skull was supposedly accompanied by tall height.⁵⁴ A Dinaric face also approximated those of the Nordics.⁵⁵ In a standard postwar handbook of anthropology, the Dinaric type was ascribed a “considerable intellect,” imagination, artistic abilities and kind-heartedness, accompanied by a modicum of carelessness and lack of organisational talents.⁵⁶ These features paled in comparison with those of the Nordic race, but looked more favourably when set against the Alpine race (which the author of the handbook identified as a western branch of the Mongolian race) or the wild, cruel and dim-witted Mediterranean race.⁵⁷ The image of the Dinaric type was also affected by wartime experiences. In later years, the main ideologue of racism in the Third Reich, Hans F. K. Günther, associated it with Bavarians and Serbs, whom he acknowledged as “particularly trustworthy due to their sense of dignity, patriotism,

⁵² VON BORN, Freiherr: “Finnland und die ‘russische Pest’” *Politisch-Anthropologische Monatsschrift*, 18, (1919-1920), 5, pp. 220-224.

⁵³ VON BORN, Freiherr: “Völker- und Sprachenverhältnisse in Finnland”, *Politisch-Anthropologische Monatsschrift*, 17, (1918-1919), 6, pp. 276-281, here pp. 280-281.

⁵⁴ ARLDT, Theodor: *Germanische Völkerwellen und ihre Bedeutung in der Bevölkerungsgeschichte von Europa*, Leipzig, 1917, p. IX.

⁵⁵ KRAITSCHEK, Gustav: *Rassenkunde mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des deutschen Volkes, vor allem der Ostalpenländer*, Wien, 1923, p. 47.

⁵⁶ FISCHER, Eugen: “Spezielle Anthropologie – Rassenlehre”, FISCHER, Eugen ., GRAEBNER, R.F., HOERES, M., MOLLISON, Th. PLOETZ, A., SCHWALBE, Gustav: *Anthropologie*, Leipzig – Berlin, 1923, p. 152.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 151 & 154.

courage and a peculiar self-confidence. These traits made soldiers originating from the Dinaric regions the best warriors of the south-eastern front during the war.”⁵⁸

According to common opinion of European anthropologists, the incidence of the Dinaric race centred on the Balkans. The approval and extension of that concept by Serbian anthropologists and anthropogeographers was virtually unavoidable. Jovan Cvijić, undisputedly the foremost among them, incorporated it into his vision of the ethnographic breakdown of the peninsula. Though he refrained from applying racial hierarchies in his own work, he replicated the idealised descriptions of the outside appearance of representatives of the Dinaric type, concluding that “degenerated individuals are nearly absent within it.”⁵⁹ A more consistent interest in anthropology was exhibited by Niko Županić. The year 1912 saw the reissue, in Vienna, of a new edition of his work justifying Serbian claims for Albania. In the book, he criticised the nationalist exclusivism of French and German scientists, who failed to reckon with the exceptional biological potential of some Balkan nationalities. Meanwhile, Serbs, especially in the south of the country, retained an untainted, primal, Aryan Slavic character: light skin and hair colour, blue or grey eyes, dolicocephaly and tall height. At the Slavic-Albanian boundary, the Nordic component mixed with remnants of the Illyrian, Romanised primordial population. As a result,

The mixing of Serb and Illyrian blood gave one of the most noble anthropological alloys in Europe, the so-called ‘Dinaric’ or ‘Adriatic’ race. This race is characterized by tall, slender (almost never stout) posture, dark eye and hair colour, and rounded skull, perhaps slightly flattened at the back. The hawk’s eyes ... throw sparks and testify to a gallant heart. These people are full of vim and energy, with very lively facial features.⁶⁰

They were supposedly characterized by a stern morality, typical for highlanders, and a patriarchalism of which Cvijić took note, as well. In his postwar works devoted to the ethnogenesis of the Yugoslavs, Županić reiterated his metallurgic metaphors, claiming that, in the case of Serbs, racial mixing brought formidable results: “Even precious gold does not have the most value or durability when found in pure state; for this reason, in mints, it is alloyed with copper and other less valuable metals to impart it with more toughness, a vivacity of colour, or a beautiful sheen.”⁶¹

There was, of course, a world of difference between the significance ascribed to the Dinaric race by Deniker, as well as Županić, and the meaning Rudnytskyi gave it. Only the Ukrainian perceived it as a primordial race and identified it with the Slavic type. In the eyes of other anthropologists, the race was more likely a product of mixing. However, in the circumstances of a European ‘spiritual war,’ such differences paled before a general, immeasurably positive assessment of the Dinaric type. Significantly, the type seemed immune to the charge of Mongolisation. Polish

⁵⁸ GUNTER, Hans F. K.: *Kleine Rassenkunde Europas*, München, 1925, p. 57.

⁵⁹ PROMITZER, Christian: “Die Kette des Seins und die Konstruktion Jugoslawiens”, en: FEICHTINGER, J., PRUTSCH, U. & CSÁKY, M.(eds.), *Habsburg postcolonial. Machtstrukturen und kollektives Gedächtnis*, Innsbruck, 2003, pp. 294-295.

⁶⁰ ŽUPANIC, Niko: *Altserbien und die albanesische Frage*, Wien, 1912 (2nd ed.), pp. 32-33.

⁶¹ ŽUPANIC, Niko: “Etnogeneza Jugoslavena”, *Rad Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti*, 222, (1920), p. 143, quotes in: PROMITZER: *Die Kette*, p. 295.

anthropologists faced a much more problematic situation, entering upon a discourse in which their nation occupied a subservient position.

It has become a frequent and important motif in the said discourse to identify dolicocephaly with Germanic origins, which allowed archaeologists to make conjectures as to the ethnic appurtenance of the inhabitants of the given lands. The trend spread like wildfire in archaeology toward the end of the 19th century and extended to interpretations of other findings as well. An ethnic character was ascribed to remnants of material culture, which, in turn, proved the indigenoussness of a particular community in a particular contested territory. Bonds with supposed ancestors were in this case treated rather literally. A leading exponent of the nationalist current of archaeology, Professor Gustaf Kossinna from Berlin, believed that “Our ancestors, though long gone, bequeathed to us not only their flesh and blood, but also their ideas, spirit and character.”⁶² At the same time, Kossinna exhibited the utmost radicalism in separating the prehistoric Germanics and Slavs. The theory endorsed by Ludwig Wilser, among others, stating that the primordially Indo-Germanic Slavs lost their dolicocephaly with an influx of Asiatic blood, sounded positively benign when set against Kossinna’s findings.⁶³ Already toward the end of 19th century, Kossinna concluded that Slavs have been separated from their Indo-Germanic roots since prehistoric times, and were thus suffering a thousand years of delay in terms of development.⁶⁴ Though named as distant kin, they were also presented as a complete antithesis to the Germanic tribes as far as spirit and culture were concerned. It was only logical to ascribe all traces of any culture uncovered during excavations conducted by Kossinna in Central and Eastern Europe to the ‘proper’ Indo-Germanics, and not to Slavs.⁶⁵

In these circumstances, it became necessary to take a stand with regard to the theory purporting that primordial Nordics (identified with the Aryans) were long-headed and Germanic. Polish scholars applied several different strategies when reacting to this claim. In their critique of the “Berlin-Austrian school,” Julian Talko-Hryniewicz and Edward Bogusławski focused on the indigenous character of Slavs in Polish territories, a notion that also helped solve a problem brought up by measurements: the rather high incidence of the ‘short-headed’ in central and southern Poland.⁶⁶ According to Talko-Hryniewicz, who based his observations on the then-recent research of Franz Boas, the dominant shape of the skull changed throughout history. Long skulls found in excavations in Poland did not belong to Germanics, but to primordial Aryan, long-headed Slavs.⁶⁷ In time, the latter came to be dominated by the short-headed type, which, incidentally, as Talko-Hryniewicz observed elsewhere:

⁶² KOSSINA, Gustaf: *Die deutsche Vorgeschichte: eine hervorragend nationale Wissenschaft*, Würzburg, 1914 (2nd ed.), p. 4.

⁶³ WILSER, Ludwig: *Deutsche Vorzeit. Einführung in die germanische Altertumskunde*, Steglitz, 1918 (2nd ed.), p. 66.

⁶⁴ KMIĘCINSKI, Jerzy: *Nacjonalizm w germanoznawstwie niemieckim w XIX i początkach XX wieku*, Łódź, 1994, p. 88.

⁶⁵ GRÜNERT, Heinz: *Gustaf Kossinna (1858-1931). Vom Germanisten zum Prähistoriker. Ein Wissenschaftler im Kaiserreich und in der Weimarer Republik*, Rahden, 2002, pp. 105-107 & 244-247.

⁶⁶ BOGUSŁAWSKI, Edward: *Dowody autochtonizmu Słowian na przestrzeni zajmowanej przez nich w wiekach średnich*, Warszawa, 1912, pp. 3-4.

⁶⁷ TALKO-HRYNIEWICZ, Julian: *Człowiek na ziemiach naszych*, Kraków, 1913, p. 64.

exhibited great reproductive powers and capabilities of assimilating the culture of which it was the bearer among the peoples of the east, and following from that, it created its own culture, easily assimilating foreign elements, often even in the first generation, both anthropologically and culturally.⁶⁸

Jan Czekanowski employed a twofold argumentation. On the one hand, he stressed that the postwar research asserted “that the Nordic element is not less numerous in Poland than in Germany”.⁶⁹ On the other hand, though, he concluded, as did numerous other Polish anthropologists after him, that most of the inhabitants of the country exhibited a mixed Nordic-Lapponoid type, also known as the Subnordic type. One could say that, in this way, he supported the contention of his German colleagues, who saw Slavs as Mongolised Nordics. In this case, however, the form of the message was more important than its content. The dominant racial type among the population of Poland was consequently assigned the appropriately ennobling name of the ‘Sarmatian’ type in Polish treatises. Czekanowski used the term already before the war, claiming that the typical division into Nordic, Mediterranean and Alpine types is inapplicable to Central and Eastern Europe. When applied, it can only mislead the researcher, unable to effect agreement between different parameters: cranial indices with hair and eye colours. In place of the received division, he suggested another that took into account – outside of the Sarmatian type – also the Dinaric and Pre-Slavic types. He treated the other categories as supplemental, devoting the most attention to Nordics of northern Poland.⁷⁰ From a historical point of view, he perceived Slavs as a primordially Nordic racial type and compared their prehistoric expansion to that of the Germanic tribes.⁷¹ While Czekanowski vehemently criticised all attempts at identifying racial types with nationalities, the tripartite division he put forward generally respected boundaries between the nationalities of the Second Polish Republic: Poles, Ukrainians and Belarusians.⁷²

Responding to a none-too-favourable image of Poles in the racial discourse dominant in Europe at the time, Polish anthropologists claimed initiative. With the aid of structures of their young state, they conducted widespread anthropological research, and used it as a source for illustration of the new classification of racial types in the region. In a way, by reinterpreting received categories and introducing their own, they obliterated the previous dogmas. It is quite telling that the term ‘Mongolisation,’ so crucial during wartime, was almost completely lost in their thought.

Finnish anthropologists followed a similar path. The young country was at odds with the interpretation of the civil war provided by Swedish and German authors, who perceived it in racial terms. This interpretation shattered unity among citizen of the state, many of whom found themselves associated with the non-European

⁶⁸ TALKO-HRYNCEWICZ, Julian: *Mieszkańcy Krakowa z X-XX wieku. Studium antropo-bio-socjologiczne*, Kraków, 1926, p. 70.

⁶⁹ CZEKANOWSKI, Jan: *Zarys antropologii Polsk.*, Lwów, 1930, p. 432.

⁷⁰ CZEKANOWSKI, Jan: “Beiträge zur Anthropologie von Polen”, *Archiv für Anthropologie*, X, nf (1911), 2-3, pp. 187-193.

⁷¹ CZEKANOWSKI, Jan: *Anthropologische Beiträge zum Problem der slawisch-finnischen Beziehungen*, Helsingfors, 1925, pp. 12-13.

⁷² CZEKANOWSKI, Jan: *Zarys...*, p. 454.

Mongoloids. The anthropological research conducted in Finland from 1924 onward was a deliberate attempt at debunking this categorisation. Groups of anthropologists traversed the country, conducting measurements based on the scheme derived from Martin's handbook. Additionally – as happened before in Poland – they conducted blood tests. And it were the latter, as Yrjö Kaarlo Suominen claimed in his summary of the research, which indicated that the Swedish-speaking inhabitants of the country differed from the rest only in tongue, not in race.⁷³ Light skin colour was deemed a primordial characteristic of the type inhabiting Finland, and consequently could not be a result of an influx of Nordic blood. According to Suominen, Finns did not exhibit the slightest marks of any kinship with Mongols. Though the Finnish research did not reference Czekanowski's findings directly, his publications appeared in Finnish periodicals and scientific journals.⁷⁴ The manner of solving the racial dilemma which the Finnish anthropologists went on to apply was, to a rather large extent, an application of the method put forward by the Polish anthropologist. Following in his footsteps, his Finnish counterparts resigned from using the generally approved division into races of Europe, introducing in its stead a new category, which they called the 'East Baltic race.' In a fashion strikingly similar to the 'Sarmatian type,' this race was said to be closely related to the Nordics, though better adapted to the natural conditions prevalent in Finland.⁷⁵

5. Toward one's own – the inclusive use of racial anthropology

Throughout the Great War and the territorial conflicts that followed, race proved an efficient means of symbolic exclusion of inimical nations from the civilised European community. The notion of 'Mongolisation' served the establishment or entrenchment of one's own community with the aid of the captivating image of the 'alien.' This mechanism has received a general characterisation from sociologists already in the 1960s.⁷⁶ However, it does not exhaust all of the uses racial concepts were applied to during the 'spiritual war.' As it turned out, they were quite useful not only for the creation of the image of an enemy, but also of a 'racial' ally, friend, and even brother.

Racial argumentation featured in the German programme of territorial expansion. It was extended both toward the Flemings, Latvians and Lithuanians, and even Estonians. During the war, as well as later, German scholarly analyses treated citizen of the Baltic countries as ethnic groups with some relationship to Nordics, but strongly mixed, and perhaps even Mongolised. The postwar Latvian anthropology also stopped short of usurping Nordic racial purity.⁷⁷ Furthermore, Austro-Hungarian

⁷³ K. SUOMINEN, Y[rjō]: "Physical Anthropology in Suomi (Finland)", *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, 59, (1929), pp. 207-230, here p. 209.

⁷⁴ CZEKANOWSKI, Y[rjō]: *Übersicht anthropologischer Arbeiten in Polen im Laufe der Jahre 1913-14 – 1924-25*, Helsinki, 1925.

⁷⁵ SUOMINEN: "Physical...", p. 206.

⁷⁶ TAJFEL, Henri: *Human groups and social categories. Studies in social psychology*, Cambridge, 1981, p. 152.

⁷⁷ See JERUMS, Lūcija: *Die Lettin vom anthropologischen Standpunkt*, Rīgā, 1935, pp. 146-151; BACKMAN, Gaston: *Die Augenfarbe der Letten*, Lund – Leipzig, 1921.

anthropologists working under Rudolf Pösch included Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians among the ‘Mongolised’ nationalities of the Tsar’s empire.⁷⁸ The fact that some German authors espoused a different view should therefore be seen as an expression not of a divergent scientific position, but rather of paying heed to the notion of annexing the lands with the people, a concept which enjoyed considerable popularity in Germany. Georg Bonne, who went to Latvia during the war as a military doctor, devoted a thesis to the country’s inhabitants, claiming it totally Germanised.⁷⁹ The previous, anthropologically divergent Baltic type has died off almost entirely, and hence, “Latvians and Lithuanians should be unconditionally accepted as purely Germanic.”⁸⁰ Origins also affected the attitudes of the Latvian soldiers: “The conduct of the so-called Latvian battalions is also an expression of the Germanic ancestry of Latvians. Within Russian Army, they were distinguished by courage, discipline and faithfulness, and retained these qualities even in the revolutionary firestorm, which made them play a similar role toward the Soviet government as Germanic pretorians did at the fall of Rome.”⁸¹ Paradoxically, the fact that there was no mass defection of Latvian soldiers to the German side served to prove their undoubtedly Nordic character, exhibited primarily in fidelity to an oath.⁸² The attaching of Latvia and Lithuania to the Reich was seen as beneficial to all parties: “The tribal nature of Latvians will enrich our great Germanic family of nations in the same way as the Flemings do in the west, calling for the strong arm of the German Reich to aid the defence of their national and tribal freedom.”⁸³

A different example of the use of racial theories in the name of kinship and friendship, rather than for the purpose of raising impenetrable barriers, warrants particular attention, as it relates to a nation whose anthropological classification was far from unambiguous. We have already mentioned the concepts of the origins of nations that became the focus of debate in Bulgaria, with opinions wavering between Slavic and Turan legacies. At a time when the country joined in the war on the side of Germany and Austro-Hungary, the number of increasingly extended mentions of a Germanic racial component began to rise as well. Although Georg Buschan stressed that the racial character of Bulgarians was significantly mixed, a fact evidenced in their brachycephaly, he also took pains to remind that the incidence of tall blondes in Bulgaria suggested remnants of Gothic blood.⁸⁴ Germany’s allies were similarly re-evaluated by Eugen Oberhammer, who tracked down elongated, Aryan skulls among Turks, and consequently adjudged them to represent an eastern branch of Indo-Germanics.⁸⁵ This wartime conjuncture was exploited by the *enfant terrible* of Bulgarian historiography, Gancho Tsenov, who published several works in German, propagating his

⁷⁸ See HESCH, Michael: *Letten, Litauer, Weißrussen. Ein Beitrag zur Anthropologie des Ostbaltikums mit Berücksichtigung der siedlungs- und stammesgeschichtlichen Quellen*, Wien, 1933.

⁷⁹ BONNE, Georg: *Die Letten. Ein germanischer Bruderstamm*, Berlin, 1921 (2nd ed.).

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 16-17.

⁸² SEECK, Otto: *Russen und Balten. Drei Vorträge*, Bielefeld – Leipzig, 1917, p. 99.

⁸³ BONNE, Georg: *Die Letten...*, p. 52.

⁸⁴ BUSCHAN, Georg: *Die Bulgaren. Herkunft und Geschichte. Eigenschaften, Volksglaube, Sitten und Gebräuche*, Stuttgart, 1917, p. 9.

⁸⁵ OBERHAMMER, Eugen: *Die Türken und das Osmanische Reich*, Leipzig – Berlin, 1917, pp. 19-20.

virtually groundless theory of Bulgarian ethnogenesis. Tsenov referenced a thesis upheld also by Buschan, claiming that ancient Thracians were racially identical to Germanics, as well as ancient Greeks. Following from this contention, Tsenov decided that Huns were also a Thracian tribe, and, rather than coming from Asia, were primordial inhabitants of the Balkans. The same grouping also included inhabitants of the ancient Troy, as well as Scythians and Macedonians. Goths–Thracians–Troyans–Huns–Scythians–Macedonians later went on to inhabit territories stretching from Rome to the dwelling-places of Aryan Slavs. Within an argument rich in spurious logic and surprising connotations, Romans also eventually came to be identified with Tsenov’s Thracians. In conclusion, the scholar identified all of those ancient peoples with the inhabitants of contemporary Bulgaria, the most ancient of all European nations.⁸⁶

6. Conclusion

World War I constitutes one of the most seminal periods in the history of anthropology. It divides a period of ‘internationalist’ science from its purely national guise. As far as research practice is concerned, the paradigm change found expression in an almost universal disregard for the distinction between racial and national orders, heretofore a basic tenet of the science. The efforts of the Austrian anthropologists, striving to use measurements on prisoners of war to depict the conflict as a war between races, inspired numerous followers. Polish, Finnish, or Ukrainian authors pursued the identification of a specific racial type characteristic of the forming nations. The notion of a correlation between race and class origins, which played a prominent role in racial discourse before the war, was pushed to the margins with the unity of nations key to beating enemies. From the perspective of an American racist, all such particular efforts were entirely pointless: “From a race point of view,” wrote Madison Grant in 1916, “the present European conflict is essentially a civil war and nearly all the officers and a large proportion of the men on both sides are members of this [Nordic] race. ... It is the modern edition of the old Berserker blood rage and is class suicide on a gigantic scale.”⁸⁷ The postwar racial discourse was dominated by the notion of biopolitics – a programme by the state to raise the racial quality of the nation.⁸⁸ In its most radical guises, biopolitics embraced a way of thinking typical during wartime, moving on to identify an enemy within the society – in the society’s others, the maladjusted, the antisocial.⁸⁹

⁸⁶ TZENOFF, Gantscho: *Geschichte der Bulgaren*, Berlin, 1917 & *Goten oder Bulgaren. Quellenkritische Untersuchung über die Geschichte der alten Skythen, Thraker und Mazedonier*, Leipzig, 1915.

⁸⁷ GRANT, Madison: *The Passing of the Great Race or the Racial Basis of European History*, New York, 1916, p. 200.

⁸⁸ TURDA: *The Nation...*, pp. 413-415.

⁸⁹ SARASIN, Philipp: “Zweierlei Rassismus? Die Selektion des Fremden als Problem im Michel Foucaults Verbindung von Biopolitik und Rassismus”, STINGELIN, M. (ed.), *Biopolitik und Rassismus*, Frankfurt am Main, 2003, pp. 60-75, here p. 67.

Until recently, the period of World War I remained a gap in the history of anthropology.⁹⁰ At the same time, it figures more and more as a formative period for a new, interwar paradigm in anthropology. As much is suggested by symptoms of a continuity of attitudes and research programmes shaped during the war. There are also other, more mundane continuities to consider. In accordance with the testament of the *spiritus movens* of the research on prisoners of war, Rudolf Pöch, who perished soon after the war, the Viennese Academy of Sciences took control over resources received from the departed and used them to finance the publication of doctoral dissertations based on data collected in the camps. The first books of that kind were published right after the end of the war, with other seeing print further into the interwar period. The Anschluss of Austria did not hinder this operation – the only resulting change concerned the publisher of the works. The Viennese anthropological society was substituted by the SS Ahnenerbe foundation.⁹¹

As opposed to the period of the Great War, no recourse to scientific objectivism clouded the eliminative nature of this process.

Traducción: Antoni GÓRNY

⁹⁰ SCHEER, Monique, MARCHETTI, Christian & JOHLER, Reinard: “‘A Time Like No Other’: The Impact of the Great War on European Anthropology” *Doing Anthropology*, pp. 9-28, here p. 9.

⁹¹ Starting with TUPPA, Karl: *Mischeren und Tipteren. Ein Beitrag zur Anthropologie der Türkvölker in Rußland*, Berlin-Dahlem, 1941.