

Zbigniew Libera

**BIOLOGICAL-CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY
AND RACIAL POLICY OF THE THIRD REICH
IN THE ACTIVITY OF SEKTION RASSEN-
UND VOLKSTUMSFORSCHUNG INSTITUT
FÜR DEUTSCHE OSTARBEIT**

“Overcharitable contextual mercy” of social anthropology, according to Ernest Gellner (1995), combines the understanding of other people’s concepts and practices with relativism, liberalism and opposition to ethnocentrism and racism, but causes theoretical and methodological problems, is reluctant to stigmatize absurdity and evil, “can lead to terrible abuses”. Cases such as the involvement of science, anthropology and ethnology in the racial policy of the Third Reich, and directly or indirectly in genocide, encourage the adoption of gifts. This gives an opportunity for moral assessments of the creation and use of scientific knowledge. This gives an opportunity for accounting for “historical responsibility”. The willingness to contribute to the current discussions of anthropology brings a negative scientific and moral evaluation of this research, as in the works of Gretchen Schafft (2006) and Andre Gingrich (2007a), who are excellent at reading as the history of academic intrigues, nepotism, opportunism, the production and application of pseudo-scientific absurdities and involvement in the politics of the state as a chronicle of crime.

There are no obvious and morally indifferent choices for the exegesis of science in the service of the Third Reich. However, I do not believe that choices should be made in the light of this history: we reject this research for ethical and moral reasons, and thus disqualify it according to today’s scientific criteria, or adopt it only in order to understand these concepts and practices – according to “contextual mercy” – which does not necessarily

exclude the moral judgments of anthropologists and ethnologists in Nazi Germany.

Schafft, who conducted research on anthropology in the Third Reich, on the collection of the Institut für Deutsche Ostarbeit (IDO) in the Smithsonian Institution, assessed it as unethical and immoral, because it was entangled in racial politics and genocide. It was created by people fascinated by science, but not by people undergoing research. She comments with indignation on the interest of contemporary anthropologists, supposedly “for scientific purposes”. The materials of the Sektion Rassen- und Volkstumsforschung (SRV) are discrediting and shameful.

They are pseudo-scientific nonsense, because they are created by scientists without sufficient competence and practical skills in anthropology and ethnology, inspired by their scientific and political careers, by young and inexperienced people who had no knowledge of or made no attempts to understand the local realities, and therefore were dependent on Polish helpers. They carried out their research without a plan, without appropriate methods of data analysis. They left behind only slightly processed materials (Schafft 2006: IX–X, 1–2, 21–22, 24, 28, 30 et al.)

However, in the previous studies on the IDO activity by Schafft (2006) and Teresa Bałuk-Ulewiczowa (2004: 16, 20 et al.), who writes about research, for example conducted by Elisabeth Fliethmann and Dora Kahlich in the Tarnów ghetto and Ingeborg Sydow in Szaflary, as discrediting to German science), on the history of racial and national research during the Third Reich (many works have been written on this subject in the recent years) and in the reports and publications of the SRV itself: by Dr Anton Plügel, Dr Heinrich Gottong, Dr Erhard Riemann, Dr Elfriede Fliethmann, Dr Ingeborg Sydow, a find confirmation that this research was carried out according to then accepted scientific models in Europe, including those used in Polish anthropology and ethnology of the first half of the 20th century, even after 1945. Thus, I am not saying that it is enough to denazify the research and work of German anthropologists and ethnologists in order for them to be regarded today as “purely scientific”. It is not possible to completely separate the grain from the chaff – science from ideology, research from politics.

The SRV materials, when accepted into the Smithsonian Institution (in 1947), were described as an enormous collection of documents produced with “German regularity and accuracy”, among which anthropometric and medical data, excellent photographs and drawings were indicated as particularly valuable (Schafft 2006: 11–12, 80). These materials have not been used for scientific purposes. They were examined only by Schafft in 1998.

The vast majority of German scholars, who were responsible to varying degrees for the ideology of the “German race” and National Socialist nationalism, imperialism and colonialism, who used materials captured in occupied Poland, the Czech Republic, Romania, Yugoslavia, or France, such as Eugen Fischer, Otto Reche, Hans F.K. Günther, Walter Krickenberg, Richard Thurwald, Wilhelm E. Mühlmann, Hermann Baumann, Walter Hirschberg, Richard Wolfram and many others, have maintained or been promoted in scientific institutions (universities, academies of science, scientific societies), government and administration of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic, as well as Austria and Switzerland, have maintained or gained international recognition, official contacts with leading British, French and American anthropologists and institutions (Lixfeld 1991: 95–116; Rybicka 2002: 160–164; Seidler 2003; Schafft 2006: 171, 173–177, 224–226; Gingrich 2003: 26–27 and 2007a:142, 146–149, 154–170; Dick, Loidl 2009: 2–3; Bockhorn 2010: 199–224). The vast majority of them retained racist, nationalistic and revisionist views, such as Riemann, a former SRV head, who published about East Prussia dialects and folklore, which he had been doing until 1942 in Elbląg and Königsberg (from where research staff in Göttingen – the centre for Ostforschung after 1945 was recruited. In 1964, he became a Professor of Ethnology and Linguistics in Kiel and the Chairman of the Committee on East German Ethnology (Peters 1995: 222).

Most of the SRV scientists were never heard of again after World War II. A former IDO worker from Sektion Landeskunde, Gisela Hildebrandt, maintained informal contacts with former Polish SRV collaborators until the 1980s. Hildebrandt, under the leadership of Dr Hans Graul (who was a Heidelberg University professor after the war), with the participation of Gottong of the SRV, conducted research in country studies and ethnography in Markowa, Gać and Białoboki in the years 1941–1942 (Gottong 1942: 39–43). The publications of this section were described in the Home Army documents as “the most scathing geopolitical theories about the irrationality of our country’s existence on the basis of geographical data, climate, etc.” (Bałuk-Ulewiczowa 2004: 35). The activities of this section were only a part of a general programme of “German work in the East”; according to Graul, Germany will colonize the East still in the 20th century (Burleigh 1988: 283).

The works of Graul (1943: 11–95) and Hildebrandt (1943) were known by some Polish ethnographers and historians. This probably explains the interest in Markowa already at the end of the 1940s and at the beginning of the 1950s of a group of scholars led by Franciszek Kotula, and later by Roman Reinfuss. They had to bypass the ideology of the IDO publications. Hildebrandt

disqualified, with few exceptions, the achievements of the Polish settlement geography. The results of her research proved the historical rights of the Germans to the occupied lands and served the racial policy of the Third Reich. Reinfuss, without referring to the publications of Graul and Hildebrandt, used the terms they used to describe forms of the agricultural system. They were explicitly invoked by Jerzy Czajkowski (1969), a friend of Reinfuss. Jacek Tejchma, an ethnographer from Markowa, started to correspond with Hildebrandt in 1995. She wrote that research in Markowa met the requirements of science, although it was dependent on Frank's policy. Tejchma himself, a person most knowledgeable about the history and results of research performed by Sektion Landeskunde in Markowa, wrote about this research as "well planned and organized", and of great importance and value, especially for museology (Tejchma 2008: 21–22 and his article in this volume).

The scientific and political activity of the SRV was known and remembered after the World War II in the academic community of Cracow, if only because of the participation in its work of many scientists, mainly from Cracow and Lviv, who at that time were generally young people who gained strong scientific positions in the post-war period, mainly at the Jagiellonian University. Some of the IDO materials, including some SRV documents, were not taken out of Cracow in 1944. The Smithsonian Institution did not receive all the materials – they were preserved in various scientific institutions and private collections, including the Ethnographic Museum in Cracow and the Chair of Ethnography of Slavs of the Jagiellonian University. These, so far, have not been used and have not served any scientific purposes in anthropology and ethnology.

The then head of the Chair of Ethnography of Slavs, Kazimierz Moszyński, must have known about them, but he certainly did not use them. When at the end of the 1940s he began to write his great synthesis of knowledge of ethnological sciences *Człowiek. Wstęp do etnografii powszechnej a etnologii* (Man. An Introduction to Universal Ethnography and Ethnology) (published only in 1958) to discuss physical and psychic diversity of peoples, he was a direct user of these publications, mainly from the 1920s and 1930s, but also from the years 1940–1944, which were the sources for the SRV: the "excellent, though not always cautious, work of an outstanding researcher and synthesist" by Egon von Eickstedt (who, like Eugen Fischer or Otto Reche, benefitted from the financial and institutional support of the faction of the Nazi state and party apparatus); by Baur/Fischer/Lenz (this textbook of racial anthropology became a fundamental work for Nazi anthropology); by Fischer (one of the co-authors of Nuremberg's racial laws, an expert in racial assessments

which determined who was sent to concentration camps) and Reche (who, takes “a credit” among his many other “achievements” for transforming the Leipzig Institute of Anthropology and Ethnology into one of the main centres of Nazi racism and eugenics); by Walter Krickeberg (an informer, provoker of the discussion on the usefulness of appropriate *Völkerkunde* schools for the Third Reich) – “his work has remained particularly valuable today” – or even by the “famous” H.F.K. Günther (“the Pope of Racism”, one of the leading contributors to the ideology of Nazism and the originators of the solution to the “Jewish issue”), and by the “phenomenally hard-working and highly intelligent”, “distinguished” Richard Thurnwald (an opportunist who supported, among other things, “applied research” in concentration camps), his pupil (“not very intelligent”) Wilhelm Mühlmann (the most influential Nazi ideologist in *Völkerkunde*) and Hermann Baumann (the successor to the dismissed Wilhelm Schmidt, in Vienna between 1940 and 1945, who praised *Anschluss* in *Methodik der Völkerkunde* in 1938) (Seidler 2003; Schafft 2006: 65, 214–215; Gingrich 2007a: 138–157).

Moszyński knew German-language scientific literature very well. He recognised the outstanding achievements of German science. He considered *Völkerkunde*, alongside the school of Bronisław Malinowski and Alfred R. Radcliffe-Brown, as a dominating school in ethnological sciences since the 1920s. He particularly valued the cultural and historical school and was relatively more critical of German sociologism. He praised German ethnologists and anthropologists for their theoretical and synthetic skills, although he also reproached them for their tendency to be schematic and for “their frequent inability to master and digest the material” at which “Anglo-Saxons and more often by the French” excell (Moszyński 1958: 189–190 et seq.).

Moszyński explained, with all reservations concerning specific issues of anthropology and ethnology, that his presentation was based mainly on Eickstedt’s systematics, with some corrections and additions of other German anthropologists (mentioned above), because it is the most useful for ethnological sciences. He justified it by the fact that this school of anthropology is primarily interested in the phenotype, i.e. The visible physical features that can be measured and described, he puts emphasis on a population research, so he “is less distant from the visual, factual material”, he can integrate phenotypic individuals into “pure” races, for example Nordic or Dinaric, which can be spoken of especially in small and isolated local groups; the types of breeds can be presented on anthropological maps, such as cultural and linguistic diversity on ethnographic or lingual maps (Moszyński 1958: 358–360, 374–377). Moszyński took over the theories and methods of German anthropology,

including the Viennese school of anthropology (I can also tell it from this passage: “others are putting an emphasis – which seems right to me – on a population”, that is “an anthropologically understood population living in one area or another”, Moszyński 1958: 360), i.e. those used by the SRV anthropologists!

He did not take into account the anthropological school of Jan Czekanowski mainly because that school focused on the genotype, i.e. – as he explained – hidden combinations of inherited physical traits that are carriers of racial traits on which the phenotype is dependent (one individual genotypically belongs to different races, when phenotypically he is a representative of one race). The Czekanowski School spoke about race in a different sense than German anthropology did. Its anthropogeography was hypothetical (“each map is a hypothesis”, wrote Stanisław Klimek in 1932: 9). Because of the lack of this anthropographic knowledge, it does not provide the data on the geography of races (Moszyński 1958: 376–377). The result now is that Moszyński’s arguments are almost identical with the statements in the reports and publications of Plügel, Gottong and Riemann, repeated by them after the most eminent German anthropologists at the time. For the SRV, the findings of Polish anthropology were of no scientific significance (Julian Talka-Hryniewicz’s libraries and the Institute of Anthropology of the Jagiellonian University, which were taken over, are “outdated and useless”, wrote Plügel 1941b),¹ because the latter limited itself to complicated calculations, “without giving any human material”, and abandoned research on the diversity of races and nationalities; its research concerns types of races not related to ethnic groups and their place of residence; it did not study biological features related to psychic and national features – therefore, German science has a great task to prepare a picture of races and nationalities in the Generalgouvernement (GG), and the SRV has to collect a large amount of data.

My statements are probably surprising, they can even be shocking, so I have to say that Moszyński explicitly rejected the racist-nationalist theories of German anthropologists. The extent to which he was familiar with their work is evidenced by a certain detail indicated by him. In the competition for the scientific and political influence, the proponents of historicism in ethnology spoke out against the functionalists, arguing that they referred to the anti-German Malinowski (more precisely, to the attack by Krickeberg and Baumann on *Lehrbuch der Völkerkunde*, edited by Konrad T. Preuss),

¹ *Arbeitsbericht der Sektion Rassen- und Volkstumsforschung*, Krakau, den 7. Juli 1943. E. Riemann, Manuscript, 8 pp., A UJ, IDO SRV, Box 01/01/09.

to which they replied (Thurnwald and Mühlmann) that German functionalism is independent of the British one and links biology with historicism, and that the Polish anthropologist is of noble origin, so in terms of race he belongs to the Nordic type (Moszyński 1958: 199–200; Gingrich 2007a: 138–139).

Psychic features, wrote Moszyński, referring mainly to German-language publications, are conditioned environmentally by natural-geographical and socio-cultural factors. Psyche is thus not inherited. Intelligence is free from these influences. Later, however, he repeated such theories about the dependence of the psyche on the physical characteristics and the biology of man, the evolutionary variability of these relationships, which not only today, but also before 1939 were considered in Poland as the scientific basis for the ideology of racism. According to Stanisław Klimek (1939), these include all views that link biological meanings of “race” (inherited morphological, physiological, psychological features) with sociological meanings (an ethnic group). As a result, they identify anthropological boundaries with national and linguistic boundaries, the really existing “races”, i.e. they treat equivalent taxonomic units with different characteristics as stages of development – lower and higher races and corresponding peoples: wild and civilized, as levels of evolutionary processes, where the elimination of weaker forms and primitive features and the appearance of new (progressive) forms and features take place.

These are the theses of social Darwinism. Darwinists were racists. Almost all German biologists and anthropologists, and many scientists from other European countries were racists (Popowicz 2009: 115–155). Darwinism was the basis of Moszyński’s “critical evolutionism”. He wrote, referring to Charles Darwin (1932), that evolution consists in openly moving away from, among others, our animal ancestors, getting rid of the physical and psychic features inherent in the primates, the appearing of progressive features. The struggle for existence, which results in “natural selection”, eliminates less intelligent and dynamic elements. It gives free space to smarter and more rational elements. The influence of the environment on the psyche which is directly connected with the body, weaken when we approach civilization, and grow when we go back to anthropoids. The long-term and profound impact of the environment (e.g. climate) results in the inheritance of mental characteristics; the physical and mental characteristics of the wild are close to those of the “primitive” peoples, who are evolutionarily and geographically distributed, regardless of differences in climate, living conditions, management, etc. This is why the wild are sensual and emotional, instinctive, have a developed so-called lower form of memory (photographic, mechanical),

use associative (magical) thinking, are less capable of logical thinking, etc. (Moszyński 1958: 488, 490, 523, 543, 561, 571–572 et seq.). Moszyński trusted Darwin (1932: 156) – the gap in evolution today stretches between a Negro and a gorilla, and in the near future it will widen, because the civilized nations will exterminate the wild and the great apes will be exterminated. He relied on German social Darwinists in anthropology and ethnology, and on himself because he studied biology between 1906 and 1909, according to some sources in Freiburg, where Eugen Fischer was a lecturer, and according to others at the University of Zurich, with which Rudolf Martin was associated.

In its time, Moszyński's *Man* was not received as a work based on the “wrong” literature which synthesized the knowledge of ethnological sciences with suspicious facts and effects. Moszyński consulted relevant excerpts of the manuscript with outstanding scholars: the social anthropologist Andrzej Waligórski (Malinowski's student), the demographer Stanisław Zalewski, the linguist Jerzy Kuryłowicz, the physical anthropologist Eugenia Stołyhwo. Thanking them, he underlined in relation to Prof. Stołyhwo: “(...) she cannot be held accountable even in part for this, and not any other wording of this chapter, because I had no opportunity to discuss various issues with her, and, besides, perhaps I have trusted myself too much, because of my education. I was a naturalist and I have never lost contact with natural sciences” (Moszyński 1958: 831).

Stołyhwo's comments concerned specific issues and probably did not call into question the “general wording” of the chapter on *the physical diversity of mankind*. A fragment of an article by Magdalena Gawin should convince us to this, as should an account by Prof. Kazimierz Stołyhwo and a release on the work of Eugenia Stołyhwo in IDO. In the late 1930s, Stołyhwo “(...) as he wrote himself, ‘intensified’ his cooperation with German scientists, and his wife Eugenia assured that there were no anti-Polish tendencies among German scientists (...). The Polish anthropologist belonged to those scientists who persistently maintained the fiction of autonomy of science in the Third Reich, in order to become its victim a few years later” (Gawin 2010: 24). In 1939, he was imprisoned with other professors of the Jagiellonian University in Sachsenhausen, about which he wrote in 1946: “To what do I owe that I was detained in this camp (...)? This is incomprehensible to me because I did not lead any political action and was only involved in scientific work. I have maintained mutual exchange of scientific work and friendly relations with German scholars over a period of 36 years” (Gawin 2010: 24–25). According to Adam Kleczkowski, an SRV collaborator, Prof. Stołyhwo was released from the camp “as a result of the intervention of Dr Arlt, for whom Mrs Stołyhwo

and the assistants of the Department of Anthropology worked, and Ms. Kutrzebianka (Anna) from the Department of Sociology” (Michalewicz 2005: 736). Upon his return to Cracow, Stołyhwo was persuaded by Gottong to work for IDO, which he avoided because of the “critical opinion he expressed about Günther”: “I preferred to work scientifically in very difficult conditions at my home in Przegorzaly, in an unfinished and unheated house, by a petroleum or carbide lamp, rather than to have contact with biased German pseudo-science, which was hostile towards Poland” (Michalewicz 2005: 497–498).

I am not trying to present Moszyński’s book in a negative light. I only mean that the reminder of this once very recognised work, which for decades was one of the basic textbooks at the university faculties of ethnography in Poland – so dependent on the anthropology and ethnology of Germany and Austria, and these are now judged as imbued with racism, imperial and colonial ideologies – should at least raise suspicions as to the legitimacy of disqualifying IDO SRV research as non-scientific at the time.

German science, which until recently impressed Polish, and, in general, European scientists, was distinguishable for the outstanding scientism of its anthropologists, Fischer being the most famous of them, and ethnologists, such as Thurnwald, the most recognized socio-cultural anthropologist from Germany in the world. They were characterized by rigorous observance of scientific rules, as well as the reluctance to pass judgments; striving for absolute objectivity and verifiability; striving to free oneself from moral limitations; extraordinary dedication to science (“featuring German regularity and accuracy”) in combination with “the deeds” (which was once called “ethics”); involvement in the affairs of the nation; a desire to be useful to the state; a deep conviction that the achievements of science serve the good of the humanity (Bauman 1995: 73 et al.).

Such an attitude to scientific works is known from the autobiography taken from “Nauka Polska” (Polish Science) (X.Y. [Moszyński] 1928: 217–245), signed by X.Y. Years later it turned out that they were written by Moszyński. He confessed that he devoted all his time to studying, working feverishly and continuously, even 14–15 hours a day, renouncing the comfort of life, giving up all pleasures except those offered by science, that he dealt only with what was directly connected with his professional work, which is a matter of “truth and accuracy”, had a feeling of antipathy for those who are not absorbed by work, felt alienation towards politics, nationalism, religion, and described his scientific career in terms of social Darwinism, as “free competition”, as a kind of “a struggle for existence”. Once again, I allowed myself to compare our outstanding ethnologist with German scientism, this time

to explain the participation of Polish scientists, students and high school graduates in the works of IDO. Between 1941 and 1943, out of 195 employees, 125 were not German. In 1942, Riemann found 17 Polish employees in the SRV, apart from the Jewish department, in Cracow, two or four in the Lviv branch; the section headed by Riemann had been “the Polish section in terms of personnel” since 1943 (Burleigh 1988: 286; Michel 2000: 152; Rybicka 2002: 53, 57, 139, 146; Bałuk-Ulewiczowa 2004: 33, 35). These auxiliary employees included students and assistants, professors of medicine, geography, Polish studies, philosophy, history, anthropology and ethnography from the Jagiellonian University (e.g. Mieczysław Małecki, Marian Plezia, Władysław Semkowicz, Tadeusz Ulewicz) and Lviv University (e.g. Przemysław Dąbkowski, Adam Fischer and his assistant Wilhelm Tabor), as well as employees of ethnographic museums (Zofia Cieślanka in Cracow), whose tasks included archival and library queries, translations, preparation of indexes and bibliographies, participation in anthropological measurements and calculations, in medical and psychological research, taking photographs and drawings, in field research (such as Wilhelm Tabor, working with Sydow, who was “borrowed” from Lviv for field research in Podhale and Haczów), “consultations” (Roman Reinfuss on Lemko issues, Julian Zborowski – on Tatra highlanders). They were only assistants, but some of them (e.g. Małecki working for Riemann and Sommerfeld) took over the functions attributed to the German scientific staff (Rybicka 2002: 139, 143, 146).

Anetta Rybicka (2002) treated the participation of Polish staff in the work of IDO as an act of collaboration. In a violent polemic with her, Teresa Bałuk-Ulewiczowa (2004) argued, mainly on the basis of the Home Army documents (similarly to Burleigh 1988: 287; Harten 1996: 153, Schafft 2006: 90) that the participation of Poles was based on sabotaging IDO’s works, including the SRV (for this reason, Sydow’s research in Szaflary ended up being “an embarrassment to German science”, and were a probable reason for her dismissal). The only problem is that in the light of the same Polish (Bałuk-Ulewiczowa 2004: 37, 84–85, 168 et al.) and German (Rybicka 2002: 140, 143; Schafft 2006: 29, 90) documents, the Polish scientific staff was assessed by the German staff as “very efficient”, “very skilled” and “ready to work” (for instance in the Tarnów ghetto, as assessed by Elfriede Fliethmann and Dora Kahlich), “diligently and professionally working” (for example, like Tabor in Podhale, according to Sydow). Immediately after the war, they belittled their participation in these works (and those who could remained silent about it). They argued that their temporary employment at IDO was not “essential for the propaganda” (as if they did not know that the SRV was the biggest

and most important section of IDO – involved in “kriegswichtige Aufgaben”), that they cheated Germans, that in the Plügel section they played bridge, etc. They claimed they used this time to collect scientific materials for themselves, for their studies in independent Poland (Rybicka 2002: 146, 148–150; Bałuk-Ulewiczowa 2004: 93). These explanations, according to one of the Home Army reports from 1942, were given reluctantly, were cynical, were given by those who “are characterised by ignorance or pretend to be ignorant” (Bałuk-Ulewiczowa 2004: 37). According to Riemann’s paper presented at the IDO plenary session (July 13, 1943), recruiting Polish collaborators to “working groups” which were to deal with intensive folklore research encountered only “a great difficulty in dismissing them from their previous jobs”.

It is not possible to evaluate the accountability of the large number of Poles from Cracow, Silesia and Lviv employed by IDO in the years 1940–1944 and cooperating with the SRV in terms of collaboration, as Rybicka argues, or “fighting at the back of the enemy” (sabotage), as proved by Bałuk-Ulewiczowa. It is not my intention to distinguish between cases of “collaboration” and “the resistance movement”. In this way, it is not possible to qualify the work of all Poles in the SRV. It should also be remembered that Zdzisław Jachimicki, Henryk Barycz, Roman Grodecki, Seweryn Hammer, Stanisław M. Kutrzeba, Jan Zaćwilichowski, among others, refused to take up employment with IDO; some of them in an extremely courageous manner, despite repeated proposals, without adverse consequences for them (Michalewicz 2005: 47, 58, 337, 662–663, 673, 777, 884–885, 887–888). I suppose that some Polish scientists accepted job offers at IDO mainly from the very adoration for science. For an exemplary scientist, science is a supreme good, which does not need external and additional justifications or excuses. Whoever has such an almost mystical attitude to science is free from all non-scientific obligations. Some of the so-called Polish auxiliary forces of IDO: Semkowicz, Małecki, Antoni Swaryczewski, Józef Mitkowski (Michalewicz 2005: 428, 652–653, 802–804) named such reasons as “dedicating themselves to science”, “continuing Polish scientific work” and “watching over the seized resources” of the university, followed by “the possibility of studying German methods of scientific organization and their personnel policy” or “the mission to probe the intentions of the Institute’s creators”. In order to take up employment in the SRV, “incentives came out, a direct appeal even” from “one of the leading Polish scientists”, recalled Barycz. “Despite my enthusiasm and readiness to devote all my energy to science, I could not undertake the activities a was disgusted with” (Michalewicz 2005: 885).

The German scientific staff of the SRV was made up of young people (in their twenties and thirties) who, as is commonly written about them, were

interested in academic and political careers. It is difficult to indicate the undeniable reasons for individuals taking up employment at IDO, for example Fliethmann and Kahlich (Burleigh 1988: 288). Their case and that of Sydow or Hildebrandt (who interrupted her doctoral dissertation on her arrival in Sektion Landeskunde) is most probably due to the following circumstances. Between 1937 and 1947, 38 out of 88 dissertations in anthropology, ethnology and prehistory at the University of Vienna belonged to women, but between 1943 and 1946 the majority of doctoral dissertations were written by women (Limberger, Sticker 2004: 64, 81). Fliethmann and Kahlich did not hide (in their letters) their aversion to men running the departments in which they were employed (as an assistant at the Institute of Anthropology in Vienna, then in the SRV in Cracow) (Schafft 2006: 29). Fliethmann took over the management of the Races Department after Plügel when he was sent to the front. At the same time, Doris Sauer and her friend Hertha Krauss went on a many-days' trip to Wilamowice, Cracow and Haczów, accompanied by Dr Karl Haiding from Graz and his teacher Prof. Arthur Haberlandt from Vienna, representatives of the Rosenberg Institute in Vienna: Prof. Karl von Spiess and Dr Hans Lorenzen and Dr Bernhard Martin of Marburg were admitted to the discussion of scholars only one evening and only as listeners (Sauer 1993: 147–152).

Ute Michel (2000: 153–155) established from the personal data of the German SRV scientific staff that the employment of Plügel at IDO was not determined by his strong commitment and political achievements (he had been a member of the NSDAP since 1929, when he was 16 or 19 years old) but by his specific education and interdisciplinary skills, practical experience in racial and ethnographic research and, consequently, close cooperation with the state authorities, the party and the police on racial and national issues. According to such criteria, he was looking for more employees, he applied for the employment of Fliethmann and Kahlich. Soon thereafter, Kahlich was hired by Sydow, although she did not have a political biography, and in her personal data she informed us that her professors were Leo Frobenius and Wilhelm Koppers, who weren't in the good graces of the Nazis, especially in the office of Alfred Rosenberg.

The German SRV research staff was, to varying degrees, prepared for anthropological and ethnological studies. Plügel had the best theoretical background and practical experience. Some of them were assessed as incompetent – like Sydow who dealt with non-European ethnology and did not know the issues of German and Eastern European folklore. Plügel, however, was an ethnologist for North and South America, and at the SRV he focused primarily on

racial anthropology. Fliethmann and Kahlich were to be deprived of the basic skills of an anthropologists, because in the calculation of the indices, according to Rybicka, Bałuk-Ulewiczowa and Schafft, they depended on the competence of a Polish assistant.

The only difference is that the main core of the SRV staff was provided by the anthropology and ethnology institutes of the University of Vienna and the Vienna Museum of Nature. Gottong (brought in by Dr Fritz Arlt who was in charge of the creation of the SRV) studied anthropology in Vienna, defended his PhD thesis before Günther and Bruno K. Schultz, and was employed by IDO as a representative of the Rosenberg Institute. It was he who brought Plügel, a pupil of Fritz Röck, in. In 1940 Plügel hired Kahlich (a student and assistant of Josef Weninger) and Fliethmann (after her doctorate in 1940 with Eberhard Geyer), who he knew from Vienna. On his recommendation (and Robert Routil's) she was hired by Sydow, who studied with Koppers and Frobenius, and then with Thurnwald (who contributed to her promotion). Thanks to Plügel's efforts, his former colleague Eberhard Riemann came from Elbląg to become the SRV manager, and Heinrich Wolfrum, who took over the management of the Warsaw branch (Professor of Political History at the Federal Republic of Germany after the war). The Lviv branch was headed by Johann W. Niemann – after his studies in Geneva, Freiburg, Königsberg, Wrocław and Berlin (he hired Dąbkowski, Fischer and “other ethnographers”, 36 scientific auxiliaries, of whom only 16% were Germans). The IDO organisation and research were supported by the greatest authorities in anthropology, ethnography and ethnology in Vienna, institutes and museums in Berlin, Wrocław, Marburg, Leipzig, Stuttgart, Poznań, and Königsberg (Harten 1996: 134, 153, 156; Michel 2000: 152–154; Fuchs 2002: 339–342; Rybicka 2002: 50–58, 160–164; Hesse 2004: 89–93, Amber 2004: 24, 41; Teschler-Nicola 2005: 126–127; Schafft 2006: 7, 91–92, 95, 108, 156, 191).

The SRV's scientific staff came mainly from Vienna. The research of this section was based on the theory and methods of the “Viennese anthropological school”. Its creation was announced by Weninger after the completion of the “Marienfeld project” in 1933–1934. This one, prepared by Weninger, under the visible influence of the major trends in research on German anthropology and ethnology over the past few and a half years, concerned the study of the rural community of German origin in the Banat district of Romania; the questions of to what extent these settlers were biologically and psychologically influenced by the outside world, and whether it is possible to define the “final product” as a result of the mixing of races, ethnic groups and cultures under the influence of local natural-geographical,

ethnic, linguistic and cultural conditions. It was then that the “Viennese anthropological school” developed its know-how: the study of the distribution and inheritance of racial traits by studying individuals of different ages, families and entire local communities. In Marienfeld, 1,081 people from 251 families were surveyed, assuming that the populations were characterised by a number of ethnic racial features, on the basis of anthropometric measurements, photographs, drawings, hair sampling, fingerprints, medical and psychological examinations, including ethnographic, genealogical and group history studies. Weninger – convinced that morphological research should cover a not very wide range of features, and that each of them must be measured and described in detail; that individual morphological features are inherited rather than combinations of them – divided the team of researchers into eight working groups. He himself focused mainly on eye examination, his wife Margarete – fingerprints, Geyer – ears, Routil – hair; hand and foot photographs were developed by Dora M. Kronner (after her marriage: Kahlich, in the future temporarily employed in the SRV), etc. (Teschler-Nicola 2005: 99–138; Berner 2005: 167–198). Weninger’s team created an overwhelming amount of data – hypertrophy was a symptomatic feature of the “Viennese anthropological school”. At that time, it was not connected with the Nazi ideology, but in the following years it increasingly moved towards racial anthropology, strengthened links with racial hygiene, and had a certain impact on Günther’s racism (Berner 2005: 189; Teschler-Nicola 2007: 56–57, 70–71). This particularly referred to the “Viennese” characteristics and evaluations of the Eastern Baltic race (including the publication of Schürer and her studies of the Volhynian population) and of the Alpine race, their physical and spiritual characteristics, which served to legitimise the imperial plans in the East (Fuchs 2003: 255–256), and which they later repeated in their works: Gottong, Plügel, Fliethmann, Riemann.

The Marienfeld study has been a model for many years of anthropological and ethnological research in Vienna, for many scientists associated with the Vienna institutes and departments of anthropology (Teschler-Nicola 2007: 68). They were exemplary for the SRV. They may have been repeated in exceptional circumstances, “in the organisational units at the disposal of the IDO”. These were: the Tarnów ghetto, where according to Plügel there were “the best working conditions”, prisoner-of-war and concentration camps (these are mentioned in Fliethmann’s correspondence, but this is not confirmed by the SRV collection; it is known that Plügel planned such a study – Michel 2000: 160; the camp in Płaszów was “at the disposal” of the chemical section of the IDO – Awtuszevska-Ettrich 2008: 259), prisons, Cracovian delousing

centres, Polish and Ukrainian Baudienst workers, who applied for a Kennkarte, and then mainly villages originating from German colonizations in Podhale and Podkarpacie. The SRV “working groups” conducted research in the Tarnów ghetto under escort and with the help of the SS and SD, they had to be supported by the Judenrat and the Jewish police, police and border guards, as in Haczów. SS and SD then provided the missing data and then had access to the results of these studies (Michel 2000: 160; Schafft 2006: 16, 17, 97–98, 101). Under these conditions, “working groups” extracted data “from human material” “on an unprecedented scale”.² In May 1940, Gottong surveyed 8,000 Poles and Ukrainians from Baudienst (Lanfeart 2012; Makuła 2009: 102–108). From spring to September 1942, 15 SRV employees underwent anthropological tests on about 1,000 inhabitants of Szaflary and 300 of Witów; they performed about 40 anthropometric measurements on each unit, conducted medical and psychological tests, sociological-ethnographic surveys, took thousands of photographs and drawings, as well as hair samples, and anthropological and medical data from intimate parts of the body. Those who remember this research today associate it with a feeling of fear and shame.

Such surveys were not possible for the “German” population of Marienfeld. These were voluntary, without embarrassing measurements of the whole body, because such measurements, Weninger believed, are possible only among primitive peoples, in civilized Europe only in clinical conditions (Teschler-Nicola 2007: 63). The racial and civilisational affiliation was indicated by the forcing or ignoring of measurements of naked people. They were examined and measured by Pösch’s students in Volhynia during World War I (Teschler-Nicola 2007: 58). Fliethmann photographed naked Jews in the Tarnów ghetto (Schafft 2006: 18). The difficulty of measuring and photographing the naked bodies of soldiers from England and Australia in the prisoner-of-war camps of the Third Reich was a scientific and political problem – such research was prevented by the Hague Convention (Teschler, Berner 1998: 10).

The SRV “working groups” even in “German” villages, Szaflary, Haczów or Markowa encountered “friendliness” of some of the inhabitants, but the distrust and fear of the majority towards the intentions of researching them: examining, measuring and interrogating. German scientists did not come into close contact with the “research material” in the Tarnów ghetto or even with the studied population of Podhale and Podkarpacie (Schafft 2006: 98). Fliethmann, characterised in the Home Army documents, just like Plügel

² Ibid.

and Riemann, as a chauvinist, who retains a great deal of distance, although politeness, in contacts with Poles in the SRV did not allow for closer contacts with the surveyed population during fieldwork studies (Bałuk-Ulewiczowa 2004: 82–84, 87). This is also what Sauer recalled (1993: 147–152): her excessive fraternization with the inhabitants of Haczów, going beyond the necessity of ethnographic research, was unwelcome by her superiors (Lorenzen, who had a reed with him for horseback riding at the time, was hitting the uppers with it when Poles appeared, which aroused their fear, and the merriment of the participants of the scientific trip). The supercilious behaviour of German scientists and officials, from the position of their racial and cultural superiority and power, combined with the maintenance of distance and separation, is known from the World Wars I and II (Geisenhainer 2009: 35), and is surprisingly similar in the GG, the occupied countries of Europe, and the non-European colonies of Germany (*Fortepian Schoppinga* 2010: 10).

At the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Vienna, Weninger accepted the statements of his former assistant Kahlich for the years 1932–1945 (Fuchs 2002: 211; Teschler-Nicola 2007: 68). In this denazification survey she informed that during her research in the Tarnów ghetto in 1942 she had “friendly relations” with Jews (Weninger’s wife was of Jewish origin, which was why he lost his job at the university in 1938; Simon, s.a.: 13–15). She provided them with food, “debated political issues”, gave them advice on what they should do in case of danger, and in the summer of this year, when she went to Haczów with Polish assistants (Władysław Witkowski, Ignacy Malinowski, Stanisław Jasicki), she treated them on an equal footing with German staff, despite the orders of her superiors, to treat them officially. Kahlich’s testimony about the ghetto was false and stupid. The part that referred to Haczów might have been true. According to the SRV reports and publications, German researchers had close relations with Polish scientific assistants.

Letters from Hildebrandt to her parents from 1941 and from Gottong to the Lonc family from Markowa from 1944 prove that relations of sympathy and even friendship were formed between these researchers and the population of “German” villages. This is confirmed by the memoirs of Eugenia Błach, née Lonc (Żygadło 2011: 38, 40–41): in her family home in Markowa there was a research team from IDO, i.e. Dr Gottong, a “scientific commander”, Prof. Jasicki from the Jagiellonian University, a “logistic manager” of the expedition, two assistants, one student of anthropology, and one graduate of geography – Gisela Hildebrandt. Gottong came to Lonc family for several months for three years, felt affection for the hosts, lived with them, sent a letter after he had been wounded on the front in 1944, and “he was so

good, so tolerant”, “as if he were our ally”, he “did not play politics”. There is quite a number of inaccuracies or misrepresentations in these fragments of memoirs written in 2011 (Jasicki was not a professor at the time; instead of the liquidated Jagiellonian University, IDO was established), and quite a few naive and untrue judgments (on Gottong’s apoliticality).

Only a few people volunteered to participate in the anthropological survey under Gottong’s direction, at the vicarage of the Markowa site. The others were called to the assembly site by a local parish priest, supposedly forced to do so by Gottong. Błach recalled: “And he studied the colour of the eyes, hair, the oval of the face, he did skull measurements and, according to him, everything was in perfect order” (Żygadło 2011: 39). In other places, as in Stary Sącz and its surroundings, in Szaflary and Witów, where Fliethmann met with the “kindness of the highlanders” (but a low turnout of people willing to undergo research), on the recommendation of the GG authorities, officials and priests called on the population to come to the place of research. These were often the vicarage, for example in Szaflary (Maj, Trebunia-Staszel in this volume; Harten 1996: 154; Bałuk-Ulewiczowa 2004: 89–92 et seq.), or schools like in Haczów (Demel 2013). Fliethmann and Kahlich encountered “a population revolt” in Haczów, but made “necessary” measurements with the help of the Ukrainian police and border guards. On their way back they were thrown stones at (Bałuk-Ulewiczowa 2004: 89–90; Schafft 2006: 100). There are also people who remember this research in Haczów; according to one of them, German scientists “were treated very kindly”, “only young blondes were afraid that they would be taken to Germany” (Demel 2013).

The generalisations (Schafft 2006: 13, 28–29 et al.) that the SRV studies were unethical are not convincing because the subjects were examined in a situation of enslavement, fear and humiliation as “material” (“material”, “continuous material”, “cross-sectional material” is the normal language of anthropology, cf. Wanke 1969: 208–210, more or less the same as a “guide” in the old ethnography). This was undoubtedly the case in the Tarnów ghetto, where Fliethmann and Kahlich worked in a hurry, fearing that the “removal” of Jews would deprive them of “valuable material”. They processed data from the ghetto when their “material” had ceased to exist (Harten 1996: 154; Schafft 2006: 13–30; Friedländer 2007: 679–680). In Podhale, however, according to Plügel (1941a, 1942a, b) and Sydow (1942a, b, 1943), after an initial reluctance and distrust of the highlanders the ice got broken fast, “some of them treated us extremely friendly, and even hospitably”, without any servility, with pride, some even over-familiarly. Hildebrandt wrote about the inhabitants of Markowa in a similar vein, Sauer recalled her stay in Haczów likewise.

What I write should not be understood as meaning that I read the IDO history studies with suspicion and I easily believe in the truth of the accounts of German scientists from the years 1940–1943, the latter being entangled in proving the racial and national separateness of descendants of German settlers. For Sydow (1943: 95–96) and Plügel (1942b: 243–247), the behaviour of the highlanders towards German scholars: proud and ambitious, deprived of servility or subservience to the state (“low” behavior was to be a feature of poor quality races and characters, Poles), they were a proof of “their attraction to Germanness”, dictated by their origins and racial composition. For Plügel, this was even confirmed by the fact that “nothing escaped us” during scientific research. Several thieving families lived in Szaflary, but according to the explanations given by the highlanders to Sydow (1943: 98), “Gypsy blood” was inside. The same Gottong had previously observed when he surveyed construction workers in villages near Cracow, where he found relatively many elements of the Nordic race, of the Dinaric type, which involved more valuable characters and behaviours (see Makuła 2009: 104).

It is known from the history of ethnicity research that the field studies involved were difficult, or even dangerous. The making of notes, taking of photographs and drawing caused suspicion and reluctance (Libera 2003: 247–260). Anthropometric measurements were even more difficult – this was experienced by Izydor Kopernicki, Julian Talko-Hryncewicz and many others, who examined in the 1930s, *inter alia*, the Lemko population. The Lemkos’ aversion was not broken by offering them cigarettes or joint photographs; their young wives, without the permission of their husbands, would never have agreed to remove the scarf from their heads (Karpiński 1939: 71–72, 121), because married women could not show up outside the house with their hair uncovered. The reluctance and fear of questions and observations, notes of ethnographers, all the more so in the context of measuring and examining by anthropologists, had to be broken with the “ringing coin”, and by the influence of local “important people” (landowners, officials, priests). This is how Kazimierz Stołyhwo (1912: 201–203, 278–280) and his wife and assistant (Marta Rzewuska) managed to measure anthropometrically the miners in Olkusz even “in their birthday’s suits”. In a different situation – I am adding this example because Austrian and German anthropologists did not perceive the interest in intimate parts of the body as exceptional – Karol Stojanowski (1925: 798–818) managed to measure and describe the size and shape of penises of Nordic, pre-Slavic and Semitic types.

German anthropologists and ethnologists encountered great reluctance and resistance to such research, like in the early 1930s, when E. Fischer finally

managed to implement a great project of Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut concerning the anthropological and cultural research of the German population. Many eminent scholars were involved in this research (e.g. Eickstedt), whose task was to go to at least 60 rural communities, selected industrial cities, Jewish population centres, people of noble descent, in order to study (with the help of standardized research instruments) each individual as a zoological unit – to collect anthropometric data, determine the blood group, evaluate the race, but also its social environment; to culturally and historically (because the race influences the culture, and the culture affects the race) review the parish's books for genealogical reasons, the health records to identify the hereditary and acquired diseases, the cadastral maps to capture the “purely German” forms of settlement; to carry out ethnographic research using the questionnaire method in 1500 places to define the “national character”, the “German soul”, so that this ethnographic material could fill the gaps in the sources of history, which would allow to give the racial anthropology a historical dimension, especially since there was still archaeological bone material to be used. The aim of this study was to determine and evaluate the racial composition, anthropological maps and the nationality and cultural background of the German population, and ethnographic maps. The research was ultimately intended to serve racial policy. Despite the enormous organizational and financial effort, the outcome was “poor and even embarrassing” (Schafft 2006: 43–52; Geisenhainer 2009: 41). Previously, such projects, although of interest, had been rejected on the grounds of huge costs. In the first years of the 20th century, only a project of anthropological and ethnographic research was developed for the entire population of the Reich, when Luschan developed tables of skin colour, Martin and Schurtz of eye colour and Fischer and Saller of hair (Schafft 2006: 40).

The World War II provided an opportunity to implement such projects. The place of anthropological research were occupied countries and the Third Reich itself. Ghettos, prisons, prisoner-of-war and concentration camps became places of “anthropological field research”. This term is used by Thurnwald in a review of a doctoral thesis written by Ewa Justin on the basis of her anthropological research on Roma people in a concentration camp (Gingrich 2007a: 141).

It was an extraordinarily busy time for scientists, a time of their involvement in the great tasks of the Third Reich, and taking advantage of the opportunity to conduct research in outright “clinical” or “laboratory” conditions. Almost immediately after Anschluss, Viennese anthropologists, such as Geyer, examined the “material” of the Jewish cemeteries that had been liquidated (Schafft

2006: 14). In 1939, under the direction of Josef Wastel (then the custodian, later the director of the anthropological division at the Museum of Natural History), the commission collected detailed anthropometric data, samples of hair, gypsum castings, photographs and drawings of about 7,000 Jews interned at the stadium in Vienna, before their deportation to Buchenwald (Spring 2005: 199–200). Commissions of anthropologists were organised with the participation of Routil and Dr Herbert Kahlich (the husband of Dora) for anthropological-ethnographic examination of “kriegsgefangenmaterials” in prisoner-of-war and concentration camps (Teschler, Berner 1998: 9; Schmidinger 2002; Schafft 2006: 8, 14, 191–194). At that time, even ethnicity research (which mythologized the “Volk” for the ideology of Nazism) into the “rural life”, “biological and cultural strength of the German peasants” – the “blood sources of the nation” – was carried out without major obstacles in cooperation with the police, as in Tirol in 1940–1941 by ethnographers and folklorists from the University of Vienna, led by Wolfram (Lixfeld 1991: 95–116; Bockhorn 2010: 199–224). The *Volkskunde* there became stronger both institutionally and in terms of the quality of staff. The years 1939–1945 were the “Sechs Jahre Arbeit für Volk, Reich und Führer” (Six years of work for the people, the Reich and Führer) (Bockhorn 2010: 221 et seq.).

Scientists involved in the racial policy of the Third Reich were well aware that the war offered a great opportunity for anthropological and ethnological research, which was not possible in Austria and Germany after 1918 and before 1939 – at least certainly not on such a large scale and without resistance of the surveyed and, as Reche wrote to Rudolf Hess, without the need for expensive and long scientific expeditions into foreign countries (Geisenhainer 2009: 45; Evans 2010: 131).

The research on such a grand scale, as the SRV IDO in the GG, had well-known and remembered patterns: in colonial countries (Fischer or Reche), in occupied countries of Europe – starting from the Prussian-French War in 1870, the occupation of Bosnia by Austro-Hungary (in 1884–1885 the research there was conducted by Friedrich S. Krauss, the great Viennese expert on the Balkans), and on a much larger scale in POW camps during World War I (Hauser 2005: 1–7; Geisenhainer 2009: 36–38; Evans 2010: 97–154). The materials obtained at that time were used by Viennese anthropologists in the 1940s (Limberger, Sticker 2004: 68–69). Plügel knew about them: he asked Kahlich to borrow photographs taken by her scientific tutor Routil during World War I (Schafft 2006: 16).

Between 1915 and 1918, Austrian and German anthropologists, with similar concepts of race, measuring instruments, tables of eye, hair and skin colour,

conducted research in POW camps. Pöche and his colleagues, as well as his students (including Weninger and Routil), were in camps in Cracow and occupied Volhynia (where whole families were studied by Helene Schürer von Waldheim, then a student of Pöche, and later his wife). They took anthropometric measurements of about 7,000 individuals, about 5,000 photographs, about 300 gypsum castings, hair samples, filmed and recorded those surveyed on phonographs, wrote down ethnographic, linguistic and musical data. Felix R. von Luschan and his student Eickstedt, who chose 16 POW camps with 66 ethnic groups as their anthropological-ethnological research sites (e.g. near Szczecin), examined 1,784 individuals. Many other anthropologists and ethnologists conducted their research in POW camps, did not give up collecting “war material” even on the front lines, and followed up with well-organized expeditions with the armies to the occupied countries: Russia, Romania, Albania (here the research was conducted by Arthur Haberlandt). These were anthropological and ethnological studies – from the point of view of racial and civilisational superiority, at the same time scientific and political, because they were important for the economic and “cultural mission” and “conquest” of Austria-Hungary and Germany, organisationally and financially supported by governmental and non-governmental institutions, industry and banks (Fuchs 2003: 242–244, 255–256; Berner 2005: 167–198; Hauser 2005: 1–7; Schafft 2006: 40–41; Gingrich 2007a: 115–116; Geisenhainer 2009:36–39; Evans 2010: 131–154).

Under Pöche’s leadership, anthropological and ethnological research leads to the Marienfeld project and ultimately to the activities of the SRV. According to Weninger, the “Viennese anthropological school” was based on the “Pöche tradition”, as Brigitte Fuchs wrote (2003: 280–281), and the “pseudo-tradition”, according to Margit Berner (2005: 129). After research “in the shadow of the army” in the Balkans in the last decades of the 19th century and first decades of 20th century, Viennese ethnography has earned the name *Kriegs-Volkskunde* (Hauser 2005: 2). German-language ethnography and ethnology, as well as anthropology related to militarism, nationalism and colonialism, based on social Darwinism and Mendelism, combined with eugenics, particularly after 1933, used the terms of struggle and war to describe scientific activity, while the theory of class struggle was replaced, according to Stojanowski (1934: 146), by the theory of race struggle – actually: they connected this race struggle with “fighting” or “a war” between social groups, nations, cultures and countries. For Mühlmann in the 1930s and 1940s, ethnology was a political science (*politische Ethnologie*), uniting the “spiritual and cultural sphere” (*kulturelle-geistige*) and the “political and combat sphere”

(*politische-kämpferische*), on whose basis (and anthropology, because these sciences cannot exist without each other) a nation can be rebuilt (racially, culturally and politically uniform) (Seidler 2003: 43–47; Winter, s.a.: 33–36). Revisionist-nationalist strategies of Ostforschung in the 1920s, radicalized in the 1930s and 1940s, used the phraseology of war and colonialism: Ostfrage, Ostfront – “the front from” Bucharest to Riga, as the “foreground of the fight”, “the objective of Ostmission”, “conquest”, “colonisation” of “Greater Germany”. National or cultural research was a form of struggle – “Volkstumskampf” for the central Ostforschung centre in Berlin under the direction of Albert Bratskmann, who had a certain influence on the creation of new scientific centres for Ostpolitik, also for IDO in Cracow (Haar 2005: 25–26, 48–50, 85–86, 106–114 et seq.; Linnemann 2002: 66–67). IDO, according to its own documents, was an “army of scientific clerks”, an “armaments factory”, the SRV had “kriegswichtige Aufgaben”, and the SRV material security (*kriegsgefangenmaterials*) after the evacuation from Cracow was “important for the war” (Michel 2000: 163; Rybicka 2002: 35, 124–128). Scientific research in war conditions was a “battle” for “fencers of National Socialist ideas” who had to face racial-nationalist and ideological-political “foreign and hostile forces”.

“Knowledge is a power”, wrote Luschan in 1904, in regard to the mutual benefit of Völkerkunde and the German colonies in Africa (Evans 2010: 50). “Knowledge about others” often means “power over others” (Schmidinger 2002). This is particularly the case when scientific institutions are dependent on state institutions. The scientific discourse is then combined with the discourse of the state policy. The research of anthropologists, ethnologists, and Austrian and German ethnographers, particularly since the World War I, and even more so during the Third Reich, had been applied research financed and supported by state and non-governmental institutions. “He who pays, demands”. When scientific institutions became financially dependent on such a powerful protector as the Nazi Germany, they had to prove the compatibility of their scientific and political activities in order to exist. This was one of the sources of opportunism for German anthropologists and ethnologists (Geisenhainer 2009: 46–47).

The publications I use on the history of anthropology and ethnology until 1933 in Germany, until 1938 in Austria, present in detail the complex processes of “elimination”, i.e. marginalisation of ideas and people from the dominant currents (liberal traditions of Virchov, Luschan, Martin), and “inheritance”, i.e. institutional, intellectual and human continuity. They testify that, in general, anthropology and ethnology were capable of and ready to put into practice the great German national ideas long before 1933, when E. Fischer,

O. Reche, Bernhard Ankermann (co-founder of the cultural theory) and Fritz Krause (chairman of the German ethnological society) declared it in an official letter to Hitler, by stating that “anthropology is essential for the strengthening of the Nazi ideas of *Volk* (the people) and *höheren Menschentums* (the higher human type), because it combines research on races with research on culture” (Gingrich 2007a: 132).

The first publications on German science in the service of the Third Reich concerned the years 1933–1945, the most recent of which focused on the history of science (anthropology, ethnology, history, history of art, etc.) before 1933, and their continuation after 1945. When read together, with omission of the numerous and important nuances, with attention attached to the “margins”, thus tendentially, they create the impression that they take into account “excessive contextual mercy”, they lead (involuntarily?) to the relativisation of the “historical responsibility” of German scholars. Some of them are examples of attempts to homogenize different histories (“History cannot be reconstructed on the basis of homology” – Leach, Aycock 1998: 31), in order then, on this basis, for example from the perspective of “European modernity”, “modern science”, “modern state” and “biopolitics” to explain the participation of scientists in the imperial and colonial policy of Germany before and after 1933.

According to various authors, the history of German anthropology and ethnology (and other sciences) is part of the history of European nationalisms and colonialism, German racial hygiene is part of the history of eugenics in Europe and the USA, the biopolitics of modern states.

Research during the war, supported by armies and other war institutions, was not a German “invention” – we know it from British or American anthropology (ethnology) (Geisenhainer 2009: 37, refers to: Streck 1995: 1–10; Price 2002: 14–20), the connections between these disciplines and politics were widespread, and they tightened during the Cold War, in totalitarian countries. These interpretations are discussed and explained by Andrew Evans (2010: 3–48, 223–230). He points out that during the World War I, which he regards as a turning point in the history of German-speaking anthropology, research was carried out (on a much smaller scale, without much connection to the problem of “race”) also in the United Kingdom or Russia, but it did not have any impact on the tradition of these disciplines in those countries (Evans 2010: 14). Moreover, theories of race inequality and degeneration, eugenics were more or less popular and applied practically in individual countries, but nowhere were they as influential and exploited as in German science and state – especially after 1933 (Gawin 2003; Gawin, Uzarczyk: 2010; Popowicz 2009).

These theories of anthropology and ethnology had been gaining in importance since the end of the 19th century, as they co-created German nationalism, providing ideological legitimacy for imperialism and colonialism, and, by the same token absorbed and transformed political ideologies and social myths, a part of popular culture of that time, on the grounds of scientism. German anthropology went down the path from the consideration of general ideas of evolution and descriptions of human biological diversity, from the problems of systematics to the hierarchy of races, to the obsession with the “purity of the German race” in the Third Reich. Old and firmly rooted European ideas about race inequality, the “Aryan myth” (created on the basis of linguistic studies at the end of the 18th century), have been transformed into a “Nordic myth” – of exceptional biological and spiritual value to the “German race”, whose mission is to lead nations. This was due to the extremely popular theories of Darwin’s evolution in Germany, social Darwinism (which includes the ideas of Thomas Hobbes, Thomas Malthus, Adam Smith) developed by biologist Ernst H. Haeckel, the combination of Darwinism with social evolutionism (and organicism), fed by the racist theories of Joseph A. de Gobineau and Houston S. Chamberlain.

The “Nordic myth”, processed by Mendelism since the first decades of the 20th century, belonged to the scientific publications and was popular in Germany. It was included in the textbook “Baur/Fischer/Lenz”, publications by Fischer, Reche, Günther, which provided scientific justification for the idea of National Socialism, Alfred Rosenberg’s *Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts*, a key work for Nazi ideology and the work of writers and journalists connected with the Blut und Boden movement – it became the *opinio communio* (Vetsch 2003: 9, 14–15, 36–39; Gingrich 2003: 29 and 2007a: 131–132; Schafft 2006: 33–34, 36–40, 189, 91, 200; Popowicz 2009: 77–83, 120, 131, 134, 163; Eisheuer 2009: 6–9).

German anthropology from its scientific beginnings has been, openly or implicitly, racist to varying degrees, and with time increasingly anti-Jewish. Racism and anti-Semitism have separate histories, until they were united by the “German myth”, until anti-Semitism acquired political significance (the myth was previously of a religious and economic nature). Since the 19th century, the “Jewish problem” has been an element of the Weltanschauung, programmes of political parties, peasant associations, economic organisations, and science, which have long discussed the “solution to the Jewish question” (Eisheuer 2009: 6–7; Popowicz 2009: 152–153).

Rassentheorie has been associated with the *Rassenhygiene* nearly since its inception. Before the consequences of this link became part of the Nuremberg

Laws, racism and eugenics were promoted first by Francis Galton, then by Alfred Ploetz, and finally by the unusual activity in this field by anthropologists, such as Reche. He said at the meeting of the Society of Race Hygiene in 1925 that an effective racial policy is more important for the existence of a nation than winning or losing the war, “the people and race will save our epoch”, anthropology and hygiene of races should be the basis of internal policy, at least a part of foreign policy (Geisenhainer 2009: 39–40; Neugebauer 2005: 99–138; Wolf 2008: 31–32, 50–58 et al.).

In studies of the history of German anthropology (and related ethnology, history, etc.), teleological narrations are created from the end of the 19th century or the “Great War” until World War II. Between about 1870 and the beginning of the 20th century – more anthropology than ethnology – they were understaffed and poorly institutionalised, and were only being professionalised. Their rapid growth was due to the so-called second industrial revolution in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the reorganisation of the university system and the huge increase in investment in science. Germany has become the centre of European science, an imperial and colonial power. Ethnology and anthropology became politically important, useful in Europe and in non-European countries (belonging to the *Kolonialwissenschaften*) for administration, the military, industry (Evans 2010: 3–4, 21–27, 43–52; Gingrich 2003: 18–28 et seq.). Scientific and political work for the new Germany after 1918 resulted in an increase in human resources and institutional anthropology, closer links with governmental and non-governmental institutions. It contributed to changes in research areas and to theoretical changes. From the second half of the 19th century until the beginning of the 20th century, anthropology (understood as “the third biology”, next to botany and zoology) defined racial types on the basis of measurements and descriptions of morphological features, identifying them with ethnic groups (Seidler 2003: 11–12). In the POW camps of Austria-Hungary and in the first years after the war, Pöche defined the population through a community of language, culture and history in conjunction with “racial” factors: the inherited traits that determine the physical and mental affinity of the group (Bernier 2005: 182; Teschler-Nicola 2007: 56).

In the Bismarck Islands between 1908 and 1909, Reche was surprised by the morphological diversity within a single population, because he expected these to be distinguished by their morphological, psychological and cultural characteristics (he referred to the ethnological theory of cultural circles). The loss of colonies by Germany forced Reche, like many other anthropologists, to deal mainly with the anthropology of Europe, the issues

of the German race, the Lusatian, Silesian and Slavic races. Since 1917 he had been working on materials from POW camps in Hamburg. In later years, he transformed physical anthropology into racial and cultural anthropology on the basis of genetics and eugenics, under the influence of Fischer's publications, with a certain participation of Gobineau and Chamberlain's theories, and participated in the creation of the concept of race as a permanent composition of inherited morphological, physiological and psychological characteristics, determining "the "soul" of the people. He set scientific-political goals for anthropology: to determine the genetic composition of individuals and populations; to reconstruct the processes and effects of the mixing of races and nations; to solve the problems of the degeneration of races and national conflicts of biological origin (he created eugenic societies in Vienna and then in Leipzig). According to Reche, the boundaries of the German nation should have been revised on a scientific basis in accordance with "natural laws" (Seidler 2003: 13–15; Fuchs 2003: 258–260; Schafft 2006: 51, 200 et al.; Teschler-Nicola 2007: 56; Geisenhainer 2009: 38–41; Evans 2010: 224–226). Reche was one of the main authorities in the SRV. Plügel and Gottong paraphrased his opinion by saying that the practical-political actions of the SRV were "in accordance with the divine order", which revealed scientific research; they used his phrases: "race is destiny" (*Rasse ist Schicksal*), Poland is "an unhappy mixture of races" (Harten 1996: 134; Rybicka 2002: 32).

Before anthropology and ethnology became a key discipline of the Third Reich, the generation of Fischer, Reche, Weninger, Eickstedt and Thurnwald, Mühlmann, Baumann led to the dominance of combined racial (*Rassenkunde*) and national (*Volkstumsforschung*) research as applied research, paradigmatic after the collapse of the German Empire and Austro-Hungarian Empire, after the loss of land and influences in Europe, German colonies, after political and economic crises, the rise of revisionism and nationalism. Since the 1920s, Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gesellschaft (KWG) and Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), as well as many other institutions (staffed by nationalist-revisionist professionals) have provided organisational and financial support for "patriotic" research (Evans 2010: 52), enhancing the strength and health of the nation, saving it from degeneration (fears that were reinforced by rapid industrialization): "purity of the Nordic race", purging the genetic pool of Germany from foreign and harmful races and mixtures, primitive Eastern European races (these were of little value also according to the American laws of the 1920s), elimination of primitive and degenerated individuals and social groups, protection of the "source of the nation's blood" – the German peasants (Schafft 2006: 41–52 et al.; Teschler-Nicola 2007: 60; Ehrenreich 2009: 1–3).

The DFG supported the *Atlas der deutschen Volkskunde* – a large and costly study inside and outside Germany (243 questionnaires were sent out to 20,000 correspondents between 1930 and 1935) – which was part of the German discourse *Volks- und Kulturboden*, *Volk und Rahmen*, used for revisionist-nationalist purposes. After 1933, the atlas research was intensified (Brügge-meier, Schmoll 2008: 132–137). These works belonged in part to *Ostforschung* and *Ostpolitik* (also financed by the DFG): research on “*Volksdeutsche islands*” in Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Balkans, the descendants of German colonizers in the German “foreland”, the carriers of civilizations in the East, defending their identity in foreign racial, ethnic and cultural environments. One of the most important scientific results (anthropologists, ethnographers, historians, linguists, prehistorians, etc.) was the project of conquests and colonization, displacement and alienation – from the Imperial Germany around 1900 to the ample “fantasizing” of the 1920s and the 1930s, the plans of Brat-skmann and Aubin of September 1939, the expulsion of Poles and Jews from *Wielkopolska*, the bringing in of German settlers, following Himmler’s order to prepare the General Eastern Plan (Haar 2002: 25–50, 85–86, 106–114 et al.; Bruch, Flachovsky 2008: 7–17; Bruch, Nötzoldt 2008: 18–27).

The research was continued with the activity of the SRV IDO. The scientific staff of this section, such as Plügel and Riemann, used the old vocabulary of *Ostforschung* and *Ostpolitik*, which was included in the Nazi language, to present their scientific and political opinions: the “harsh and hard” plans for the “racial substance” of the GG serve the building of a “new order” designated by the Third Reich – on the foundations “consistent with facts”. Furthermore, they serve the protection against “low-value blood”, primitive races in the “foreground” of Germany, and by the same token reinforce Germany with the “work towards the strengthening of German nationalism”. They are to enable scientific and propaganda activities on “the islands of German colonies”, contributing at the same time to the exclusion of Germanization of Poles (for racial and political reasons), combating Polish nationalism and the “demoralizing influence of Jewry”.

Katja Geisenhainer (2009: 41) wrote that similar ideas and activities, involved in research as those represented by Reche, are known from Polish anthropology, the work of Czekanowski (a participant in the famous German expedition to Central Africa in 1906–1907, whose research she assessed as colonial) and Stołyhwo; from the disputes of Polish and German anthropologists from the 1930s. Geisenhainer omitted fundamental theoretical and political differences of these anthropologies, she pointed out the analogies. The findings of Polish anthropologists were rejected by German

anthropologists during the Third Reich (e.g. by Fischer, who had previously written favourably about Czekanowski's school) for scientific and political reasons. For the same reasons, the SRV rejected the compilation of German and Polish anthropological and ethnicity studies. From the documents in this section we learn that Polish colleagues had to undergo "training". We do not know what kind of a "training" Stanisław Jasicki, a student of Stołyhwo, had to undergo. From the paper³ we know that he rejected ethnographic surveys developed by our outstanding ethnologist Adam Fischer – he had to develop completely new ones himself.

The anthropology from the "Cracow school" of Józef Majer and Izydor Kopernicki was connected with the "protection of national existence" (Czekanowski 1948: 12). In the interwar period, the "Polish anthropological school" had a practical meaning for the state, worked for the army, economy and politics, because the knowledge of selection values, including psychic predispositions, social values, racial and psychic components led, for example according to Stojanowski (see Patalas 2010), to an increase in the quality of the nation.

The greatest authorities of anthropology at that time: Czekanowski, Stołyhwo, Jan Mydlarski, Ludwik Jaxa-Bykowski and others, of ethnology: for example Stanisław Poniatowski, Jan S. Bystron, Adam Fischer, and other historical sciences: Przemysław Dąbkowski, Władysław Semkowicz (the last three, which is extremely interesting, were later employees of the SRV IDO), supported the work of scientific committees of the Society for the Development of the Eastern Territories (TRZW), founded by General Władysław Semkowicz. Tadeusz Kasprzycki (Minister and President of the Union of Mountainous Lands), whose general objective was to "rebuild the power of Polishness on the Eastern Borderland", "restitution work" towards national minorities, on the basis of detailed research conducted by ethnographers and sociologists, historians, archaeologists, anthropologists, geographers, and historians of literature. The task of the Society was to unite the efforts of Polish science, state authorities and social organizations in research useful for the state (even monographs of local communities were to be of great practical importance), to help the researchers and to publish their results (in cooperation with the Union of Mountainous Lands, the Institute of National Research, the Society of Friends of Hutsul Region, etc.), and to conduct propaganda activities (Dworakowski 1939: 116–125). The latter were combined with scientific research, an example of which were the publications by Władysław Pulnarowicz (1937) on the "knights of the Podkarpacie region", i.e. the history

³ Ibid.

and “duties” of a ruthenised petty nobility, *Łemkowie – zapomniani Polacy* (Lemkos. The Forgotten Poles) by Aleksander Bartoszek (1939), even the publications about the western borders of the Boyko region by Jan Falkowski and Bazyli Pasznyi (1935) who succumbed to the pressure of the Sanation to move these borders more eastwards (Babicz 1966: 61). Due to the agitation of Ukrainian nationalists, the TRZW in cooperation with the Ministry of Military Affairs established the Lemko Committee, headed by Professor Jerzy Smoleński, with the participation of the academic staff of the Jagiellonian University (Chojnowski 1979: 198–199).

At the same time, “Western thought”, which existed in the 19th century and developed after 1918, and especially after 1933, was a reaction of Polish politics and science to German revisionism and imperialism. Jan M. Piskorski (2005: 260–282) pointed out many analogies between the Polish “western programme”, whose scientific centre was Poznań, and Ostpolitik and Ostforschung in Berlin. Responding to Gustav Kossina’s theories (used in IDO by Radig, Plügel and others), Józef Kostrzewski combined Lusatian culture with pre-Slavic culture (Moszyński was one of the few – perhaps also for non-scientific reasons – who questioned the identification of archaeological cultures with ethnic and linguistic groups). According to German anthropologists, the Polish lands belonged to one of the ancient lands of the Nordic race, the reaction were Czekanowski’s works (1930), and later the works of his pupils who argued that the Slavs’ homeland was a territory between the Vistula and the Odra (according to Stojanowski, between the Vistula and the Elbe), that the Polish lands (especially Silesia) are more Nordic than Germany in terms of anthropology. These claims encountered a violent reaction of German anthropologists. This is why the findings of Polish anthropology were unacceptable to the SRV.

The scientific views integrated with political views, especially those of Stojanowski (see Patalas 2010), a pupil of Czekanowski, a collaborator of Kostrzewski, are shocking by today’s standards if we put aside our “contextual mercy”. He was a Mendelist and Darwinist in anthropology, fascinated by the German eugenics movement (Jan Mydlarski, Stanisław Żejmo-Żejmis, Kazimierz Stołyhwo, among others, took part in the eugenics movement). He was a National Democrat whose ideas of the state (he was a follower of Roman Dmowski) were close to European fascism. He spoke with great appreciation about Hitler until he noticed that Hitlerism was a deadly threat to the Polish state. To some extent he agreed with Günther, but rejected his hierarchy of races – instead he shared his views on the Jewish question: it was not possible to assimilate them for eugenic reasons (but he opposed plans to exterminate Jews).

Polish scientists participated in the works of the “Eastern” and “Western” programmes, and maintained a total separateness of scientific views. Falkowski’s research into the ethnographic borders of Russian highlanders, which was supported organisationally and financially by the Third Reich, ended in disputes that were violent at times and the refusal to recognise the competences (Reinfuss’s by Falkowski) (Libera 2011: 13). Polish scientists, differing in scientific and political terms, worked for a weak, internally diversified and conflicting state. Work on behalf of the Second Republic in the late 1930s had no great or permanent significance either for anthropology and ethnology, or for the state, which soon ceased to exist.

It is only when scientific knowledge is created in one binding way that (a) the aim is to create “total science”, as had been the case in Germany since the 1920s, which synthesizes specialist research, integrates biological and human sciences; that (b) comprehensive and applied research is rewarded, because such research can meet the needs of a strong totalitarian state (Schafft 2006: 41–50), and (c) scientific institutions adopted research and practical-political goals at the same time. These were the tasks of the SRV, wrote Gottong, Plügel, Fliethmann and Riemann without providing any justification.

From the “Great War” to the World War II there was continuity in human and institutional resources and in anthropology practices in Vienna (Berner 2005: 168): from Rudolf Pöche (since 1912 the Director of the Institute) and his successor Reche (from 1924 to 1927), Josef Weninger (and Margarete, who formed the “morphology school”, with a break in the years 1938–1945, until Weninger’s retirement in 1955) (Kater 2006: 274). This continuity leads to young anthropologists employed by IDO: students and associates of Weninger, Geyer, and Routil. The SRV originated directly from the “Viennese anthropological school”. This was a part of the national and international networks of anthropologies and ethnologies. Pöche, then his pupils, in collaboration with anthropologists and biologists and ethnologists Luschan, Martin, Ploetz, Reche, Thurwald, Baur and Günther, under the particular influence of Fischer, transformed anthropology as a science of race on the basis of genetics: the inheritance of physical and psychic characteristics, as applied science, organised the eugenics movement, introduced racial hygiene into university courses, and developed paternity testing methods (after the war, until the 1960s Kahlich and Karl Tuppa from the Institute of Anthropology, and Wastl from the Museum of Nature worked as court experts on paternity in Vienna (Fuchs 2003: 242–244; Teschler-Nicola 2005: 99–138; Berner 2005: 167–198; Neugebauer 2005: 53–64; Wolf 2008: 50–51; Geisenhainer 2009: 38, 41).

The “Viennese anthropological school” was fully prepared for the tasks set by the state. Anschluss provided an opportunity to realise scientific and political opportunities. Afterwards, it sufficed to integrate the anthropologists’ statements with the ideology and language of the Third Reich – this served to “legitimize scientific publications” (Limberger, Sticker 2004). During the period of “work for the people, the Reich and Führer”, the writings of scholars such as Wolfram from the University of Vienna (Bockhorn 2010: 199–224), Plügel from the SRV IDO, contain references to Hitler and *Heil Hitler!*; Plügel’s article (1941b: 15) concludes with a sentence from Hitler’s speech at the NSDAP Convention in 1933: “No matter how the external image of the world might change, the internal racial conditions would remain the same”.

The anthropology, ethnology, and ethnography, or prehistory, have acquired the language and ideologies of Nazism, but these influences were not confined to the rhetorical layers. Connecting science with the interests of Nazi Germany led to the adoption of the language of Nazism, and thus to the unification and radicalization of the theory of anthropology and ethnology (but without full agreement, for example, on the origins, history and characteristics of races). Many of the statements and actions of Reche, Fischer, Günther or Mühlmann were even identical to those of Hitler because German anthropology and the closely related ethnology contributed to the ideology and racial policy of the Third Reich. Hitlerism was justified in German science. Scientists who supported Nazism provided scientific justifications for the National Socialist ideology. Common knowledge has become a part of this ideology. The “fatal *Schlachtwort*” of science and state entered everyday language: *Lebensraum*, *Rassenkunde*, *arische Rasse*, *Volkstum*, *völklich*, *Blut und Boden*, *Volksboden*, *Volksseele* (Schmidinger 2002; Limberger, Sticker 2004; Schafft 2006: 15, 51, 115, 200, 207).

Between 1933 and 1945, almost all anthropologists and ethnologists (as well as historians, linguists, demographers, geographers, theologians) worked to recover former colonies, return lost lands to the Reich, and colonize the East. Schools in German ethnology: of morphology of culture, of diffusionism, mainly of cultural circles and functionalism competed for the regime’s favours, for scientific and political influences. Thurnwald, interested in researching colonies, showed outstanding opportunism, adapted the language of ethnology to the language of Nazism, made his own discipline’s theories and tasks similar to those of the national socialist state (Begusch 2004: 5–8; Gingrich 2007a: 128–135, 158; Ulrich, Seidler 2008: 149–155). After 1938, the Völkerkunde Institute in Vienna became a “care centre for colonial-ethnological research”, the greatest of which was due to Mühlmann,

according to whom ethnological interests in Africa, which emphasize Germany's colonial aspirations, have parallels in Europe, especially in Eastern Europe, in a wider area of Eurasia; the goal of *Ost-Ethnologie* is *Volkstumspolitik*: the problems of nations; and the "ostensible peoples" (Scheinvölker – who did not meet the criteria of either *Volkstum* or *Volk*) – Jews, Gypsies, Bosnians, Serbs, Albanians, Poles, etc. – who were the victims of the Nazi occupation. The problems of assimilation and dissimilation, re-Germanisation (*Umvölkung*), the formation of national identities (*Volkwerdung*), *Volkstumsforschung* (research on the relationship between nation and culture on a biologicist basis) (Michel 2000: 149–150; Seidler 2003: 44, 47–49, 85 et seq.). Scientists involved in Ostpolitik demanded "new colonies" in Eastern Europe. Since September 1939 Reche (born in Kłodzko, for racist and nationalistic reasons, hated internationalism, socialism, Marxism, Jews and Slavs), as a member and expert of the Nord- und Ostdeutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, in his letters to the head of the association, Brachmann, pointed out the need to remove the "mixture of races": Asian elements, Jews from Poland, to widen the living space on the basis of the "natural laws" of the Germans. In his letters to Günther Pancke, the head of SS Rassen- und Siedlungshauptamt (RuSHA), he presented himself as a specialist in racial affairs and racial policy in the East (Geisenhainer 2009: 40–46; Schafft 2006: 115). In 1939 Reche was 60. The Nazis preferred young scholars like Frank – while establishing IDO – the next generation of "hungry young hyenas" (this is how the Reche's and Fischer's generation was described by Gingrich 2007b: 237–238, after Evans 2010: 12).

IDO was the largest scientific and political institution in GG, with the ambition of becoming a university in the future. It was one of many institutes dealing with Ostforschung and Ostpolitik. Some of them were active before 1939, others were established just after the outbreak of the war: in Vienna, Graz, Prague, Berlin, Leipzig, Wrocław, Poznań, Stuttgart, Poznań, Elbląg, Gdańsk, Königsberg, Riga, Dorpat, Tallinn. About 50 German scientific institutes dealt with the East, including nine established in occupied Poland (e.g. in Poznań). In 1943, Rosenberg sought to establish the Reichzentrale für Ostforschung, which was to comprise 400 anthropological institutes and 38 research groups, and coordinate activities for German work in the East (Burleigh 1988: 274, 297–298; Harten 1996: 137–138, 149–154; Linneman 2002: 66–67; Schafft 2006: 86–103 et al.). "In the late summer of 1942, IDO with its branches in Warsaw and Lviv and a significant number of 195 planned locations has already become the largest of all the eastern institutes" (Michel 2000: 152).

IDO was directly subordinate to the GG government. It provided organizational, human and financial support. It had the status of a state office (German universities were founded by the state, so the officials were scientists employed in them) (Iggers 2002: 109). Its employees were members of the NSDAP, IDO officials, formerly (e.g. Gottong) or simultaneously (Riemann) employed in the GG government offices, and some of them (Riemann) acting as Himmler's or Rosenberg's proxies (Gottong and Radig). Frank issued "research orders". The scientific and practical activities were influenced by Himmler (Frank was an administrator of the GG, Himmler, well versed in racial anthropology, was the Reich Commissioner for Strengthening the German Population in the East) and Rosenberg (this Himmler rival ensured coordination of research activities and links with the party and the military) (Harten 1996: 153–154; Michel 2000:146–166; Rybicka 2002: 20, 26–29, 32; Haar 2005: 107–116; Schafft 2006: 85, 82, 91–92).

In his speech at the first working session of IDO (June 21, 1940), Frank said that because of the specific nature of the racial-nationality relations in the GG, "particularly important tasks awaited" the SRV. In order to clarify these issues, the section was linked to the department of the Bevölkerungswesen und Fürsorge (Population and Social Welfare) of the Ministry of Interior in the GG government (from that department Gottong and Plügel moved to the SRV), who worked closely with the Reichskommissar für die Festigung deutschen Volkstums (RKFDV – Reich Commissioner for the Strengthening of the Germanness) – their aim was to organise, in cooperation with the police and security forces, the mass displacement and murders of Poles, Jews and Gypsies. The cooperation of these institutions became closer from the beginning of 1943; the RKFDV plenipotentiary appointed Riemann as the research manager at Volksdeutsche Mittelstelle. At that time (February 11–14, 1943), the conference of these institutions gave a new direction to the activities of the SRV, so that they would be consistent with the current needs of the Third Reich, aimed at researching the population of German origin in the Podkarpacie region and the Vistula river basin, strengthening the research on the *Volkstum* and the *Umvölkung*'s problems. Hence the presence at the conference of A. Haberlandt, director of the Vienna Ethnographic Museum, specializing in research of southern Slavs and Carpathian Ruthenians, who enjoys great recognition in the Rosenberg Office and Hans J. Beyer, one of the main creators of the racial-sociological theory of *Umvölkung*, has been recognized at the universities of Gdańsk, Stuttgart, Berlin, since 1942 an assistant professor at the German University in Prague, hauptsturmführer SS (Michel 2000: 152–153, 161; Harten 1996: 141–143).

These findings were reported by Riemann at the IDO meeting in July 1943: research in the field of the SRV was practically halted due to the situation on the eastern front, but he promised to speed it up particularly in cooperation with the RKFDV (in agreement with Walter Coblitz, director of IDO); the section will make scientific achievements available for the Reich's policy, will strengthen work on Germanisation of the German population and related propaganda training of students and teachers from Germany, publication of textbooks, calendars, songbooks, fairy tale collections, etc.

Making the research results available to the relevant national authorities was the main objective of the SRV. The scope and objectives of this research were defined before the creation of the IDO. The principles of the assimilation and dissimilation policy were included in the memorandum concerning *the Issue of the Treatment of the Population of the Former Polish Territories from the Perspective of the Racial Policy* of Rassenpolitischen Amt der NSDAP (Office for Racial Policy) of 25 November, 1939, according to which Poles should have been Germanized, unless prevented by political reasons (their loyalty to the Polish state), and the Silesians from Upper Silesia and Cieszyn, Kashubians, Mazurians, Highlanders and Ukrainians are suitable for Germanization. The classification criteria for this memorandum were adopted in September 1940 by Himmler's RKF for the drawing up of the Deutsche Volksliste and the guidelines for the relevant institutions, including those binding for the SRV, for determining racial and nationality affiliations: "what ultimately was decisive for inclusion in the group of persons *suitable for Germanisation* was mainly the specific political situation, as well as economic and military interests" (Michel 2000: 156–157; Schafft 2006: 116–123).

Gottong, Plügel, Fliethmann, Sydow and Riemann, like all scientists working for the Third Reich, argued that they provided the scientific basis for the state policy, that scientific tasks are essentially practical and political tasks, because their aim is to control the racial and national situation in the GG, this mixture of primitive and foreign races, which are a threat to the health of the German nation. In order to face up to these forces and tasks, each individual and each group had to be examined from the racial, psychological, medical, ethnographic, historical, linguistic, and national perspectives – ultimately to "catalogue" ("sort" – according to Himmler – the population for the "new ethnic order"). This is what Coblitz, Gottong, Plügel wrote from the very beginning of the existence of the SRV (Michel 2000: 156–157), with reference mainly to Reche, in accordance with the theories of Günther, Fischer, Schulz, Richard W. Darré and others: appropriate tasks ought to be determined taking into account the criteria of anthropology and racial hygiene – appropriate

to racial and mental predispositions. One should plan the displacement of primitive racial populations, determine the possibilities of “Umvölkung”, choose the right types of racial Germany to settle the appropriate Polish areas with, because “the German sword should be followed by the German plough” (Harten 1996: 140–147; Schafft 2006: 95, 112–115).

Plügel’s and Riemann’s reports and publications (like Radiga’s from the pre-historic section) describe the activities of the SRV in terms of a “factory” whose staff – German scientific and administrative staff, Polish assistants and field collaborators – have precise action plans and objectives, work together to produce “quickly and efficiently”. The activities of the SRV were described by Plügel (1941b: 6) in terms of materials science – anthropological research, such as technical activities, consists in the knowledge of “semi-products” in order to build an “efficiently functioning machine” from these heterogeneous “materials”, “raw materials” (these terms were used, among others, by Himmler), after proper selection and elimination – in order to create a new order according to Blut und Boden.

This SRV dictionary is a processing of the metaphors of cultivation (Auslese) and breeding (Ausmerzen), which permeated the writings of anthropologist Reche, biologist Bauer, ethnologist Mühlmann, Minister of Agriculture, Darré (Schafft 2006: 115). These metaphors were key in the language of the Third Reich, but they originated from social Darwinism, racism and eugenics, a vision of a “biologically pure society”. They were a continuation of common and strongly rooted in modern Europe (also repeated by Polish eugenicists) images of a “gardener-state”, “breeder-state”, using “surgery” or “engineering” – “biopolitics” (according to the Swedish political scientist Rudolf Kjellen from 1920) (Gawin 2010: 8). The language of anthropology and eugenics – “struggle”, “selection”, “elimination”, “purity”, “disorder” of races and characters – has become a part of the language of politics, has been taken over by the humanities, has become a part of knowledge and colloquial practices. Metaphors are one of our ways of thinking and the basis of our actions, so the Holocaust could have been understood as a “great medical procedure” (Popowicz 2009: 147–148), and the SRV studies as a contribution to the work of introducing “order” instead of an “unfortunate mixture of races” in the GG, as a “healing” or “purification” of racial and national relations, after the removal of Jews whose place will be taken by “Polish rural proletariat” (Harten 1996: 156).

The “Purity of the Race” was an obsession of Nazi anthropologists. “Purity of race” gave health and strength to the body and mind of the individual, the nation and the state. Resettlement operations, liquidations of

“degenerated races”, the liquidation of ghettos was a hygienic treatment – it was called “cleaning” (Schafft 2006: 66, 70). “At present, thorough cleaning is going on again”, Fliethmann wrote to Kahlich about the liquidation of the Tarnów ghetto (Schafft 2006: 25). Writings (letters, publications) by Plügel, Fliethmann, Hildebrandt or Sauer contain significant comments on order and cleanliness in “German villages”, dirt and disorder, lack of “culture” and “poverty” in Polish towns and cities. This attention arose not only from the *Ordnung muss sein*, from the mere cultural differences that could be observed, but also from the assimilation of the truths of Nazi anthropology. Plügel (1942a, b: 246–247), when proving the racial identity of the Podhale highlanders, pointing to their innate character traits (and proving that the opinions repeated by Polish tourists were false), wrote: “(...) I did not meet a single house that would be dirty. Chambers almost always shone with cleanliness, barns and courtyards were cleanly tidied up”, “the children were clean and taught cleanliness, I did not meet any unwashed slob”. Sydow (1943: 95) noticed that in Szaflary, families less valuable in terms of race and character live in poverty, neglect and dirt, because rich farmers – with a “better” racial composition and character – make a good impression in this respect, their children and youth “are not afraid of water and willingly bathe in the river”. This was confirmed by thousands of photographs taken by the SRV employees, which “documented” civilisational differences, the order and cleanliness of “German villages”, the lack of order and poverty in Polish towns, the striking distinctiveness of Jews (see Duszeńko-Król, Sekunda, in this volume). “This is not even a Polish mess, it is a Jewish one”, Hildebrandt heard in October 1944 in Schloss Mitach, where some IDO materials were brought from Cracow. Such statements were justified in the anthropology according to which Jews were the race of the poorest quality, in the fanaticism of “racial purity”. Its source was the “German national character”, the “German upbringing” which developed a tendency to cleanliness and order – explained Alan Dundes (1977: 257–265) – as well as old and popular ideas of Germans about the fact that Jews are not pure by “nature” of their bodies, psyche and customs.

A new order can only be built, as Fischer or Reche wrote, on the basis of thorough and impartial scientific research (Schafft 2006: 112). The SRV is one of the numerous scientific and political institutions whose task was to participate in the construction of the “new world” and a “new man” owing to “thorough and comprehensive research”, “research that is impartial”, “bias-free”, “purely scientific methods”, “in line with facts that are not created by us but arise from the divine order in the world”, because only such an approach “provides the basis for a sound policy”. Gottong did not create

“wishful theories”, he did not recognise guessing or speculation, but only what was scientifically proven”, wrote Hildebrandt in her letters to Tejchma (see his article in this volume).

The authors of the reports and publications presented the work carried out in the categories of “production” – great, fast and effective (despite objective difficulties, e.g. due to the appointment of Gotthong and Plügel), which corresponded to the “standards” of German science and to the urgent needs of the state. They wrote about the uniqueness of their activities, in terms of “mission” – because of the scope and importance of this research for science and the Third Reich – and even about their novelty. Meanwhile, the scientists of this section did not invent anything new. They used the theory and methods of German anthropology from the 1930s and 1940s, and these were, according to Schafft (2006: 33), the “unearthing of earlier studies on the relationship between race and culture”. In the “modern” SRV research one can even indicate a number of such elements, which were characteristic for anthropology and ethnicity studies from the second half of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century.

The activity of the SRV⁴ covers two research areas at one time which “cannot be grasped at first glance as one whole”, but it is a deliberate combination of racial (natural sciences) and nationality (humanities) research, because race studies (*Rassenkunde*) is partly a humanity and the nation (*Volkstum*) has racial roots. Riemann wrote as if he wanted to explain the surprising combination of these sciences in one section, as if these relationships were something new. On the other hand, they were almost obvious and necessary for a long time. Racial anthropology gained primary importance in the Third Reich, and ethnology along with it. The integration of anthropology and ethnology was not forced by the ideology and politics of the Nazis, because it happened long before 1933 as a result of a conviction: anthropology and ethnology cannot exist without each other, since the existence of peoples is rooted in race and culture. Even after 1945, it was sometimes difficult to distinguish between these disciplines from an institutional and professional point of view. The scientists who conducted research, published and lectured in both fields since the first decades of the 20th century included: Fischer, Reche, Thurnwald, Mühlmann, Wagner, Luschan, Eickstedt, Pöche and Weninger, Geyer (Gingrich 2007a: 132, 140, 152–153; Geisenhainer 2009: 35–36, 40). The research and studies of Plügel – an ethnologist, Gotthong – an anthropologist, Fliethmann – an anthropologist, and Sydow – an ethnologist, took into account, to varying degrees, empirical data from anthropology and ethnicity studies.

⁴ Ibid.

Ethnology, ethnography and prehistory were “sisterly sciences” of anthropology in Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte (founded by Rudolf Virchow in 1869) or in the Anthropological Commission of the Academy of Arts and Sciences in Cracow (founded in 1873). The works of Kopernicki (a doctor and an anthropologist, an ethnographer) or Talko-Hryniewicz (according to him, anthropology indicates the relationship between physical and psychic features, and on this basis describes material, social and spiritual culture) referred to Paul Broca: anthropology is a general science about man that combines natural and human sciences. According to Czekanowski (1948: 17), “the Cracow School” “was a branch of French anthropology”. In the interwar period, Polish anthropology was mainly connected with German-speaking anthropology. According to Czekanowski, Klimek, Stojanowski, Stołyhwo, Adam Wrzosek and others, anthropology studies the biological background of social phenomena, “racial” factors in history and culture, processes of inheritance of physical and psychic traits and environmental influences, so it is both a biological and a sociological science, for which the auxiliary sciences are geography, prehistory and history, ethnography (hence “the position of ethnography among other sciences is on the borderline of biological and social sciences”, wrote Adam Wanke, Czekanowski’s pupil – Wanke 1969: 111), ethnology and sociology, psychology, linguistics, comparative philology (Wrzosek 1926: 3–15). However, the personal, professional and institutional ties between anthropology, ethnology and prehistory were much weaker in Poland than in Germany at that time, with such exceptions as Czekanowski’s research and publications (which combined anthropology with prehistory and ethnology, linguistics, etc.), the work of Stojanowski (he worked at Kostrzewski’s Department of Prehistory at the University of Poznań, he wrote many works using archeological materials), or Poniatowski (an anthropologist by education, who over time became involved in ethnology). The Anthropological Society made an attempt to consolidate these scientific circles – at the First Anthropological Congress – within the framework of the 14th Congress of Polish Doctors and Naturalists in Poznań (Wrzosek 1933: 14), probably in response to the achievements and position of biological and cultural anthropology in the Third Reich, and its anti-Polish theories. The attempt was unsuccessful.

The same auxiliary sciences of anthropology were used by the Polish anthropology school and the team headed by E. Fischer in their research in the early 1930s in Germany – formerly by anthropologists from Vienna under the leadership of Pöche (in POW camps during the World War I), then by Weninger (in Marienfeld). The knowledge and skills of the humanities were used in the SRV,

because – as Coblitz (1941: 35), then Riemann⁵ wrote – when investigating the racial-nationality problems of *Volkstum* one cannot take into account only ethnicity studies themselves (*Volkskunde*). The research ought to be combined with research into geography, history, prehistory, linguistics, and even history of art, if these are related to ethnicity (*völkisch*) (Michel 2000: 158).

The SRV racial research consisted mainly, like the research of the “Viennese anthropological school” in 1915–1945 (similarly to the “Wrocław school” of Eickstedt), in the study of phenotypes – including morphological and metric traits of individuals, families, populations, i.e. measurements and morphological descriptions of groups with numerous photographs and drawings: (1) head; (2) face; (3) eye area; (4) nose; (5) mouth and chin; (6) hair; (7) pupils; (8) ears; (9) hands; (10) legs; (11) fingerprints, palms and feet (Fuchs 2003: 312; Wolf 2008: 124–125). These “materials” were then converted according to the rules of Martin’s anthropometry, the tables of Luschan, Martin and Schultz, Fischer and Saller (see above). In fact, the research on this “morphological school” focused on physiognomic features and was an application of the “physiognomic method”, as in the stadium in Vienna in September 1939, according to Margit Berner’s assessment (2005: 189–192). That is why Reche recognized Jews in the streets, as he reported to Rassenpolitisches Amt (Geisenhainer 2009: 40). Fliethmann and Kahlich might have claimed (on the basis of a strongly established stereotype) that a Jew could be recognized by his nose (Mosess Hess: Germans hate the religion of Jews less than their race, less their faith than their peculiar noses – Jeggle 1986: 134), lips, skin colour... and psychic traits, regardless of anthropological tests (in the Tarnów ghetto they took 18 head measurements and 13 body measurements from each “material”, analyzed the colour of the eyes, hair, wrote down personal data – Schafft 2006: 18, 21). In Plügel’s studies (1942b: 242–247 et seq.), there is an abundance of common-sense physiognomic and character observations made during anthropological and ethnicity studies in Podhale. Combining physiognomic remarks (and physiognomics is *ars semiotica* developed from Aristotle to Johann C. Lavater) with anthropological data was common in the 19th century, it was frequent in the “Cracow school” (in Kopernicki’s anthropological-ethnographic works of the 1980s), repeated in interwar Poland (for example, by the historian Aleksander Kuczera, who mixed the results of Czekanowski’s research with his own physiognomic observations).

⁵ Ibid.

The teachers of Plügel and Fliethmann, as well as other SRV scholars, knew that anthropometric testing alone, despite the best measurement tools, did not make it possible to distinguish racial, hereditary elements from the environmental ones. They, like Fischer or Reche (the co-founder of the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Blutgruppenforschung* in 1926), sought to base anthropology not on morphology, but on biology, to demonstrate relationships between blood groups and physical and psychological traits, to supplement them with medical research (hereditary and acquired diseases), to study individuals within families and populations and to supplement them with historical and ethnological research (Geisenhainer 2009: 39–40; Schafft 2006: 49–51). In the SRV, morphological research was supplemented by physiological, medical and psychological research, followed by historical research, including ethnographic research, since socio-cultural life is based on race. The anthropology practiced in the SRV was burdened with ethnography, as was the case with old anthropological schools (Czekanowski 1948: 12 et seq.). It could not undoubtedly state which features of the head, face, eyes, ears, hair, skin are anthropological, which are environmental, which diseases are inherited, whether behaviour is inherited (e.g. gypsy nomadism and thievery) – the transition from phenotype to genotype was impossible before DNA was discovered in 1953 (Popowicz 2009: 144–145; see Kaczanowski in this volume).

The first task of the SRV was – wrote Plügel (1941b: 6–15), followed by Fliethmann (1942: 272), then Riemann⁶ – to quickly present the general racial and nationality situation in this “German foreground”, the “transitional German-Slavic zone”. These lands were not available for German science, the data of Polish anthropology are useless, because it “did not study human material”, but characterized the race by “complex calculations”, it abandoned the study of biological characteristics in connection with national and cultural characteristics. The SRV therefore faced the problem of the lack of data, the impossibility of presenting a picture of the racial composition and the need to provide provisional research results. “We have to start from the beginning”, wrote Plügel (1941b: 9). The identification and classification of the GG population had to start on the basis of general and random surveys, on random samples, “in the sites” of IDO: in delousing rooms, among workers sent to Germany, among construction workers, prisoners of war and imprisoned members of the resistance movement, people applying for German identity cards, and then in selected “islands of Germanness” (originating from the German

⁶ Ibid.

colonization from the Middle Ages to the present) below the Cracow-Lviv communication routes.

Contrary to the assertions made by Plügel and other German SRV scientists, they did not discover lands completely unknown to German science, but accepted and applied the claims of racial anthropology and the achievements of Ostforschung. Plügel and Gottong knew from the works of Reche, Günther and Schultz that the Polish lands belong to the unique areas in Europe in terms of a large number of racial and national mixtures, that the racial basis of the population in this “foreground” is the Eastern Baltic race, with a large share of more simple and primitive elements, forms of low value: Pre-Slavic, Laplandian, Mongolian, Western Asian, and so on (Harten 1996: 134–136; Rybicka 2002: 32; Schafft 2006: 101–102, 200). This was confirmed by Gottong’s research in May 1940 (published in February 1941) of Polish and Ukrainian Baudienst workers, in whom he generally found a small number of Nordic and Dinaric elements. The latter dominated, Gottong proved, among those who applied for German identity cards – they had few elements of eastern races (Harten 1996: 135; Makuła 2009: 102–104; Lanfear 2012: 91–92). A significant number of Nordic, Dinaric and Mediterranean elements were carried by the layers of intelligentsia and nobility (in some regions contaminated by Eastern Baltic influences), the highest layers were devoid of Eastern races. This is how Plügel (1941b, 1942a) wrote, referring to the statements of German science (Harten 1996: 137, 142–143), anthropology and historiography about different racial and ethnic origins of the people in power in Poland or Russia (“theories of conquest” were popular in the historiography of the 19th century, known from the history of Polish historiography – Wierzbicki 1999: 426–440), probably also on the theories of Polish anthropologists (Czekanowski, Jaxy-Bykowski, Stojałowski and others) about physico-psychic differences of the layers of intelligentsia and nobility and peasants of pre-Slavic types (Chałasiński 1958: 54–56). Exactly the same results of racial research, together with the comments that cultural achievements are owed to “polonised nordics”, were presented in the reports by RuSHA in Poznań in 1942 (Harten 1996: 137).

The SRV provided empirical data for the theory of racial anthropology. Gottong’s and Plügel’s studies confirmed the claims of Reche, Günther and Schultz. The results of Plügel’s anthropological research in Podhale were confirmed by Fliethmann’s research in Szaflary and Witów (1942a, b), which was referred to by Sydow (1942a: 266), who wrote that she presented a temporary collection of materials from Szaflary, “which in fact confirms the results of Plügel’s research”. The findings by Gottong, Plügel, Fliethmann and Sydow

were presented by Riemann in his papers and reports. In 1943, he wrote that the SRV research would give a picture of the racial structure of the GG population on the basis of detailed and numerous syntheses, while Plügel, based on the research conducted in May 1940 (published in February 1941), characterized the races and nationalities of the GG after stating that only detailed research would make it possible to move from general images of races to local racial stratification”, he concluded, that it is possible to risk that two thirds of the population, perhaps more, are Eastern races, and of the remaining one third – one eighth are Nordic, the rest being Dinaric, Western Asian and Mediterranean – “further research will not change this picture”.

The first Gottong-Plügel study, discussed by Riemann,⁷ corrected the image of the “unfortunate mixture of races” and discovered that the GG was populated with forms unprecedented in the German population, that races there were more primitive than expected (Harten 1996: 135–136). These “discoveries” resulted to the least extent from the analyses of the “material”. They were based on observations made with the naked eye. Immediately after his arrival in Poland, Plügel (1941b: 10; Harten 1996: 135) felt the primitivism and crudeness of the races, the great racial differences between the GG and Germany were striking; it was enough to move around with eyes wide open, to see photographs of the “material”, to immediately notice this mixture of races, the further to the west, the closer to the German racial forms, the further to the east, the further away from Aryanism. Plügel encountered “boorishness at every step”, primitive races accompanied by spiritual primitivism, apathetic types, the instinct “sensing its master”. This was confirmed in Polish, even more Russian, literature, but the sources of his assessments were in the Günther’s characteristics of eastern races: the Eastern Baltic race is distinguished by its thick, dull, stocky build, “thick” facial features, and these “coarse”, i.e. crude physical traits correspond to spiritual “coarseness”, dulled sensitivity.

After achieving the first goal of building a general racial-nationality picture of the GG, the next, much more important task was to identify – wrote Fliethmann (1942), and Riemann⁸ repeated after her – the relationship between inherited physical and psychic traits and environmental, geographic, social, and historical-cultural influences, in order to get to know the causes and processes of selection and elimination of racial-nationality traits. Creating a synthetic picture of these relationships required comprehensive research in

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

selected places. These studies included partial studies of disciplines dealing with “forms of life”: anthropology, medicine, psychology, geography, prehistory and history, ethnicity studies and linguistics, even art history and literature. This research was carried out in small populations, paying attention to all manifestations of local racial stratification and the functioning of communities that determine the identity and distinctiveness of a group. These research units were small and closed communities, isolated from external influences, identified on the basis of phenotypic and ethnographic features, according to anthropogeographic and historical criteria. This is the account Riemann gave of the previous research and publications of Plügel in Podhale, of Fliethmann and Sydow in Szaflary and Witów, of Gottong in “German” villages and his own “excursions” to several other towns in the Podkarpackie region. Riemann planned to intensify these studies and extend them to cover the whole GG. Their scientific objective was to provide data for race maps, then ethnographic maps (modelled on the *Atlas der deutschen Volkskunde*) and language maps (modelled on those developed in Marburg).

It can be assumed that these maps would correspond to each other and that they would coincide with the borders of the new ethnic order. This was what Hitler expected: in his speech in the Reichstag on October 6, 1939, he announced mass displacements in Poland, throughout Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, which would eventually give rise to new borders between nations and countries (Michel 2000: 151; Schafft 2006: 100, 102). At the closed meeting of IDO on April 20, 1940, with the participation of Frank and Coblitz, these “special needs of the GG” were discussed, which were to be implemented by the SRV using “scientific methods” for the benefit of the institutions concerned (Michel 2000: 151). Plügel (1942a) distinguished the “living space of the appropriate highlanders” in Podhale, which was racially and culturally different from other highlanders: Ledzianians, Lemkos, Boykos, etc., in accordance with the actions of the German administration in the GG. Surely these maps would divide the GG area into smaller racial-nationality territories. This was announced by Plügel’s research and publications (since 1941 he had been working on the creation of the maps correlating racial areas with ethnic territories. – Michel 2000: 159) or Gottong’s research and publications, or the studies by Riemann, referring to Max H. Boehme, according to whom a people is a nation when it possesses state-forming abilities, which strove to prove the lack of rights to the existence of the Polish state, because the local population is not a nation (contrary to the propaganda of Polish nationalism), is composed of many different races and social groups. The Polish nobility did not have any common blood and

origins – wrote Plügel (1941b: 13–15) – so it was deprived of common ideals and goals, and was not able to build a lasting state. This leadership layer was distinguished by the racial composition (Nordic, Dinaric and Mediterranean elements), the related distinct psyche and culture – succumbing to the strong influence of German and Romance culture. Poland was a racially torn country, torn apart by contradictions and inequalities of social groups, where there was a great gap between the nobility and the intelligentsia and peasants, between rural and urban areas, between individual towns and its environs, or even between Polish and “German” regions, i.e. those originating from German colonizations. Due to the lack of cultural capacity of the local population (Slavs in general), the leadership layers accepted civilisation and culture from outside. These originate from Nordic areas from prehistoric to historical times (from Germany – the Romanesque and Gothic style, from Italy – Renaissance and Baroque, from France – Rococo, from modern Paris – Decadentism; the intelligentsia which studied in Vienna or Berlin found no understanding in the Polish environment), as Plügel further argued. The history of Poland is a history of borrowings and “funny imitation”, a series of failures of the state and economic inefficiency (*polnische Wirtschaft*), slavery. Polish peasants “built” from the eastern races, therefore characterised by dullness and passivity, brought up in serfdom and poverty, “to be a working animal without their own opinion”, “overwhelmed by the complex of inferiority and servility”, when they are “guided by a hard and decisive hand” – predicted Plügel – will become persistent and useful workers in the “new order”. Race-nationality relations in the GG are more complicated, because apart from Jews and Gypsies – completely foreign in terms of race – there are “strips” and “islands” of intense Nordic or Dinaric-Nordic elements: along the Vistula – below Warsaw (which, according to Plügel, Polish anthropology had confirmed), in “small German islands”, among the Lemkos, more often among the highlanders near Zakopane. These “preliminary findings” of Plügel confirmed his detailed racial and ethnicity research in Podhale, followed by research in Szaflary and Witów by Fliethmann and Sydow, which “discovered” that the highlanders were non-Polish in terms of race, language and culture (the Polish propaganda convinced them that they were Poles), clearly different from the Podhale and lowland populations. In the south of the GG, German settlers like in Markowa or Haczów were polonized (Gottong 1942: 39–43), but they are still recognizable (their looks clearly prove this), racially and culturally different from their surroundings. A study of construction workers conducted by Gottong contradicted Talko-Hryniewicz’s assertions that the Cracovians (from the vicinity of Cracow, the Olkusz,

Dąbrowa Górnicza, Bochnia and Limanowa districts) are a racially homogeneous people. He proved that the closer to Cracow, the higher the share of Nordic and Mediterranean races, there is no dominance of Eastern races (this was recognised by Polish anthropology); the population from the nearest vicinity of Cracow is relatively high, slender, It is characterized by industriousness, hospitality and good-naturedness, and “is attracted to Germanness”. The anthropological diagnosis is confirmed by history, because Cracow – wrote Gottong – is a city founded by the Germans, it was a German city for 300 years, the inhabitants of the villages near Cracow are the polonized descendants of German colonists (Harten 1996: 134–136; Lanfear 2012: 91–92; Makuła 2009: 103–104). Detailed research on the SRV led to the fragmentation of the “supposedly unified nation”, the building of anthropological and ethnographic classifications consistent with the “special needs” of the GG, and the Third Reich.

In 19th-century anthropology, including the Cracow school, the problem of “racial” types (understood as combinations of morphological features) was limited to ethnic types, so the anthropological territories overlapped with the territories of ethnic groups, the borders of these areas were determined mainly according to anthropogeographical criteria. Research in the Carpathians was of primary importance for anthropology and ethnography, where primeval and pure forms were to be preserved, because anthropological and ethnographic features were eliminated on the plains, “mixed races” were accompanied by unclear notions, “beliefs and customs”, the compactness of the group was determined not by blood bonds, but by language and culture, until their civilization was destroyed. This anthropology was characterized by ethnography and anthropogeography (Klimek 1932: 3; Czekanowski 1948: 12–14).

These were also features of the anthropology practiced in the SRV. Plügel wrote: an understanding of the current racial and national situation in the GG (1941b: 6–7, 1942a: 56–59) is immediately given by “the land” (Boden). Poland did not create a compact and homogeneous area with clear natural borders (contrary to Germany and Western Europe, which is the basis, with an appropriate racial substance, for the building of a permanent state form), so for thousands of years it has been a path of migration, a place of mixing races, peoples and cultures, and the existence of short-term state forms. On this land, the Podhale region is unique: “a closed large melting pot of races and nations”, an area surrounded by high mountains, with a heavy climate and difficult natural and geographical conditions. These defined the “living space” of the highlanders (settlement zones, economic activities, etc.), favoured the preservation of old racial forms, the survival in colonies of German Nordic, Dinaric and Mediterranean elements, as well as old tribal

and cultural forms. In this “melting pot”, open only from the north to external influences, Fliethmann (1942) and Sydow (1942a, b, 1943) described Szaflary and Witów – villages originating from the mediaeval German colonization – as “closed” and “isolated”, lying on the side of roads, where environmental conditions act as factors favouring stabilization – the permanence of old life forms – where nature brings up these “children of the mountains” to people with specific character traits. These characteristics of the highlanders are – and this must be justified in the works of other scholars (Harten 1996: 147–149) – racial characteristics adapted to geographical conditions: hospitality and friendship, resistance to the adversities of life are characteristic of the Mediterranean types; industriousness and intelligence, love of freedom are features of the Nordic race; attachment to the land is a Dinaric element. The physiognomy and “soul” of the races could be read from the “physiognomy” of local nature or from settlement forms (that were geographically defined). The account of the research in Szaflary Sydow (1942a: 266) begins with a panoramic description of the area, the general appearance of the village, with the distinctive central part – the oldest (as confirmed orally by Szatkowski from Zakopane), and scattered homesteads and houses. Due to their cultural and racial characteristics, Plügel (1942a) had previously written about such forms of settlement in Podhale, referring to Graul. The knowledge of German science is necessary to recognize in these descriptions that the loosened forms of settlement are characteristic of the German race with its individualism and heroism, because dwellings situated close to each other, muffled, are characteristic of the eastern races (Harten 1996: 147–148). Plügel’s research (1942b) showed, as confirmed by Fliethmann’s research (1942), that highlanders were characterised by a large percentage of Nordic and Dinaric elements, but with primitive races brought in by later and racially and culturally weaker settlements of Wallachians, Tatars and Poles. These low-value racial and cultural elements then explained to these researchers the bad features of the highlanders’ character, their succumbing to the influence of modernity coming from the north – from cities, from tourists and holidaymakers, etc. The highlander – concluded Sydow (1943: 97) – was separated from the Polish north and therefore retained the remains of a separate culture to this day.

The geographical method was a part of German historical schools in ethnology, and thus racial anthropology. Schurtz’s anthropogeographical truths that people live “as nature dictates” were invoked by Sydow (1943: 95): “The “mountains educate” the highlanders into hard, persistent, hard-working, intelligent, supple and agile people (which can be seen in their dances) who

love their homeland (this can be heard in their songs, seen in their returns from exile) and freedom (they do not obey the instructions of every authority); they live according to the local nature, so they maintain the “child-like simplicity of spirit”: faith in ghosts, old prejudices and superstitions (despite Catholic piety). Plügel represented the cultural-historical school in ethnology. Writing about the dependence of phenotypes on the geographical environment in Podhale, he allowed himself to make common-sense comments of the type “they fit/do not fit into their surroundings” (this phrase is known from the history of Polish ethnicity studies, used with reference to e.g. Ruthenian highlanders, Hutsuls or Boycos, used when their Slavic/non-Slavic origin was recognised). The publications and writings of Plügel and other SRV students are filled with undisclosed references to the assertions made by racial anthropology, ethnology and ethnography, history, and to German common sense.

Similar ways of using anthropogeography are known from the history of Polish ethnology. The assertions that “the divisions of nature” delineate the boundaries of the family divisions, nature defines the basic family features, physiognomic and character differences, morphological and psychological features, dictates the ways of life (“like country, like people”, “nature sculptures the living people”), co-created the knowledge of ethnology from its scientific origins (Wincenty Pol, who referred to Alexander von Humboldt and Carl R. Ritter) to the ethnology of Fischer and Falkowski (Lviv representatives of the German cultural and historical school), Reinfuss and his scientific followers (Libera 2011: 2–5). The basic and simple assertions made by anthropogeography of the 19th and 20th centuries are transformations within the framework of successive philosophical and scientific systems, which were easily connected with theories of various disciplines (ethnology, history, anthropology, etc.), old and common topos of folklore, literature, or old medical doctrines (the humoral theory of Hippocrates and Galen). Anthropogeographic thinking belongs to pre-scientific thinking (common knowledge) or parascientific thinking (as in the case of physiognomy and literature of the 19th century). This is how a can explain Plügel’s anthropogeographical judgments, which are based solely on his field research and on common sense observations.

Race and land (Blut und Boden) and history are essential”, wrote Plügel (1941b: 6), “for us who must take on the task of leading humanity”. The explanation of the contemporary racial-nationality situation, including the definition of the place and tasks for particular “substances”, was rooted in history and prehistory. Genetic and historical research served to legitimise racial

research. The anthropology practiced in the SRV was characterized by: anthropogeography, ethnography, genetism and historicism. It continued its historical approach to the anthropological and social phenomena prevailing in German science and European science in general since the 19th century. Every anthropology that defined the components and physical types entered into the problems of the genesis of peoples, in connection with prehistory and history, as well as ethnography – at that time it was understood as a historical science.

The anthropology's goal are not systematizations and classifications – explained Czekanowski (1930) and Klimek (1932) – but the study of race-creating and microevolutionary processes; it ultimately enters the core of the peoples' origins, the historical processes that explain contemporary anthropological phenomena connected with social and cultural forms. The Cracow School (Czekanowski 1948: 12, 24, 26–27) and the Lviv School linked anthropology with history. Czekanowski wrote about his school that it was based on Mendelism, that it was Martin's and historical (Czekanowski 1948: 34). Klimek counted Czekanowski among the cultural and historical school of Ankermann, Graebner and Schmidt (Klimek 1939: 18). This was represented in Poland by leading ethnologists: Stanisław Poniatowski and Adam Fischer.

Current racial and social relations are the result of history and prehistory. Polish anthropology recognized and presented these relations differently, and consequently indicated different histories and geographies of the “races”. German anthropology was added to the completely different classifications of races and, accordingly, their origins and history. The present racial-nationality situation in the GG – in this “foreground of Germanness” – according to Plügel (1942b: 7–9) (and the sections on the prehistory and history of IDO – Rybicka 2002: 64–65 et seq.) stemmed from the Palaeolithic and Neolithic period. Groups of gatherers and hunters, followed by farmers – racially heterogeneous but with a huge predominance of primitive eastern races, linguistically related to the Finno-Ugric tribes – were colonised by Indo-German peoples coming from their native areas in the North. This event changed the racial relations between Europe and Asia into a lasting one, and its effects are felt until now – then by the Nordic people from their primeval locations between the Vistula and the Oder River. The Vistulan land was a road of marches and settlements of many races and Eastern peoples, penetrating these “Germanic areas” of the Slavic tribes only from the 7th century BC. The decisive factor were the subsequent Germanic escapades from the Baltic Sea, from Scandinavia – the tribes of Goths and Vikings, which founded countries on the Black Sea, in Ruthenia in the 9th century, in

Poland in the 10th century. Another great historical event was the influx of German settlers in the Middle Ages and the subsequent German colonizations. The influx of foreign blood, races and peoples from the East: Mongols, Tatars and Turks, Mediterranean peoples, including the Wallachians, and totally alien races like Jews and Gypsies, led to the creation of a chaotic composition of primitive and low-value racial-nationality mixtures. The result was the struggle of races and cultures in the “unfortunate history of Poland”, and its ultimate collapse.

The racial composition of highlanders in Podhale was markedly different from the Polish average by a higher percentage of Nordic and Dinaric elements, mixed with Mediterranean, Eastern-Baltic and Asian forms – according to Plügel (1942b: 236–238) and Fliethmann (1942: 272–274) – the current situation and racial-nationality history of Podhale differed from the rest of the GG. Due to the lack of archaeological data, it is difficult to tell about the oldest racial layers whether they were Slavic or non-Slavic, but the original and primeval elements are likely to have been affected by the accumulation of Nordic people, who colonized these areas from the Middle Ages (the 13th century) to the present day, the effects of which are visible nowadays. There is here a striking continuity of the Germanic race and civilization, testifying to its high resistance to foreign blood and cultures which arrived here with the Mongols and Tartars, especially with the Wallachians (from the 14th century), the influx of “Little Poland-Lechite elements” from the vicinity of Cracow. The rapprochement of highlanders and Poles had taken place since the 19th century under the influence of the school and the Catholic Church, with holidaymakers and tourists, migrations of highlanders. According to Plügel, Fliethmann and Sydow, the latter events caused that the Podhale region is, in general, racially heterogeneous and, as a consequence, not culturally stable, but there are places there, as shown by research in Szaflary and Witów, in which the history of “German blood” is visible in phenotype, characters, language, material (agriculture, breeding and craftsmanship distinguish these people from the people of Wallachian origin with their primitive buildings, interior furnishings, tools, etc. who were herders and hunters), social and spiritual culture.

Particularly prominent were the scientific and political activities of the SRV concerning populations with Germanic roots – the population of Szaflary and Witów, Haczów, Markowa and Gołkowice. The SRV was interested in the descendants of the assimilated German population, because the RKF and Volksdeutsche Mittelstelle assumed that they were suitable for Germanization (*Umvölkung*), and the service in the SS, because of their origin they

“were capable of fighting” (Michel 2000: 160–161). These populations were described in the SRV as “closed/isolated colony islands”. These spatial terms meant separate areas of small groups, defined by natural-geographical or racial-nationality factors, i.e. also genetic-historical, psychic and cultural factors. Plügel’s, Fliethman’s and Sydow’s surveys in Podhale and Gottong’s surveys in Markowa, Riemann’s “scientific expeditions” to, among others, Biecz, supplemented by Graul’s and Hildebrandt’s research, answered important questions concerning “the resistance of German blood in foreign racial environments” and “the power of German culture to influence the East”. These scientists’ “responses” – discussed by Riemann⁹ – to the policy agenda (Germanization) sounded almost like a medical certificate or a court judgement (Schafft 2006: 202–203). Although the population, due to its origins and racial composition, psychic and cultural separateness, was polonized, at first glance it stood out from the Polish environment – it maintained its high or even total racial purity (in Szaflary – a “typical village” of highlanders – “there was no mixing of population due to selection in Golkowice”, originating from the *josephinische Kolonization*, no eastern or Asian elements were found). Due to its innate predispositions she closed herself off from foreign blood (the strong endogamy of the *Volksdeutsche* near Kielce was confirmed by Fliethmann and Kahlich – Fuchs 2002: 341–342), proved the resilience and vitality of the German race, the strength of German culture in confrontation with foreign cultures (as in Podhale, where it marginalised the Wallachian influences). Its isolation defended it against Polonisation, favoured the preservation of old German language forms, settlement forms, which was visible in construction, customary law, folklore, and the “German character”. The character of the inhabitants of the Podhale villages was not been “broken” – despite the lack of communication with the homeland for centuries, the negative influence of tourists or modernity. “In conclusion, the people of Szaflary are healthy and resilient. The statistics also prove that their number is increasing, that they are a people capable of living”, wrote Sydow (1943: 99). These SRV studies have also confirmed the knowledge of German science: biologically homogeneous groups are more resistant to *Umvölkung*, “racial hybrids” are easily subject to foreign influences, the German people threatened with blood, language and culture contamination in foreign lands retain awareness of their species and national origin, have an instinctive ability to protect them from national alienation (they feel a physical dislike when meeting with lower races, e.g. Gypsies) (Harten 1996: 138–141). The highlander has an

⁹ Ibid.

“instinctive aversion to Jews” – said Plügel (1942b: 249), referring to the truths of German science, treating social stereotypes as objective truths – which is one of the proofs for his “healthy instinct” (i.e. bodily-psychic purity); he feels exceptionally different and superior towards his neighbours (these and the Polish intelligentsia succumb to the fashion for a highlanders’ style).

In such places, the SRV promised to carry out “comprehensive research” (in the style of the tradition of Pöche and Weninger, or Fischer and Reche), which would take into account – wrote Fliethmann (1942: 272–274) after the research in Szaflary and Witów – “all manifestations of community functioning”: from anthropometric tests, blood groups (these failed in Szaflary “for technical reasons”) to medical examinations (the state of health of the population, hereditary and acquired diseases), typical predispositions and psychic reactions (such tests were conducted only in Witów during the two-weeks’ stay of Dr Ferdinand Carspeken, a psychologist from Marburg), historical written sources (location acts, parish books, etc.), geography and history of settlement, studies of linguistic data (names of villages, fields, people and things), sociological and ethnographic data which prove the origin, identity and distinctiveness of the group – from descriptions of forms of dwellings, construction, interior furnishings, activities, food, clothing, to prejudices and superstitions, rituals (e.g. wedding rituals), data concerning folklore (songs, legends), religious life, the attitude to the Church, the state, other ethnic groups, towns, and also the causes and effects of emigration... Fliethmann presented only a modest part of such intended research – as she pointed out – for at least three years. Gottong, Plügel, and Sydow stressed in their publications, and Riemann repeated this in his reports, that they presented only preliminary results of the research – on this basis they all made certain statements, confirming each other, that served practical and political purposes.

The ethnicity studies department “did not go beyond the first results”, Riemann said, the ethnographic research plans were fully implemented in selected places in Podhale by Plügel, Fliethmann, and Sydow. The emphasis on Plügel’s racial research (who was appointed to address the problems of ethnology) and Gottong’s emphasis on the history of German colonization took place at the expense of ethnicity research. It was not until mid-1943 that Riemann – after Gottong and Plügel were sent to the war front, after the SRV essentially ceased to carry out field research and intensified the practical and political commitments of the SRV (in cooperation with the Office of the Reich’s Commissioner for the Strengthening of Germanism) – presented plans for the development of ethnicity research. The reorganization of the research, the continuation of the *Rassenforschung*, the strengthening

of the *Volkstumsforschung* were political decisions, forced by the situation on the eastern front, the result of an agreement with the RKFDV and the aftermath of a conference in February 1943 (the one with Beyer and Haberlandt). The planned activities of the SRV were a response to the changing war situation, so that, in accordance with the needs of the Reich's Commissioner, the ethnicity research would serve to "strengthen the German national character" (Michel 2000: 162). Plügel's 1941–1942 ethnological articles and Sydow's 1942–1943 ethnological articles testify to the fact that even then "the biological approach was replaced by a much more promising, sociopsychological approach because it was better adapted to real needs" ("Ultimately, the apartheid principle did not apply to the assimilation and dissimilation programs of the so-called eastern colonization. It was not the principles of origin that guided it, but rather its economic needs, social needs and socio-political structures, which were adapted to the structures of Nazi power"). These are statements (Michel 2000: 164–165) which are completely groundless, as the presentation of the work by Plügel, Fliethmann, Sydow, and Gotberg provided below, and their discussion in Riemann's reports, should demonstrate.

After working with 40 ethnographers from leading universities (including Walter Kuhn, an ethnographer from the University of Wrocław who was to send his student to *Volkstumsforschung*), Riemann wanted to set up five working groups consisting of one German ethnographer, two Polish ethnographers and a photographer to carry out a survey in 1250 villages in the GG, along the lines of the *Atlas der deutschen Volkskunde*, but with a "new method". Because it was the questionnaires prepared earlier in the Lviv branch, which were corrected ("adapted to the conditions" in the GG and the German Atlas surveys), that would be filled in by previously trained groups of ethnographers, and not by correspondents – so that the data collected would be consistent and comparable with the data from the neighbouring territories of the Reich. Riemann presented a vision of "large-scale research", which was partly prepared by the development of a bibliography of ethnicity studies by Plügel and the employees of its Lviv branch, by taking over the collections and library of the Ethnographic Museum in Cracow or the Talko-Hryniewicz's book collection, by purchasing new books, by collecting all the materials in every "German" village, by creating an archival collection of slides, by establishing a collection of maps, films or records.

So far ethnicity studies have taken into account mainly "the external features of material culture", but in the future they were to cover also spiritual culture, promised Riemann in 1943. However, this was not promised by the research

practice of the Volkstumsforschung department before 1943, the planned post-war separation of the SRV departments, and the references made to the *Atlas der deutschen Volkskunde* model. Riemann himself noted that “the areas closed to the survey method, i.e. primarily national assets, should be reserved for later research conducted by the party and teachers”. He wanted to intensify his research, to continue the current style of describing ethnic groups and their culture.

In the SRV, ethnicity studies were only a part of the Volkstumsforschung. They were closely related to racial research. Ethnicity studies were practiced according to the model of racial anthropology. The model anthropological studies of the SRV were based on the measurement and description of morphological features, using “physiognomic methods”. Ethnicity studies were a measurement of culture, an application of “anthropometric methods” to “external features of culture”, a description of its “physiognomy”. After all, it covered social and cultural life in terms of the organism, culture in terms of anatomy and physiology. *Volkskunde* treated this as a whole made up of material, social and spiritual elements – ethnic features that are spatially distributed and can finally be presented cartographically.

One of the first tasks of anthropology was to distinguish hereditary and environmental morphological features. Initially, the task of ethnicity studies was to separate elements in culture as traits, as well as the old and the “native”, the new and the foreign. Plügel, Fliethmann and Sydow – on the basis of their many-weeks’ stays in Nowy Targ and Zakopane, in Podhale villages, their own observations and their conversations with the local guides – wrote extensively about the negative effects of “bland modernity” on highlanders, which produced bad taste and love for factory-made rubbish and urban kitsch (for example, colourful and bright holy paintings in chambers – “supported by the Church”). They wrote about the bad effect of the “liberal-Jewish lifestyle”, which had been reaching them for decades with tourists and holiday-makers, the re-emigration of highlanders, a massive influx of racially and nationally alien elements together with the developing industry, railways, cities, the “expansion of the Christian superstition” (until recently the highlanders were pagans, they are still in villages far from the church) which is detached from life, hostile to the people, which develops “Polish servility” in them (these “insights” stem from the teachings of Darwinism and Nazism which are anti-Christian and accuse churches of destroying the old life forms of the people), schools and Polish offices, which pulled the highlanders into “Polish nationalism”, detached them from their roots, detached the young from the use of their own language and customs. In Podhale, there is a “clash

of primary culture with modern civilisation”, “the destruction of old customs by new liberal currents”, a process of great cultural and historical significance, because it gives an understanding of current events in the East, wrote Plügel (1942b: 241–242), and it is a turning point in the life of the highlanders. Investigating the destructive, foreign and new influences in Podhale encountered the reaction of the German administration – he added. It is also an urgent scientific task.

“The traditional culture is dying”. “Today’s villages are changing ever faster – from an ethnographic point of view – to worse ones”. The “levelling influence of the city’s culture” continues. “Trashy modernity” destroys folk culture. This time these are quotations from the works of Falkowski, Reinfuss and Antoni F. Ossendowski on Lemkos, Boykos and Hutsuls (Falkowski 1938: 9; Reinfuss 1939: 40–41; Ossendowski 1936: 108). Interests and fascinations in primitivism, in what was archaic and exotic, went hand in hand with national ethnologies of those times, with a reluctance to modernity and the decline of old forms of life. The ethnologist had to pay attention to new, foreign and bad phenomena in selected ethnographical groups, in an interesting historical and cultural area, for example, to focus on “interesting forms of life”, “preserved like a fly in amber”, to places in the eastern Lemko region and the western Boyko region which “still defend themselves against the influence of civilisation” (Reinfuss 1939: 40–41). Distinguishing between the new and the foreign, the old and the native was a necessity for all ethnologists interested in classifying ethnographic groups and areas. After all, they were distinguished on the basis of their “Lemko” and “Boyko” characteristics, their “strict” typology and chronology – in the works of Falkowski and Pasznyi and Reinfuss (Libera 2011: 12–17), and on the basis of “highlander features” in the works by Plügel, Fliethmann and Sydow.

However, there are “old world reserves” in Podhale, wrote Plügel (1942b: 241), “in general, the Carpathians can certainly be called a museum of the history of races and nations”. Sydow found many “fossilized forms” in Szaflary. She considered it a success that so many of the old German elements were discovered. Her surprise with their results was pretended, because in her sketch in ethnicity studies (its form, content and the narrative structure resembles studies by experts from the last decades of the 19th century) she referred to the earlier Plügel’s “discoveries” about the history and ethnography of Podhale. Her research had to be “successful” because it could not contradict the anthropological research which “proved” the presence of Nordic and Dynamic elements in the blood of highlanders with some participation of primitive races, so the task of ethnicity studies was to find Germanic elements

in contemporary culture. After all, it is rooted in the race. The ethnicity studies by Plügel, Fliethmann and Sydow changed from the general characteristics of the current socio-cultural situation to the problems of history and origin of particular parts of culture.

Anthropological classifications of these races and their varieties led to the issue of origin and history of the races. In the reconstructions of the past, German (and Polish) anthropology invoked the same historical schools in ethnology. Therefore, anthropology was a “hard” science, whereas history and ethnology were “soft”, thereby less certain (I refer to Claude Lévi-Strauss’ jocosé statement about the division of sciences and museums devoted to natural history and to a man as a creator of culture – Duvignaud 2011: 93). Ethnology and ethnography were considered historical sciences at the time. During the Nazi period it belonged to the Volkstumsforschung. That is why the SRV considered that genocide alone was not able to cover all national issues, complex and multiple historical processes. Riemann wrote¹⁰, discussing Gottog, Plügel, Fliethmann, and Sydow’s research, that their works “covering the historical situation” “from a historical point of view” fill the gaps in the sources of written history. In this way, the SRV treated folk culture as romantic ethnicity studies, strengthened by the Nazi ideology of *völkisch*, through the prism of racial-nationality theories, as a historical monument, a living document of the past, a carrier of permanent and true national features.

Historical links between the “islands of Germanness” in the GG and their homeland, as well as appropriate cultural elements, were demonstrated using the methods of historicism in ethnology. Even Sydow, who studied with leading representatives of functionalism, used the language of a historical school. “The similarity of forms should be reflected in the similarity of origin”, she wrote (Sydow 1942b), again in the same way as Plügel (1942a), “about the layout of fields and homesteads, architecture and interior design in Szaflary; in historical reconstructions, the age of elements is less important than their characteristics from the point of view of Volkskunde. The criteria of form and quantity, the typology of forms and the relative chronology allowed Plügel and Sydow to extract the features of German culture from the confusing current situation, to separate them from the Wallachian and Polish elements, and to uncover the old and fossilized forms that found their way here with the colonists from Germany. In this way, Sydow’s findings “exceeded all expectations”, confirmed earlier research by Plügel and Fliethmann, as

¹⁰ Ibid.

well as findings of some Polish scientists. They proved that the racial relationship is accompanied by the cultural relationship of the inhabitants, e.g. of Szaflary, with their kinsmen and ancestors from central and southern Germany (because the inhabitants of Golkowice resembled the inhabitants of Palatinate, where they came from). Similar forms of evidence of German origin were found by the SRV researchers in Podhale (Plügel 1941a, 1942a, b), Szaflary and Witów (Fliethmann 1942, Sydow 1942a, b, 1943): in the layout of fields and dwellings, the law of inheritance (different from the Polish one, which led to a great fragmentation of the land), architecture (even in the care of wood processing, the importance attached to finishing in the building industry, which is an influence of German carpentry art), interior furnishings – in the appearance and names of furniture (old cupboards, tables and chairs come from German Gothic), dishes and tools, in such secondary features as ornaments on the sides of shelves, reminiscent of gothic forms, frequent occurrence of swastikas in ornamentation, elements of costumes (highlander clips are similar to Goths' clips – according to Władysław Antoniewicz, who referred to Plügel, but added that they “have something to do” with German clips from the Middle Ages and the early modern period), paintings painted on glass (reminiscent of those from upper and middle Germany), in the names of towns, fields, family names, names of objects (as demonstrated by Józef Rozwadowski), typical activities (different from those of the population of Wallachian origin, mainly engaged in herding and hunting – as described by Kazimierz Dobrowolski), industriousness and intelligence, which distinguishes these people from poor and miserable Polish villages. Further proofs can be found in their character traits: they are open, proud, love freedom and their homeland, they demonstrate common sense and cunning (in their stories a highlander outsmarts even the devil – this cunning of the highlander, Sydow concluded (1943: 95, provides an explanation why there are so few Jews here), as well as the love of order (dirt and disorder are characteristic of the population of Wallachian and Polish origin, and Gypsies).

The studies by Plügel, Fliethmann and Sydow therefore included what in the old ethnography was called the “external character” of the people, which consisted of descriptions of the country (region, county, village) in geographical, historical terms, descriptions of physiognomy and character, and then houses, activities, food, clothes, articles of everyday use. This was followed by the presentation of the “inner character”, i.e. habits, customs, beliefs, folklore. They were the implementation of the Nazi Volkstumsforschung program: research on the external sides of the nationality, including ethnicity studies in order to evaluate the degrees of resistance

to foreign linguistic and cultural influences, the effects of assimilation of a foreign language and beliefs on the personality of the people (Harten 1996: 138–141; Schafft 2006: 91).

The focus on the external, “physiognomic” features of culture, especially material culture, was also the result of the fact that these studies were conducted by teams led by the SRV employees during several-weeks’ or several-months’ “field research”, while “comprehensive studies” took years to complete; by German scientists who – especially in the ethnicity-related research activities – were dependent on the work of Polish assistants and collaborators who did not know and understand local life, and did not know the language sufficiently well. Gottong and Sydow did not speak Polish. Plügel, Fliethmann and Riemann understood Polish a little (Bałuk-Ulewiczowa 2004: 82–84). Hildebrandt was better acquainted with the Polish language, and her research focused mainly on material culture, and to a negligible degree on rituals and folklore (see Tejchma in this volume). Their independent ethnographic research could have looked like that described by Sauer (1993: 147). In the group of scholars visiting Wilamowice, Cracow, and finally Haczów no one spoke Polish except one interpreter from Vienna. During her attempts at ethnographic research, Sauer was alone. She took down the melody of the songs herself, their lyrics were translated by a man found in Haczów who remembered the German language from the time of his service in the Austro-Hungarian army, or by a woman who explained their meaning in American English, which Sauer translated into German. In Szaflary, Sydow spoke with the highlanders if they spoke “broken German” (known to some from the time of the Austro-Hungarian Empire) and in “broken American English” (spoken by those who came back from America).

The German scientific staff involved in ethnicity studies was more dependent on help from Poles employed in the SRV, and from collaborators – guides and information sources on site, such as Zborowski and Szatkowski – than when they carried out anthropological research, and, furthermore, on publications (despite Riemann’s declared rejection of the idea of combining Polish and German science) of Leszczycki, Władysław Matlakowski, Antoniewicz, Stanisław Witkiewicz, Dobrowolski, Rozwadowski, Zborowski, Talko-Hryniewicz, Seweryn Udziela, Tadeusz Seweryn. Plügel (1942a) did not hide the fact that his extensive “sketch” about Podhale highlanders, as he described it, was based on a several weeks’ tour of the villages during the anthropological research projects, and “gaps from field research” were filled on the basis of the “material side” of the Museum of Tatra Mountains in Zakopane (its rich collection did not include, unfortunately, as

he pointed out, any documentation of spiritual culture, photographs and drawings), also thanks to the information and explanations obtained from Zborowski, German officials, on the basis of the relatively large number of publications produced by Polish ethnicity studies (partly obsolete, with many information gaps, untrue news – according to Plügel’s assessment). Similarly, Fliethmann collected ethnicity data as a side activity to the anthropological research he conducted, and recorded them “by means of numerous sketches and photographs”.

Ethnicity studies of the SRV were limited to “ethnographic observations”, to viewing. The SRV has collected a huge number of photographs for racial and ethnographic research. The collection of the latter contains a lot of general views of villages and their environs, homesteads and buildings, detailed shots documenting wall and roof structures, chalet interiors, furnishing elements of chambers, their fragments – decorations, etc. (see Duszeńko-Król, Sekunda in this volume). The subject matter of these photographs, the fact that many of them were taken in museums, their hypertrophy in relation to a small number of notes from field research raise the suspicion that they were the main material on the basis of which Plügel, Fliethmann, and Sydow wrote their articles in Cracow, supplemented by materials gathered in the Ethnographic Museum at the Wawel Hill. Plügel’s works are read as if they were a description of subsequent views, the collections viewed at the Museum of the Tatra Mountains, photographs, discussion of excerpts from Polish publications (translated in the SRV by Polish assistants). Their storyline pattern corresponds to the order of photographic documentation: race, history, land, “external features of material culture”. Riethemann announced in 1943 that he would create an archive of photographs divided into disciplines “which would provide important ethnicity material”.

Characterization of ethnic differences and historical-cultural areas can be done without a method – admitted Reinfuss and Falkowski (Libera 2011: 15) in a dispute over the Boyko-Lemko border – an experienced researcher “with the naked eye distinguishes striking ethnographic details”; these goals allow to reach the fastest and most effectively separated “pure elements” of material culture (social and spiritual culture are not suitable for these tasks).

In fact, the SRV ethnographic research was driven by German common sense, reinforced by field experience. The descriptions of the photographic materials were supplemented by “impartial observations” and field experiences, devoid of emotions and prejudices – as Plügel described it – “these are subjective impressions, but more accurate” than the impressions of skiers and holidaymakers from Zakopane, burghers and writers (such as

Stanisław Witkiewicz), Polish opinions in general, biased and full of contradictions, about the physiognomy and character of the highlanders, their culture. Plügel, Fliethmann, and Sydow moved from the theory of hierarchy of races to the hierarchy of cultures, they accepted the social and cultural diversity as a result of the physical and psychic differences, they characterized the highlanders with the use of stereotypes, social and scientific myths (of the people, peasants, highlanders in general). They made this characterization with the use of the physiognomic method. In physiognomy, single signs – the characteristics of individual parts of the body reveal the appropriate properties of the soul. Likewise, the characters of the peoples are imprinted in observable elements – in the features of culture. It was enough for Plügel (1942b: 239) to look at specific people, things and events in order to immediately create collections of (sometimes contradictory) syllogisms: a highlander kissing a parish priest's hand is a new form of "Catholic serenity". When entering the church, driving an alpenstock into a door frame, not taking off his hat, talking during the service he proves he is a pagan deep down inside as he had been until recently a "child of nature".

The SRV researchers put the knowledge of German science on a par with German common sense. Their research and publications illustrate that they treated their own culture – with its objectivity, truth and morality – as a reference culture, that they thought "substantially". The "substantial properties" are always part of the biological or cultural essence – this has been, and still is, the connecting element, according to Pierre Bourdieu (2009: 14) – and part of "common sense", racism, certain scientific theories. This gave rise to "obviousness" and "customization", i.e. in the case of the SRV IDO activities, reduced "making an anthropology during the war" to the categories and patterns commonly known and understandable in Germany. We know this from the autobiography of Rudolf Höss (accounts of the functioning of the concentration camp as a kind of "social institution", of his participation in crimes as "business tasks") or Jürgen Stroop (who talked about the liquidation of the Warsaw Ghetto and about other "actions" as a "soldier adventure", in the convention of the adventure novel) (Czyżewski 1991: 166–183), from Fliethmann's and Kahlich's correspondence, who described their work in the SRV, research in the Tarnów ghetto or Haczów as an expedition with difficulties and dangers, a great adventure which they regretted was coming to an end (Schafft 2006: 29, 24, 100). The SRV IDO research is at the same time a part of the history of German science and politics, it is primarily a document of science at the service of the Third Reich. Recognizing this, I did not strive to whitewash the scientific achievements

of anthropologists and ethnologists in the GG. I did not denigrate Polish anthropologists and ethnologists because I compared their theories and practices with German research – after all, I pointed out certain similarities, but also fundamental differences – and tried not to describe these stories according to the principles of homology. I used the “contextual mercy” provided by others, I expanded these contexts on my own, only to get closer to the “texts” – research and publications of the SRV. The effort to understand them is not connected in any way with their justification. Anthropology as a “school of interpretation” is sometimes a “school of cynicism” – not in this case, however.

Finally, I do not transform the stories described above (which is a frequent temptation in such situations) into a parable: “recalling the history of anthropology’s involvement in politics should teach us today...”.

The last sentence: the presented research on the activity of the IDO SRV is the beginning and not the end.